

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: What we are aiming to do in these two days together is to develop our work plan. So let's have this discussion thinking about how it's going to translate into concrete tasks from us. This is our objective in having this conversation. That was, I think, your point. Wasn't it, Alain? Why are we doing this?

So maybe to guide us, sort of some jump-off points are do we need any more information? Are there any bits where we feel like we don't have the information?

I think it's a point that you raised, James, about sort of the timeliness and that not every recommendation in that previous report is created equal. There are some things which were clearly felt to be a big strategic priority to do, and other things that may or may not have been. As we're looking now, five, six or seven years later, if there are things that haven't been completely completed, to what extent does it matter?

What I'd like to hear from you is, thinking about further information needed, and also any of the major issues, major problems or major opportunities that might be coming up that we can then develop into our work plan. Thank you.

Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: For the question that you asked, my answer is yes. I think there's a fair amount of additional information that we'll need. I think this has been a

---

*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.*

Session

---

really useful start, but I have a few pages of questions and additional requests for information to follow-up on what we already heard, just to note that.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Yeah. Maybe something that we also have the balance of what we explore here in our plenary session and what we then kind of take away or we get a small group working on. So I've made a few little bullet point lists of things that occurred to me. Has anybody else developed any kind of thoughts about that?

Looking around the table, Alain, Noorul, anything? Boban?

How do we take forward your massive list of questions and how do other people contribute? Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Just to see, are we going to continue with the reflections on the SSR1 reflection or going just straight into the work plan because for me, it's two different discussions and I just want it to be clear before we continue.

EMILY TAYLOR:

That's a well taken point. I think is more of a reflection time, but bear in mind James is going to lead a session tomorrow on the work plan, so let's be thinking towards that, but equally, you don't have to have a particularly well planned response at this time. It's just sort of what's

occurred to you, what haven't you had time to say so far about the implementation and about the SSR1 as a piece.

So I've got James, Denise.

JAMES GANNON:

I think Denise is going to kill me now. So I'm going to be a little bit controversial and I want to put it out there that given the age of SSR1's report, I don't want us to spend an uneven amount of our time reviewing its implementation. We came both as a community and as ICANN the organization, and how even ICANN is structured and governed, it's an entirely different landscape to what it was during SSR1.

And while we have a clear mandate to review and assess the effectiveness of those implementations, I don't want it to become a significant chunk of our work. There is a [role] for us there to do that, but where there is additional requests for information and things that we need to dig into, I'd like us to get that done, get our review and assessment complete as quick as we can, and then move on to the piece of work that we have with the new ICANN and the new landscape we exist within now, what are we doing there.

We're a pretty small group and I can guarantee you we could easily spend a year reviewing this, or one implementation, easily.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Thanks. Does anybody around the table feel that that is a controversial statement? Would anybody like to take issue with what James has suggested?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, I just want to fully support what James has said.

EMILY TAYLOR: Kaveh? I've got Denise and then, okay, hot pursuit Kerry-Ann, and then we'll go to Denise.

Okay, Denise and then Kerry-Ann.

DENISE MICHEL: I actually agree with James as well. We're obligated as a Review Team to assess the effectiveness of the implementation and the impact of the implementation, so we do need to do that. But I think more importantly, a number of things that have occurred that fall under SSR1 implementation are very relevant, I think, for our work now and going forward.

For example, the Identifier Systems Attack report, which not many people in the community seem to be aware of at all and were unclear of how it's being integrated into the work, I think that falls squarely within something that this Review Team should take on and should understand in more depth and is very relevant to our work.

Session

---

So many of the things that I would like additional information on go as much to our work broadly than simply, let's check a box on the implementation of SSR1.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Okay, I've got James. Kerry, I'm confused. Do you want to speak?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Because Denise had her thing, I wasn't sure if she was speaking because she was in the queue or she was responding to James as well, so I got confused. That's why I was kind of waiting to see and let her go first.

But it was in response to what James said and I think it's one of the reasons I won't be here tomorrow, unfortunately, but I'll try and come in remotely.

But it's one of the reasons, as I said, in terms of we're looking at the subgroups that we had, we have entire subgroup that's dedicated to the SSR1 implementation. I think it will be not an efficient use of resources to have an entire subgroup for that. I'm just putting that on the record.

So at least, when we do revisit it, to me, it's more identifying some of the implementation measures that [will act] act early, what has been done well.

I think you asked that, Emily. What has been done well? What we could probably take away that could have been implemented even more or

Session

---

carried further, and then in that regard, from the SSR1 review, we could then give recommendations as to what we could build on, if anything.

So it's in support of what James said, but just to carry it a little bit further as well.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay, James and then Alain.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. So building on Denise's response then, I suppose this is more of a framing question for me then. I would prefer us to expend that energy focusing it on our future recommendations and placing those questions and that workload in that context rather than in the context of it fitting under the review of the previous reporting.

If we're getting ideas on things that need to be re-recommended, then let's do it on that side rather than on the review side.

EMILY TAYLOR: Alain?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Yes. When I listened to Jim, sometimes I think to raise my hand, but then when he speaks later, then I say, "I shouldn't speak."

We have to consider the SSR1, okay, but I think the issue is how do we approach? But we can't ignore these things, so we have to look at it. And one recommendation from [inaudible], they're saying these [inaudible], we should be focusing on what are we taking away.

We all have an idea, what do I think of what John is doing or you could do this better. But I think at some point, we lack focus on what are we looking for here [inaudible]. Then we can keep engaging staff and [in parallel]. But when we are here, then we should be focusing more on the takeaway than our general feeling or what we think we should be doing.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Alain, I think when you started speaking, I was reminded of the standard meeting wisdom which is, "I think everything has now been said, but not yet by everybody." So please do. Even if you're just taking the microphone to agree or to reinforce, this is all really helpful.

Denise and then Cathy.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think I would also note that I think we haven't received a briefing on nearly half of recommendations, so in terms of one of our next steps, I think we'll need to decide or ask staff to schedule the rest of those so we can make sure that we've done that.

And then in terms of whether or not to have a subgroup that focuses specifically on SSR1, I think as I understand it, James's initial strawman

---

Session

---

about the subgroups and how they might operate are illustrative. And I think part of our job today and tomorrow, especially when we cover the work plan, is to decide how we move forward with our work and if we are going to use subgroups, what those subgroups are going to cover.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. Cathy?

CATHY HANDLEY: Initially, I wanted to support James. I still do. But to the point of the subteam for SSR1, maybe given what Denise just said, having not received the rest of the briefing, and I'm going to say this really easy but don't take offense at it, instead of dragging everybody in to doing this, maybe you just keep the small segment for the rest of the review, of the SSR1, take it to that small subgroup and do it that way instead of getting everybody in on it. Thanks.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. I'm hearing quite a lot of agreement around the table, so I don't want to push my luck too much. My own impression is that, this is something, James, the landscape, the focus on security within ICANN is just unrecognizably different to what it was when the first team was looking at this.

And I think that if we had any major, major anxieties about lack of implementation, I would be expecting those to have come to the surface by now. And I think that the fact that we seem to be, at this



Session

---

stage, relatively relaxed on this work item, which we do have to do, which is one of our mandated things, perhaps [if it] just gives us a suggestion about where we focus our energies. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

For myself personally, I would say it was premature to say that. I don't know if I'm worried about implementation on any of the recommendations and I think, also, the fact that we found so much in the implementation briefings on half the recommendations to be very useful and very relevant for our work going forward, to me, that would indicate that the whole team should hear the rest of the briefings on the implementation because I suspect that, to some of the recommendations that we haven't reviewed yet, will also be very relevant for our work going forward.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you. I was going out on a limb on that and so I totally accept that point. But also that the briefings are giving us a really useful jump-off point where we're starting to explore the issues around this area and exposes areas where more work is needed and where we might need to focus. James?

JAMES GANNON:

I'm going to come back in with the counterpoint that I think it'll be more effective for us to look at that within the subgroup. I think that'll be the best use of our time. Just personal opinion.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR:

Kerry?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

I think just to go back to what Cathy said, I mean, I think there's a balancing to be done. The reason why I had kind of suggested maybe not having the subteam or having it is just because there is so much work to be done now and I think to decide who will be part of that subteam that will look at the SSR1 may be losing a valuable resource for another subteam.

I think to explain because I see some persons nodding, but Cathy gave me the frown. So for example, let's say Eric volunteers for SSR1 Review Subteam. Just as an example, maybe Zarko, James, three technical persons have volunteered for the SSR1 Subteam, and then based on the review that will be done tomorrow, there are the technical sides there. I think it's just to figure out how do we ensure that we use some of the best, not that the SSR1 Review wouldn't require the technical persons as well.

How do I explain this? If anybody gets what I am saying and can put it in better words, I think it's to figure out how the resources will be allocated back to the max because the SSR1 review, staff has given us a really good starting point in terms of saying what has been implemented, what hasn't been implemented, and we can get that kind of general sense.

Session

---

As Denise said, it gave her a nice list of things that needed to be further explored, so I'm just trying to [figure], as someone said, is it that all of us need to hear that? Is it the subteam that needs to do that given that the general sense that may come from that review might actually incent the work of other subteams? If we carry it back down, how do we ensure then that experience is the same to influence the other works that we had. I think it's just for me, how do you balance the resources?

EMILY TAYLOR: I think this is something I hope we will be exploring in more depth tomorrow.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [Inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay, well, we're here now and what we're not doing is there was a lot of energy in the room before lunch to sort of talk about the detail of the stuff, the substantive issues. Now it seems quite natural to be doing this, and while you're here, this is fine as long as nobody else objects.

I've got Zarko, and then Cathy, Denise, I think, Bernie.

One thing I would just say is we're not obligated to do subteams and the subteams don't have to be fixed and unchanging. This is up to us. We are a small team. Several people have mentioned that. We may not have the resources and it may be a really hard work load to impose on

Session

---

ourselves to have individuals in several subteams at her commend. Everyone's in different subteams, so we need to be mindful of that.

With that, Zarko and then Alain. You didn't want to say anything? I thought you were asking for the mic.

ZARKO KECIC:

I could say what was just discussed. We have to read that and I know everybody should read the recommendations because briefing is helpful, but it will not come up with final recommendation that we need to produce out of that.

That's one thing, and another thing we should, actually I can do that, not for tomorrow but for next meeting conference call that we have, we have to divide SSR1 recommendations into different groups, either technical or policy or I don't know. We have to find and then to jump on with our expertise.

So not to have one team for SSR1, but to have smaller, specific groups which will look at parts of SSR1 recommendations.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you, [inaudible]. Alain? Sorry, list management. Cathy and then Alain.

CATHY HANDLEY:

My response to what Kerry-Ann said, I wasn't saying that was the only place and that only those people. I think Emily put it, and Zarko just said

---

Session

---

it, I think we're going to see membership or participation in those teams morphing depending on exactly what the topic is. And I think given we have a really limited resource of bodies that whether we really want to or not, we're going to have to start, I think, taking some things out of the big body and using those smaller bodies for what they are for, is to help us progress the work. Who's in them is irrelevant at this point, but thanks.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you, Cathy. Alain?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Yes, on the line of what Cathy just said, I think this [meeting], we're allowed to have an [inaudible] consultant and expertise, so maybe it will be an option we feel like this thing, we now have enough resources to focus on things.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you for that, and thanks for raising that. Denise, then Bernie and James.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, so I guess just to follow-up on this. There's a number of recommendations that we haven't had a chance to discuss yet that I think may be quite important and relevant to our work going forward.

For example, we haven't looked at the operational and business practices as it relates to ICANN's own security. Since this report was written in 2012, I'm wondering about the best practices that were actually identified and adopted. There was a whole host of fairly serious security breaches of ICANN's own operations, particularly as it relates to new gTLD operations, but others as well. I think that's an area that this team will want to look at.

Recommendation 10 on contractual compliance obligations, ICANN's responsibilities related to abuse mitigation, I think that's an important recommendation to look at further and relates to some of our work going forward.

We haven't really looked at the SSR budget and what has occurred in that area, both in terms of budget and staffing resources over the last five years. That will come into play as we start digging into how ICANN is prioritizing its SSR responsibilities and how it's resourcing them.

There is also a recommendation about the SSR-related components of the risk management framework. I think that also may come into play in the areas that we want to look at for the future. I think those are just a few highlights.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Okay. Thank you very much for that, Denise. What strikes me as you're describing those areas is that there is a high degree of overlap with the past and also our future work, and so those briefings may well have an important role in sparking ideas, conversations, identifying gaps as

Session

---

we're looking ahead to some of the other tasks in our terms of reference. So that was just a note.

I've got Bernie, James, Alain.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay, so I'll take you off the list. So Bernie, then James. Kerry-Ann, you had yours. Was that a hot pursuit thing that you wanted? Okay.

JAMES GANNON: So I want to follow-up on Alain's point and I think it's excellent. I think it's something we should discuss as we have a lot of writing ahead of us and we have a budget for external consultants and I would like a discussion over what options are there. I think a technical writer with a background in security and risk management will be extremely useful to us and would help us progress our work very quickly.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much for that. Bernie and then Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: I would just like to second this one because we talked about it yesterday.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just throwing a few more options out for you to consider from other working groups. You could split up the recommendations into things that, let me back up a bit.

Obviously, the briefings you're going to get on the other recommendations will be different. You've gotten sort of the cream of the crop with OCTO. There are other ones that are important, but it's going to be a different take on the [world].

You may want to look at splitting them into things that you want to do as a group and things that maybe you want to parcel out to individuals so that you don't block off a bunch of people looking at the same thing. Maybe some of these recommendations, if you feel comfortable enough with that approach, you could just say, "Okay, who wants to take on the responsibility?" They'll talk to someone and they'll write up a small report for the group, bring it forward. You can ask that person questions and things.

The other thing is as we say in Work Stream 2 for accountability, you will not get through this if you don't start working on the list. You're talking a lot about limited resources and other things. I'm just telling you guys, this does not get done at face-to-face meetings. Face-to-face meetings are use to resolve issues, identify work plans, and just go off



Session

---

and do them because you've got a lot of work facing you. And so just a few things that I've learned from other working groups. You can do what you want with them.

EMILY TAYLOR: That's very valuable. Thank you, Bernie. Kerry-Ann, did you want to?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think it was more along the lines of what Bernie said because I think the more information we have, more ideas will come. But I think as we fine tune the work plan or get into it tomorrow, it's more identifying which one of the SSR1 recommendations sits as well onto some of those topics because that way, you could streamline them in terms of adding additional or saying it was done well. So I think it's streamlining those as well. Something along the lines as Zarko said, in terms of separating and taking into context how MSI separated it as well.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just a quick follow-on, also, another thing you may want to consider, we're evaluating the impact. As Denise has mentioned, some of these things have an impact on what you will be considering going forward. But some of them may not because as we discussed, this stuff is old and maybe considering that, if you re-split the things, you don't need to get those done up front.

Logically, if you're doing the workflow, it's nice to get the old stuff all evaluated and done, but if you can actually come up with a list of stuff

Session

---

that is less critical, you can maybe spread it over time and use your time now to do some of the more critical things. Just a thought, again.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Right. We've got 15 minutes before Dave's presentation is scheduled. Do we feel able to move forward in any way on some of these suggestions like what do we want to do on briefings with SSR1? Do we want to assign tasks to individuals? Do we want to create small groups?

Do we want to move forward on the suggestion, if there is a procurement ask on getting some help for this team and there are several voices around the table, we need to start that now because otherwise, that will take its own time and otherwise, we're going to find ourselves tripping up later on. So a couple of questions out there, do we feel ready to actually get some closure on some of these things right now?

I see Denise and Cathy asking for the mic. Anybody else want to join the queue?

DENISE MICHEL:

I don't remember what I was going to say. So I would also agree with getting resources now, although we don't have a complete picture of all the work we'll need assistance with, there is absolutely no doubt in my mind we'll need additional assistance and the sooner we start that process to get an additional consultant or two, I think the better off we'll be.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: So just to pick up on that point, does anybody violently disagree or even slightly disagree with this suggestion?

Okay, well I think that we can say that we're all feeling this need. Could I have a couple of people to volunteer to help staff describe our ask in terms of skills and tasks?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I'd be happy to work with [you guys] [inaudible].

EMILY TAYLOR: So I've got Denise, James, and Cathy volunteering to help draft the RFP, really, or review the RFP. Okay, thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: And just to finish out, in terms of practical action items on SSR1 implementation, I think an important step will be to actually contact members of the SSR1 Team, share the implementation report with them, and invite them to provide their perspective on certainly the effectiveness of the implementation and the impact or any other comments that they have. I think that's just an important step that we need to take, and I'd be happy to facilitate that.

And then second, I think asking staff if there's agreement, to as expeditiously as possible, schedule the rest of the briefings with the

Session

---

relevant staff and either the full team or the subgroup, however we decide to do that, will be important, I think, to get through that.

Personally, I'm not quite ready to issue an opinion on implementation of the recommendations we've heard thus far, but I don't think it personally would take me too much longer to come to kind of a general opinion about most of them.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you for that. So could I just follow-up on Denise's suggestion for members of the first Security Team to brief us in some way on their view on implementation? Does that seem like a sensible suggestion to people around the table?

Cathy, you're in the queue anyway, so do you want to?

CATHY HANDLEY:

It's too [inaudible]. Oh, do you want to go first?

EMILY TAYLOR:

David go first.

DAVID CONRAD:

Just as a recommendation, a long time ago, I was actually on the ATRT2 and we did a review of the SSR1 recommendations. At that time, and this was 2013 or something like that, it was challenging to locate and

Session

---

speak with the SSR1 members. They just dispersed and run away screaming. No, but Brian Cute was the Chair. No.

CATHY HANDLEY: That was ATRT1 and 2.

DAVID CONRAD: Yes, but I would try to track down Chairs.

CATHY HANDLEY: Alejandro Pisantry.

DAVID CONRAD: Alejandro Pisantry as opposed to the members.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah, so excuse me, Cathy. I did have a chat with Simon McCalla of Nominet who was also, I think, did a lot of the drafting and took an active role in that. And he certainly suggested that he would be willing to brief us or to help our work in any way, so there's that offer as well. But perhaps a general call to the members and something like that. But Cathy, please go ahead. Sorry to have kept you waiting. And then I have Negar.

CATHY HANDLEY: I was going to be here anyway. That's okay.

---

Take heed of what Bernie said. I do worry that we're pretty much back where we started for having everybody work on everything and my personal view is I think that's going to cause us issue in getting things done. I love the idea of having a tech writer. I think that's wonderful because I hate to write, so that's wonderful.

Zarko's suggestion of possibly going through and looking at SSR1, what's technical, what's administrative, I think may help in a way how we review the report because someone may not want to sit through the real technical part, which takes us again back to James's layout with groups.

I just personally think we really, really need to go back, particularly given that it took place five years ago, it took place before the IANA transition, before the new Bylaws. There's been so much change and we've seen it just in the information that the team shared with us today about what they've done and how far they've gone and your DART thing and all of that, that a deep dive makes me nervous about doing that. So that's my only comment.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much. I've got Negar and then Alain.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Emily. The question I wanted to put to the Review Team is would it be more useful for the Review Team to provide us with the remainder of the recommendations that we haven't covered in this

Session

---

briefing today, that you provide a priority list as to which recommendations you would like us to go over for the next briefings?

For example, Denise, I know you had mentioned Recommendation 10, the ones pertaining to budgeting and risk management, and then we can try to schedule them in that order so we cover whatever high priority items you have on your list in the order you'd like to receive them, and then go through that in a more effective manner for the team.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Okay, thanks for that suggestion. Alain and then Zarko.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:

Yes, I think Denise said something and you said about them, and 15 people from SSR1, and you said that you have one of them willing to. But I think at some point, we maybe need to separate the informal discussion from the formal one. So is the person you mentioned going to officially brief this group and take responsibility for what they're saying, or it's just for information?

EMILY TAYLOR:

I think that's a really important point, and of course, although I believe that the more recent major working groups like the Cross-Community Working Group have retained a vestigial role in looking at what happens in implementation, in those days, once you were done, you were done and there's nobody who is going to have the ability to speak formally on

---

behalf of those Review Teams. And so that's a really key point. Also, it's a big ask of somebody who may not have been following implementation particularly closely for the last five or six years. So just to respond to that. I have Zarko and then James.

ZARKO KECIC:

Yeah, I agree but I don't think that briefings either by staff or SSR1 Team will help us. We have to do some analysis and we have to start working on that. And then, if we have additional questions because we have to do that in iterations. We cannot do many things by just looking at documents and that's it. We'll have to work with OCTO and the SSR Team on all stuff.

So my proposal is to start as soon as possible, step by step in digging into SSR1. And what Cathy said, we'll have to divide them into important stuff, which is really still important, and create that by importance as well at the moment five years later.

So we'll have to say, this recommendation is not important anymore. It is implemented but next steps are like this, and this, and this. And this recommendation is still important and we would like to extend our recommendation this way. So we'll have a really good report at the end.

You mentioned procedures in ICANN as an organization and OCTO especially. We'll have to do that as SSR2 and also SSR1, where they gave recommendations on that.



Session

---

So one recommendation should be covered by our scope of work, and in that case, we will cover a recommendation by SSR1. So let's go step by step, although for next meeting, next conference call, do whatever I think is important with each recommendation, what group is there, and then we start reading and then ask additional questions, either SSR1 Team or ICANN staff.

EMILY TAYLOR: So we have a concrete proposal there for Zarko about how to move forward, that there's a piece of work from us somehow in categorizing the priority, the importance of the existing.

ZARKO KECIC: And also what should be done, or what kind of work should be done.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah, what kind of work should be done, so that's a concrete proposal.

[ALAIN PATRICK AINA]: I thought this is part of what we would discuss tomorrow. No?

EMILY TAYLOR: Yes, indeed. We will be discussing tomorrow. James, you were asking for the microphone. We've got about three minutes until – Dave, you better get yourself together. You have three minutes for your presentation. So we will be returning to this subject tomorrow. I totally

Session

---

take the point from Bernie and others that we need to up our rate of work, we need to get assistance if we need it, but we also need to work at how we're going to get this stuff done. We can't put it off any longer. We've got to actually get down to it, so talking about working and working to slightly different skillsets.

James, did you want to add something?

JAMES GANNON:

I have a totally off-track question for the group. It was something that Bernie said and reminded me that I'd asked Karin about this in Copenhagen. So a quick look around the table, who else here uses Slack?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Facebook Messenger?

JAMES GANNON:

I should have expected that. So a little over half, maybe. So just before I expend any actual energy on this, would there be any interest if we could get ICANN to agree to set up a compatible, publicly archived Slack and [inaudible] to work in a bit of a more real-time manner than the mailing list because we know the mailing list works for some people, doesn't work for some people. Is there interest in that? Should I expend any energy on trying to get this done or not?

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Thanks. I've got Jennifer with the flag up, and Margie, did you want to come in quickly on that question? Because I saw you responding.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, because we've already gone through this with the CCT group who made the same request. We're not able to support Slack. We have all the transparency and other issues that come with it. We explored it for an extended amount of time with our IT team.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible] just with Slack or anything?

MARGIE MILAM: Just Slack is the one we went through.

EMILY TAYLOR: So one method that I'm hearing around the table is also Google Docs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a checked solution. There are [little boxes] that [inaudible] too, so we need something to be able to discuss ad hoc [inaudible].

EMILY TAYLOR: [Inaudible]. It's not very transparent, is it?

Session

---

MARGIE MILAM: Part of the obligation we have is to maintain the transparency of the work you do, and so a lot of the issue that comes up with us is with mailing lists, you can see that the right people can look at it and follow it. With these messenger systems, you can't and we haven't developed the capability of doing that to satisfy the transparency requirements.

EMILY TAYLOR: So I've got a queue of Jennifer, Denise, James. Really, please, very, very brief comments.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Just to let you know that we do have the contact information for the SSR1 Team ready to go, so you just need to let us know and we can set up a poll.

EMILY TAYLOR: Denise and then James.

DENISE MICHEL: Just to note, there's a limit to our transparency responsibilities. We have no responsibility to create an archive of our dinner discussion last night and nothing is preventing us from having individual phone conversations or individual e-mail or Slack or Facebook Messenger conversations. I would not take off the board our ability to collaborate and advance our work, and certainly, drafts of our work will actually always be in the public domain. But I think we should think more

---

Session

---

broadly about the tools we need to work collaboratively. And I think there is a group chat function in Google Docs, so I don't know that I would take that off the table either. But I'm open to using whatever technology and tools people need, either informally to advance our work together.

EMILY TAYLOR: I think as long as we're conscious of the public archive and we just keep in mind what is a private conversation. So tweet length interventions. [Both] James and then Kerry-Ann.

JAMES GANNON: So just very briefly, it can be done and that's why I'm asking the group, if there is a will for the group for me to investigate this. I've done this in another organization which has even more stringent transparency requirements than ICANN. You can do a fully publicly archived Slack. It can be done, so if there is a will to do that, I can investigate it further with staff.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: You raised for me an even more important question. Pigeon hole it for the discussion tomorrow. I just want to kind of put it on the record. If we do get to the point, then, of the subcommittees, let's say Cathy and I

because we are close to each other in D.C. and Maryland, decide to actually do our subcommittees on a certain topic and we're not able to document the same way, everything that both of us talk but we're able to produce a report to the group, which will be publicly available.

Because for me, the Slack conversation is similar to that. It's like us having a coffee conversation but what comes out of it is the document. So I'm just wondering, when we get to those smaller groupings, however they look, whatever shape they'll be in, you guys won't be beside us when we're having those dialogues. So I'm just wondering what's the rule for that, then?

EMILY TAYLOR:

Margie?

MARGIE MILAM:

Well, in the past, when we've had subteams, we set up separate mailing lists for them and so that is archived. But you're right. Obviously, coffee conversations is not. There is a limit to it, but it is one of the things that we're trying to strive for is we don't want to encourage major conversations offline when this is work that the community is really interested in.

Not to say that you can't, obviously, talk, but if the large amount of work is being done in an untransparent manner, it raises concerns for the organization and it would be certainly something that's an issue.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Well taken, and I think that there's a happy balance to be achieved. If we find that we're actually working in a non-transparent environment, or if we could take forward James's suggestion of actually getting a chat environment which is archivable, let's explore that.

I think that what we're responding to, naturally, is a perceived need to advance our work and advance our sense of collaboration in as many ways as we possibly can. And so personally, I wouldn't like to say no before exploring what's happened. But your point about transparency is essential. It's something that we must bear in mind.

Bernie and then I'm going to go to Dave.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just a minor point having worked on trying to provide such tools in this kind of a group. We do have people from a bunch of different regions. One should not automatically assume that all tools can be used in all regions.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you for that. Okay, so with that, Dave, thank you for waiting for us and we're looking forward to your presentation.

DAVE PISCITELLO: I think it's working now. I'm going to do two parts to this. Part one is the presentation that Sarah will actually sync for people who are online, but I regret that I have to run the live demonstration off my machine so I

don't know whether that can actually be projected. So if not, I apologize. But this will probably not be the last time I actually demonstrate the DART, and so there will be another opportunity.

So let me begin with "What is the domain abuse reporting tool?" This is a platform for reporting on domain name registration abuse behavior across TLD registries and registrars. It is rather unique in the sense that we have spent probably five or six years in the formulation of what we attempted to accomplish in this project.

Over time, we observed several studies either from academia or from industry that attempted to assess or describe the threat landscape, or the abuse landscape, of the TLD space. All of them had limitations that one way or the other rendered the results or the findings of the recommendations unsatisfactory for the purposes that we were seeking.

In some cases, they only studied samplings of registries or samplings of registrars or samplings of data from the communities. In other cases, they employed only one or two reputation feeds. Particularly in the academic world when people are doing research papers, they don't have the financial backing to acquire the large commercial feeds which can be thousands of dollars a year. So often you see some repetition in the feeds that are present in the academic papers, and so you're only really getting a small surface of the actual reputation data that are used every day by large organizations and by Internet service providers.



The next one that is very important is that most of the research papers are usually snapshots, or very small windows of a history. And often, they look at one particular kind of threat. Either they look at phishing or they look at spam or they look at malware or botnet, you'll see too, but they don't typically look at them all.

The last one is important because in academia, often what you'll find is that they're very concerned about explaining their methodology, but they don't really know their data. In industry, they don't read their data or their methodology and often, in the industry reports, there is some bias or there is some marketing opportunity that they're trying to go after.

So we wanted to overcome all of those and I'll explain to you how we do that in future slides. But the primary purpose here was to say, "Look, nobody has a good picture and nobody has a full picture, so how do we get a good, accurate, full picture? And how do we get something that would be valuable for not only snapshot, but historical, perspective on abuse and a persistent one?"

So what we want to do, and the overriding goal for this project was to provide the ICANN community with data to make informed policy decisions. These kinds of data are not available today. People make speculations. People make, I think, sort of crazy exhortations about the extent of abuse or the extent of misuse of data. So let's get one set of data that everybody can agree is accurate, is reliable, is persistent, and put it in front of the community.

---

So there are many ways that we see the data being used, at least at our research level in OCTO, we believe that we'll be able to identify threats better reported to TLD or registrar level for all TLDs for which we can obtain data. We want to be able to historically track the security threats that we're going to examine.

We want to be able to track and correlate those to domain registration activity because this is a good way to understand flocking behavior. Flocking behavior may be attributed to promotional pricing or may be attributed to a Friday afternoon before a holiday where there may be a major spam campaign. But what we'd like to understand is, what are the inflection points for various attacks?

We also want to help operators clean their portfolios, and quite frankly, the value of a project like this to me is to eventually see all the threats down close to zero across the entire space because that would be an enormous win.

So studying malicious behavior registrations may be an input to a change in operations by registries and registrars. It might actually feed into some policy or some recommended practices that registries and registrars might choose to adopt voluntarily. All of that is outside OCTO's remit. OCTO's remit is to get the data in front of people to make those decisions.

So I've talked about data and let me explain the kinds of data that we use. Let me begin by saying that the largest effort thus far in putting together the DART system has been in building the collection engine.

The collection system collects currently 1,238 top-level domains every day, and that brings us to approximately 194 million domains records that we have been accumulating over time since November.

We use the centralized zone data service. We have some problems with that service, both in trying to get applications that are rejected by various parties because of some policy that the registries choose to implement that are inconsistent with what we had experienced with some of the legacy TLDs as an example.

We also began with the idea of doing gTLDs but always with the eye that we would use any ccTLD data that a ccTLD operator would offer and after my presentation yesterday, I had five ccTLDs come to me and say, "We'd love to participate." That brings the total number of ccTLDs that have personally contacted me to about ten, which is very encouraging because I've only been talking about this for a couple of weeks. So I would love to see ccTLDs up their registration.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Please present that at the ccNSO meeting.

DAVE PISCITELLO:

It will be. It's already on our horizon for Abu Dhabi. So the question was please present to the ccNSO, and we will do that on Tech Day, I believe.

We also, in order to identify the registrar that was the sponsor for the registration in the gTLD space, need to be able to access WHOIS and collect WHOIS on a daily basis at a very, very phenomenal rate. So we're

talking six figures plus of WHOIS queries every day across 1,200+ TLDs, rate limiting that's applied by the WHOIS service operators is a severe encumbrance to our collection engine.

We have adopted the same techniques that all the major reputation service providers, like Spamhaus, and SURBL, and abuse.ch use where we use massive numbers of IP addresses to actually go out and acquire WHOIS. We still cannot complete a full census of new WHOIS registrations within a 24-hour period. So we fall behind and this is impeding our ability to actually provide reliable registrar statistics at this time.

So one of the things that we need in order to get this system up and running to its full accurate operational capacity is a better, a more reliable and more timely and [unfettered] access to WHOIS

When we use domain names in the context of the DART system, we are talking about domain names in the zone, not domain names that have been registered. So in order for it to be counted in our system, it's a domain name that actually can resolve to an address. The rationale behind this is that if the domain can't resolve to an address, someone can't connect to something that is a threat or that threat can't be manifested from that IP address.

That part of the collection system builds up the name space. The next part of the collection system builds up the reputation space. So for all these names, which are the names that are actually identified as having

at least one abuse event recorded against them? Most of the studies that we have seen use one or two reputation lists. We use 20.

I've gone out with Greg Aaron, whom many of you know, and Greg and I have seeded through over 80 reputation lists and we have walked very carefully through their methodologies. We've looked to see who in industry trusts these methodologies and trusts these lists for their commercial products. And so we believe that what we have done is accumulated what we call a very high confidence set of reputation lists that exhibit high accuracy, very large collection infrastructure, good methodologies, low false positive rates, and all of the characteristics that we believe make these lists attractive to large scale organizations that run security systems to defend their own Internet users.

And one of the things that we believe that allows us to do is to give the ICANN community the same optic or the same lens about the domain space that a corporate user or an Internet user who has a very capable ISP sees. So our goal here is to show the community what everyone else is seeing when they come to the domain name space. I've already mentioned we use these many reputation data sets and as I said, DART reflects how parties external to ICANN's community see the ECHO system.

One of the things that we intended to do and I think we've accomplished is that we've built the system so that it's relatively pliable. If one disputed the voracity of one of our reputation fees, we could take it out and we could re-run to see whether that reputation system had actually affected any of the parties.

In the future, yesterday, several people actually came up to us and said, “Hey, we have some data for you.” We will go through those data with the same rigor. One of the things that John insists on and I agree is that we have to make certain that we use data that anyone else can get because that way, someone can repeat what we do, hopefully reproduce what we do with our methodology and that’s the scientific approach that we like to maintain throughout this project.

Another reason why we use multiple data sets is because several of us have been doing this for many, many years and we know a lot of the people who have done some of the good work in the academic community. In particular, Metcalf and Spring have done multiple tests over a three year period that show that it was not common for a domain name to appear in multiple lists, that the frequency where you would find a domain name in two or more lists was very, very low.

We actually tested that in-house. I ran some experiments – I’ll get right to you – in-house with a script that allowed me to go and test 85 reputation lists with thousands of domains and we consistently found that the domains were in one, maybe two, but certainly never 86.

And the reason why is because the spam trap infrastructures or other detection infrastructures are not all the same. In a Venn diagram sense, in a [inaudible] sense, they’re not all one-to-one and [not] two. So there’s some overlaps. There are some places where only one operator actually has reach, and so, you get a different perspective.

---

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Dave, sorry. Noorul, did you want to...?

But I think did all of us see the presentation yesterday? We did. Didn't we? This is my fault for just setting you off before even teeing you up.

DAVE PISCITELLO: Oh, I'm sorry.

EMILY TAYLOR: But it may, just thinking about is there new information that you want to give to us but also, can we open up to questions because I think your presentation –

DAVE PISCITELLO: Sure. I also can give a demo because I actually woke up to people and took it away from them [inaudible] gatherings to get it to work.

EMILY TAYLOR: That would be really appreciated, and sorry not to have done this before, getting you started. I got over-concerned with time, but I think my reflection from yesterday is that your presentation stimulated a lot of excitement and a lot of questions amongst this group and I would really like us to perhaps have that demonstration since somebody has gotten out of bed, especially, but also it would give us a bit more insight. But also, with your permission, to turn it over to questions and answers.

Session

---

DAVE PISCITELLO: Absolutely. I've done it three days in a row.

EMILY TAYLOR: I'm sorry to have set you off on the wrong track.

DAVE PISCITELLO: That's all right. Do you want me to demo or do you want to ask questions?

Absolutely. Interrupt the demo. Ask me to move however you'd like. So let me explain what we've done. We have contracted with a company that manufactures.

EMILY TAYLOR: Sorry, can you just speak into the mic?

DAVE PISCITELLO: I've got it over here. I'll get it. This way, I can wander because my energy level is up. The eight cups of coffee have finally caught up.

So what we have done is we've worked in conjunction with a company called iThreat Cyber Group. Greg Aaron works for that group, Jeff Bedser works for that group. They're both on ICANN's SSAC. We have worked together, John and I. And Jeff and Greg, essentially designed this. I won't tell you over how many vodkas we actually designed this because that might damage our reputation and credibility.



So we have been using the cyber tool belt tool for what we call open source intelligence prior to deciding to incorporate into this platform. And one of the reasons why we chose this platform was because we had hired them for consulting and for some investigations and as a result of those, they had ended up building the collection engine that we actually now employ. So we were leveraging on already spent money.

One of the things that we did was we incorporated into their enterprise account system so that we have an ICANN enterprise account under which all our access is controlled, so it's restricted to just ICANN staff thus far or anyone who has an account under the ICANN enterprise.

So all these tools that you see are tools that we can avail ourselves of but the tool that we have developed custom for us is called the TLD Reporting Tools and that's because we haven't told them to change it to DART.

When you get to the dashboard for DART, the first thing you encounter are the summaries and we'll be expanding summaries to have some other statistics available. But this is mostly for the management and generation of reports for staff right now. So we have over 194 million domain names in 1,238 domains and there are about 450 top-level domains that have at least one security threat.

So one of the first things you can observe is that this debunks the myth that the entire new TLD space is bad because there are at least 800 or so new TLDs that have no accounts. We also are in the process of identifying all the different variations and naming of the registrars

because they actually don't all put the same information in all their records. Especially in the reseller space, you find all these variations and permutations of names of the registrar. So to try to assimilate and match them correctly has been a chore.

There's also a summary graph and this is just the total registrations and the percentages. We're going to eventually have some summary graphs that break down into different abuses on this landing page so we can have some optics. And then on this page, you get your first view of our results of our processing.

So here, it's essentially just like an Excel spreadsheet and you can do the same sort of sorting by column. And so the first column is simply a number. The second column is the name of the gTLD, the current count of domains in the zone, the current listed abuse domains, and then the abuse score. The abuse score is simply a fraction of this number over this number times 100.

So the average abuse score, we don't have that on here. The average abuse score is somewhere on the order of 0.6 and that just gives you a calibration point for how far you are from the average.

Yes, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. So does the abuse score change on a daily basis?

Session

---

DAVE PISCITELLO: Yeah. The abuse score changes every time we update the record.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you provide an aggregated abuse score, say by month or rolling?

DAVE PISCITELLO: I'll get into that. I'll show you on the next drill down. You're sort of providing a nice segue to the deeper data.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, and then a question for whenever you're ready to answer it is with this insight into the abuse landscape on a particular gTLD, do you provide ICANN Compliance with this information and is it the type of information that they find useful to have a more targeted approach to their compliance responsibilities in the new gTLD space, or the gTLD space, I should say?

DAVE PISCITELLO: So that is one of the perceived applications. It's not necessarily for compliance enforcement, but to compliment the information that they have received in a complaint. We are not going to drive complaints out of [inaudible] their system. That's not in our remit. We will be able to provide them with some other insights into behavior.

To answer your question about how frequently this is refreshed, we gather zone files daily or as frequently as the operator publishes, so if Comm publishes very, very frequently over the course of a 24-hour day,

---

Session

---

we gather that. We gather the abuse data on the frequency that the abuse list publisher advertises. And so these numbers are populated fairly regularly.

DENISE MICHEL: And I have just a follow-up question. The zone file information, you don't pull that information from the CZF, the Central Zone File.

DAVE PISCITELLO: Yes, we do.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, you do. And how do you get around the problems that we continue to see with new gTLDs not doing daily dumps of their zone files as required, or using a variety of different formats rather than the one that's prescribed, and those types of issues?

DAVE PISCITELLO: So we have experienced problems in applications. We've experienced problems in lapses [causing] renewal, and we have to accommodate them in the platform [inaudible]. John?

EMILY TAYLOR: Can I just [respect] the list a bit? Because we've got Noorul waiting.

Session

---

DAVE PISCITELLO: No. [inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: You want to wait.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay, fine.

[JOHN CRAIN]: So one of the purposes of doing a project like this is actually to learn those kind of problems. So although we could probably take shortcuts and try other things because we're special-special, we're not going to, because I want other people to be able to replicate this, and I want to find out what the problems are. And boy, are we finding problems, and there will be feedback.

DAVE PISCITELLO: Having said this, we now encounter a tension between trying to eat our own dog food, which is John's methodology, and delivering something that's reliable based on a zero-error [feed] of information. We don't have the same problems collecting [inaudible] data that we have in collecting –

Session

---

Sorry. Did I turn it off?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVE PISCITELLO: No battery? Okay. I'm going to go over here. So we have overcome reputation data collection. That seems to be very reliable. Part of the reason why is because those systems have been serving commercial customers for many more years than [CZDS.] We want to try to eventually have very reliable data in time for meaningful consumption for the community, depending on how the community decides to use the data.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thanks. I thought in a queue of – do you want to ask your questions now, or –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] want to ask questions.

DAVE PISCITELLO: However you want to drive this, I'm here for you until you take me away.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Can we just also do a bit of time management here? Because we're very fortunate to have Alain as well to talk about the health indicators. This session is due to end half past the hour, including a 10-minute coffee break. I'd really like to get to Alain within the time as well.

So I just thought – so option one is we break for coffee, we sort of rush a few questions – so it's Dave now, break for coffee at 3:00, come back at 10 past and go to Alain, or we could extend this period, because I think that there's a lot to be said. We've got actually an hour and a half of time allocated to sort of Any Other Business recapping and planning for tomorrow.

So what I would propose is that we edit at least another half hour to this session and see where we are, because it's substantive. We've got the opportunity to speak to you both, and I sense a level of excitement and engagement in the room. With that, we'll take these two quick questions, and then we'll have a coffee break. Or shall we go until quarter past and have the coffee? Yes? Because we'd like to hear a bit more from Dave before coffee.

Okay. Noorul, this is your moment.

NOORUL AMEEN: The basic question I want to ask is, what are the feeds used for preparing this kind of summary?

DAVID PISCITELLO: You mean which reputation feeds do we have?

---

Session

---

NOORUL AMEEN: No. Basically, we have an early warning framework in our organization. We use DNS logs plus BGP feeds to identify squatted domains, [prefix] hijack and DNS-related malicious domains.

DAVID PISCITELLO: Yes. We use commercial feeds from SURBL, from Spamhaus, from Malware Patrol. And from Malware Patrol, we actually get 12 feeds compositely included. We use [feeder] tracker, we use – I have the whole list, and it's going to be in the frequently addressed questions that we're going to distribute very shortly.

So we gather from 20 different sources and we have multiple sources for each of the security threats. So we manage spam, phishing, malware, and botnet C2 separately and in aggregate.

NOORUL AMEEN: Sorry to quote the names, do you have any feed from [Shadow] people?

DAVID PISCITELLO: Shadowserver? We don't use Shadowserver yet because they're not curated. When I say they're not curated, Shadowserver goes out and they match malware signatures to something they find on a website. And based on that, they generate a notification. They don't do any further curation or hands-on examination of those data. We want something a little bit more reliable, because we know our community is



very skeptical about these kinds of reputation feeds, and so we've used feeds that either we know by experience through more hand tuning and curation have more deep heuristics in the way that they assess and classify a threat than Shadowserver.

Having said that, we have talked to the Shadowserver people. I actually have a Shadowserver feed for myself. I've used it in other studies, and I think it's very reliable. But we've talked to people who say we have some stuff that we can do on top of the Shadowserver feed along with what you do that's kind of a hands-on or curation.

So until we're satisfied that the false positive rate falls into our kind of stringent view of what it should be, we don't use Shadowserver. It's a great feed for notification, but it's not confirmed in the same way that APWG is confirmation, or PhishTank or the others are.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Could I suggest that – because this is a rich and detailed discussion, I suggest that you take that offline with great encouragement to continue that conversation. And then can I go to Eric and then James?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

This'll be really quick because you've answered most of it anyway, but I was going to ask if you do classification based on different types.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

[inaudible]

Session

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right, okay. Just some metrics on that. You'll have the metrics calculated separately?

DAVID PISCITELLO: We'll talk about that as well.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. So a question and a follow-up. So this isn't an ICANN tool, this is a commercial tool?

DAVID PISCITELLO: No, this is a commercial tool that has a custom API and user interface that we paid for.

JAMES GANNON: Okay, so ICANN have paid for the development of this.

DAVID PISCITELLO: So no one else can get to the TLD reporting tools except anyone I authorize. And then we have a license limit under current contract.

JAMES GANNON: Yes, I'm very familiar with [inaudible] itself. So this is just something you've asked them to build on top.

Session

---

DAVID PISCITELLO: Yes, exactly. Okay, so let's look at more data, because –

EMILY TAYLOR: Sorry, before you get started – and I know it's really frustrating because we all want to see it, but we've also all got questions. So can I go to Denise and then Boban?

DENISE MICHEL: I have some meta questions, so I'll wait until the end of the screens. And then if you put me on queue for that. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR: Boban?

BOBAN KRSIC: As a new registry operator, I have a specification 11(3)(b) I think, so the requirement to do so domain abuse monitoring. Now we assume I'm a registry operator and I ask ICANN to do this for me, because it's quite the same, what do I have to do?

DAVID PISCITELLO: See my boss. This is me being catastrophically frank, but one of the things that I have been chomping at the bids to do is to point out that throughout the total period of time that people were trying to decide

Session

---

what to do with spec 11(3)(b), we simply took our skunkworks operation and did it.

So I'm not advocating that the registries don't do this, but we have done it, and so we have a certain amount of expertise that could help you. And lots of people are cynical about what we're doing, but it's the data. It's all the public data and we're collecting a lot of it.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Just more FYI for everyone as well that whenever you're interested as well, we've built that in-house as well for ourselves from scratch. We didn't use a third-party provider, it's just hosted in the cloud. But we built something called [inaudible].org. We have four sources right now, but you can imagine at the governmental level it's a bit harder to get by, and the plan is to eventually have more nodes throughout the region that would actually feed as well. But we have four of the sources that you use. We use the same source. With Shadowserver, we actually started [to negotiate,] and our internal tech guy cleans the data based on the country-level domains. And then he puts that into the feed.

DAVID PISCITELLO:

So you understand what I was talking about about curation. When I use the word "curation," I mean you were trying to separate the quality

from the craft. Alright, I'm going to ask you to stop asking questions so I can show you more exciting data.

So on this page, one of the things we can do is we can sort not just by the count of domains, because obviously, .com is the biggest, but we can sort by the number of listed abuse domains. And if you notice, things quickly change.

.top is not one of the top five total registrations, but it is second in the number of domains listed. .science is very, very bad. I'm not going to say bad. .science is interesting, and .science may be a targeted top-level domain. And you can look down and you can see.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Dave, just as a reminder, this is a recorded session.

DAVID PISCITELLO: Yes. That's why I said I'm not going to say that stuff.

EMILY TAYLOR: So until this is recorded session, did the TLD – sorry, you said not to ask any more questions – did the TLD operators know these scores?

DAVID PISCITELLO: This is our debutant ball this past three days. We've been trying to reach people, and certainly, we are not hiding this. Anyone who wants to see this just has to call and we'll arrange a webinar or a Skype shared screen

---

Session

---

or whatever to share, and the idea is to get it in front of everyone so they have an idea to see what it is that we're collecting.

These data are public. We're not the only ones who can show this kind of representation.

DENISE MICHEL:

Since Emily breached the wall, can I just say that this data tracks with what I see every day on the global platforms that we are responsible for enforcing on? This is not a secret to those throughout the world who are charged with enforcing against abuse in TLDs across the board.

I think what is unique is this is the first time that someone on ICANN staff has stood up and said, "This is what the world is seeing in our top-level domains," which is why I think it makes it so powerful.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

The reason I mentioned that this session is being recorded is I don't want to make any sort of value judgments here. We're just presenting the data. Some TLDs show up in different ways. If you click on the abuse score, you can see data that is highly suggestive, but we aren't going to make any value judgments as to why things are the way they are, we just are presenting the data for the community for policy deliberations and for just information.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you.

Session

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Contractual Compliance can view our data just like anyone else.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much. I'm going to let Dave continue for the next six minutes – poor guy, interrupted nonstop – and then we'll break for a short break, or maybe even bring our coffees back in and then with your permission, we'll go to Alain.

DAVID PISCITELLO: Certainly. So one of the things that is helpful – and is not necessarily unique, but going to be persistent in this collection environment – is that we can provide historical views and we can visualize some of the activity.

So when you click in our management console and you choose a particular TLD, you will get a breakout of the total registrations, the total number of abuse domains, and then we break it down into the three GAC security threats in Spec 11(3)(b).

The reason why we do not have pharming is because pharming is actually not a security threat, it's a way to actually do phishing. There are very few – if any – reputation feeds that actually tag a phishing attack as uniquely pharming. So rather than do that, what we chose to do is track spam, because spam, from the industry perspective, is the biggest optic of abuse. This is what most people focus their attention

on. Spam is essentially the way that phishing, malware and botnets are weaponized very often, or it's the delivery mechanism for an attack.

And then at the end here, you'll see that we have abuse domains listed over the last 365 days. That will be a sliding window. Obviously, we haven't been collecting for 365 days, and that just simply shows that there are activities that have appeared and have disappeared in the portfolio.

This number is not always the total of the four that follow it, because this number is always the unique domain. This number is counted once even if a domain is identified as both a spam and a phish. So this can be larger or it could be smaller. It could be smaller because the domains have been identified or tagged differently in two different lists. It can be larger if we don't have tagging for a particular threat.

The graph that I'm showing you here is basically registration, so the purpose of having a graph like this is to allow us to see changes and to correlate them possibly with a subsequent graph. So the subsequent graph kind of tracks on abuse scoring, and the abuse score shows the mean abuse score and it shows the score that this particular TLD has.

This is relatively down in the very healthy TLD range, and so that's one of the reasons I'm showing this. If you go to some of the other registries that are being heavily exploited or heavily flocked to by attackers, the abuse scores can be very much higher. And I see an operational value for those operators because they can not only see the trends but they can perhaps correlate these to promotional activity, to pricing changes,

---



to operational changes, and use those hopefully to correct their portfolios.

The last graph actually shows how the trends are for each of the security threats, and so spam dominates because it's the largest purveyor of attack. So if you click that off, you get to see the patterns of some of the others and the Y axis adjusts according to scale.

As you can see – and this is pretty consistent with what we've seen for years – botnet C2 activity is very consistent across a legacy TLD. Many of the kits that botnet users or botnet builders use are sort of old school, they use the old public suffix, they have historically used ccTLDs and the legacies. They're starting to move into the new TLDs. And we can see a lot of this already. Got one more screen and then we're done.

Everything you see here is one of the abuse totals, and we will do the same thing for registrars when we have the data, so I'm not going to show you any of that because the data is not reliable.

The other feature that we have that is for us in OCTO – at least for me, this is what I giggle at, because I come here and I can choose a top-level domain or a registrar, and I'll just choose – you know what? I'm going to choose something that is probably not controversial. I'm going to go and get [.den.]

And what I can do is I can say, "Okay, I want to look at this TLD or this registrar, I want to choose a particular abuse type, and I want to choose a data and a range." And so this'll run a search, and it'll generate the list

Session

---

of domains that fall into this search pattern pretty quick. I think they were migrating to a faster machine this week.

And so this is something that's really attractive to the people that I showed, is you find a domain, the abuse type is identified, the list from which we got it is identified, the creation date, and the expiry date or suspension date are –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello. You have been conducting a meeting for a long period of time. If you need to continue meeting, press 1 now. If not, I'll end the meeting.

DAVID PISCITELLO: Do some cyber or some stealth surveillance, we can get the WHOIS, and we can build dossiers on individual names. We could export the name list and share it, or feed it into another open source intelligence platform.

One of the things I tend to do from this point is I export the names and I go into domain tools iris which allows you to do pivoting on various pieces of the WHOIS, and so you can do some really fascinating research once you have these names on the given range.

So if you want to hold questions until you've got coffee, you can do that, or we can just ask some questions so I can say thank you and head off.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: How are we feeling coffee-wise?

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. Come on then. Alright.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: I think that we've got the sense of momentum. Let's just take a few questions. Okay. Kerry, and then Denise. Anyone else? James? No, okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Not to put you on the spot, Dave, but the thing that flashes to my mind is because we've done this in-house, the reason why we went in-house you can imagine is because we're dealing with the country-level domain names of all our member states. So we have proprietary from front to back, it's hosted in the cloud. We're still working on that aspect in terms of who, but this is a tool that's owned by someone else. I'm just wondering with all this information resting on their –

Session

---

DAVID PISCITELLO: Currently, it's all public information. When we've talked to some of the ccTLDs, what we –

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That was the other question I had, yes.

DAVID PISCITELLO: What we had discussed – and I was absolutely astonished by how cooperative they were willing to be – is to do the registrar piece, we only need the domain name and the sponsoring registrar. We don't need any of the WHOIS information.

And there have been registries who have said, "Well, we could probably generate a file for you on a daily basis." That level of cooperation is unexpected and marvelous, because they see the value immediately, after one demonstration, of being able to have someone do this tool.

So that would be ideal for us if we could set that up. Now, it does violate John's "Everybody can't get to it" rule, but to get 250 more TLDs and have a picture of the entire space may be very well worth that.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That's what [I wanted to lead into] in terms of what was the outreach to them to get them on.

Session

---

DAVID PISCITELLO: GDPR, yes. We do not have to use any of the WHOIS information for this project, other than the domain name and the sponsoring registrar and the IANA ID.

EMILY TAYLOR: Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. So I have, I think, about four questions. I'll give them all to you, and if you have time to answer or the ability to answer, great. If you want to follow up on the e-mail list or other forms, that's great as well.

My first question is about next steps and timing. I believe I asked this yesterday and didn't get a very precise answer, so I'd like to ask it again. What are your next steps, and what is the timing for those steps? What are the barriers to conclusion, and what is conclusion on this project? That's sort of question number one.

Question number two is, how much money would it take to get this into the public domain and to have an API that the public could access? Ballpark. I think that's my second question.

My third question is, is there a possibility that you could market – using the term in quotes – this or provide this as a service to new gTLD registries as a way of helping them comply with Spec 11(3)(b)? That's my third question.

---

Session

---

And then my fourth question is, anyone who has operated in the abuse mitigation and enforcement environment comes up against and is frustrated by WHOIS rate limiting. And I don't need a history lesson on why there is WHOIS rate limiting, but I do have a question about when you've got a white hat reason.

DAVID PISCITELLO:

[inaudible] a solution. We have to go and see how we can resolve that. Even once we have all the WHOIS at line rate so to speak, we're going to still have to do some assimilation to make certain that we are representing each registrar with the full compliment of names and channels that that registrar actually uses. And then we'll have a period where we're going to actually drill and bang on the system with in-house people making certain that the numbers make sense. Alain is very good at looking at numbers and going, "That doesn't make sense," so he's going to be one of the primary testers.

When can we do that? I would ideally like to be able to demonstrate a production-ready product by Abu Dhabi, but that's going to be gated by externalities. The goal is to have it up and working. You asked about –

EMILY TAYLOR:

Market opportunities and cost of making it public.

DAVID PISCITELLO:

Obviously, this is built into a commercial product that is sold by [seat] and that was intentionally so, because we spent a relatively small

---

amount of money by comparison to having to build this and build it out. We also – we’re not sure what purpose the community would actually choose to have, whether they want to be an API that was going to be for general access, what the nature of that API might be, how they wanted to do this.

I can see a lot of different business models. I can see a business model where we essentially say as a community, anyone who wants this goes to the cyber toolbelt, applies, gets a license, and does that. And maybe there’s a pool for people who do this for research. That’s one model that I would just drop off the top of my head. I have no idea.

We haven’t even talked about whether or not the community wants this information to be made public in a broader form than this form. So I’m just being honest with what we see as not necessarily inhibitors, but things we haven’t done yet. Because this is still – research is coming out and saying, “Look at this shiny new toy that we have. Do you like the object? What would you like to do with it?”

DENISE MICHEL:

If I may, just for clarification, so your end goal is a production model for demonstration in Abu Dhabi, and then you’re going to say to the community, “So, what do you want us to do with it?” I’m trying to be really clear about the end goal here.

DAVID PISCITELLO:

Are you asking me personally what my end goal is?

---

Session

---

DENISE MICHEL: I'm asking ICANN staff officially.

DAVID PISCITELLO: I don't think there's an official idea yet, because we are still looking at it in awe and saying, "Hey, this is really cool."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So Dave is looking at this and saying, "I've got a really cool tool for looking at and dealing with abuse." I'm looking at this and saying, "We can drive policy discussions and we can inform policy discussions."

We've only started showing this to people recently, and all of your questions that you've asked are extremely good and important questions, and they need to be discussed in the community.

How much would it cost? I don't know, but if the community had a will, I'm sure we could work out the licensing and the cost things. But this is going to drive some really interesting discussions. The fact that we found a centralized zone database system to be interesting should help drive discussions around that. The fact that WHOIS rate limiting is problematic for researchers is another good discussion.

So the fact that we are now doing this – which I think is indeed the difference – I hope will drive some of those discussions, and that we can hopefully come up with solutions for everybody, not just four our research project.



Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: So we've gone 25 minutes over from our coffee break, and I'm sensing the energy around the room is dropping a bit. So what I'd like to do is have a 10-minute break. I know that there are still people in the queue. I wonder, perhaps Alain, you and I can have a chat in the break about how to structure your intervention, because I think that there are probably follow-up questions from your presentation from yesterday, and our best use of time.

My proposal is that we finish this at 4:30 and spend the last half-hour together thinking about tomorrow and what we've learned today. I think that'll be ample time. Okay, so let's have a break for 10 minutes. Thank you very much to Dave.

[BREAK]

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay, we're starting now. What we're going to do is hear from –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: We're going to hear from Alain about the health indicator project. But first of all, in response to a prompt from Alain, other Alain – our Alain –

---

perhaps we could just spend a moment thinking about where all of this fits within our work, because we've been getting a huge amount of information.

So, does anybody want to take a crack at why this is relevant to our scope and where our nexus of interest is? Does anybody want to do that? Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

So it relates directly to several recommendations in SSR1 related to SSR metrics and mechanisms for abuse mitigation, so SSR1 has a nexus here. And then I think more broadly when you talk about security of the Internet identifiers and in particular the DNS system, this is an important point of risk and vulnerability, and security threats globally. I think that also puts it within our mission.

EMILY TAYLOR:

So we're looking at the paragraph that says that we shall also assess the extent to which ICANN has successfully implemented its security efforts, the effectiveness of security efforts to deal with actual and potential challenges and threats to the security and stability of the DNS, etc. So there's a clear –

DENISE MICHEL:

And then I think more broadly in our previous discussions about we should understand the threat environment, we should understand the

Session

---

environment in which we're doing our work and assessment. This data also feeds into that objective as well.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. Alain, does that satisfy your question?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Yes, and it looks like Alain's slides are designed to [essentially delve] why and how these Review Teams should care about this. So [inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you for that. Other Alain, thank you for joining us. And also, I think all of us listened with great interest to your presentation yesterday at the DNS symposium, so rather than having you repeat that, perhaps you could just give a couple of minutes recapping what the project was, just because we're in information overload, but then open the floor to questions. And Dave, equally, if you want to chime in, there are a number of parallels with both of these projects. So Alain, the floor is yours. Thank you.

ALAIN DURAND: Thank you, Alain. Can you hear me now? Oh, good. Much better. So I would make the assumption that all of you have seen my presentation yesterday. If that's not the case, please tell me, and maybe after this I can go into some more details.

What's the project ITHI? This is about identifier technology has indicators, so this is much broader than just DNS. It actually encompasses every single global identifier that ICANN helps to coordinate.

So in the scope of this you will find names, and you'll find also IP addresses. Within ICANN here we're going to look at the name pot. Our friends from the IR community developed essentially a sister project to look at the IP address pot.

So this is a long-term project that we have started, and we want to collect this data and track them over time. And the goal is not to look at the number and to say, "Is this good or bad?" The goal is to look at the trends. So that's why it's important from the beginning to make sure that we have a correct definition of what we are going to look at, so we can a couple of years from now look at the last 20-30 months and see what was the trend and follow is. Is it progressing in the right direction?

But even in order to answer this question, "Is it progressing in the right direction?" We first have to ask, "What is the right direction?" So in this project, what we have done is essentially – just skip all this, here we go – start by defining some problem areas.

When we talk about [inaudible] nobody agrees what it is. When we talk about problem areas, then it's easier to find some local concerns about what those things are. And when we understand what problem we're tackling here, we can decide how we can measure if this is going in the

right direction or not with other metrics, and then can collect numbers and start tracking this.

The goal of this is not to make any value judgment about something. This is about informing the community about this is what is in our data, and then let the community use this in their own policy development process to actually drive whatever they want to drive.

So we have started by defining five areas. And that's where [inaudible] is a main distinction between what we do and what Dave has been doing. We are going to be a customer of Dave's work for one of those five areas, namely in the abuse area, domain name abuse.

That's probably right now the most important one, but it's also the most controversial one, and it was a voluntary decision on my side to say, "Let's start with something that's a little bit controversial or even most controversial. If we can get this through, then the rest will be easy." But [that] will provide I believe the most value by tackling this first.

The first one of our [bad data] actually means WHOIS data accuracy, so it's a handle for that. We'll talk about this. And the third one will be on excessive traffic. You may have seen the presentation yesterday from Roy Arends of all the data that goes and feeds into the root. The root is acting as a giant filter, so can we quantify this filter? Can we look at this and track this over time?

Leakage is all about things like [corpo mail] that found their way into the root of a DNS tree, and that sometimes makes it difficult to allocate those names. And the one that's not showing up on the screen here – I

apologize – is lies, is when recursive resolver answers a different answer than is expected from them. That's what DNSSEC was supposed to be addressing, but it's interesting to see how much of a privacy problem this is.

Those five areas that we have identified, that doesn't mean that those are the only ones. There can be more that we can add later, or some of them may have disappeared as an issue, and then we draw them from the map. But if we want to have a quick handle on that, what's the difference between this project and Dave's project? Dave is one of the components of this, and we will be one of his customers.

I'm going to skip a whole bunch of this thing. So what we want to do in this metric here is to look at the different types of abuse and to track them individually. Dave was showing earlier an abuse score that he had. That's not the one that we are interesting in. We're more interested into looking at more into detail what is the metric about spam, about phishers, about malware, command and control.

And we had some good comments yesterday saying that an aggregate doesn't necessarily mean much, because there would be different ways of calculating the aggregate depending on what exactly you want. And if you provide the metrics on the individual components, you can build your own aggregate. So that's why we will do that.

And overall, this is what it looks like. Right? Five registries more or less chosen randomly, some recent ones and some not so recent ones, some older ones, and you see there's a huge difference in their profile. What

Session

---

matters to me is not, "Is this 500 or is this 7000 out of 10,000?" I don't care, but I would like to see those numbers go down. And if we can show a curve that is going down, that's good.

Now, from your perspective you may want to have more in-depth look at what this is, because we see that the profile for spam is different from the profile for phishing. Very different from the profile for malware distribution where there seems to be more affinity in different registries, and very different from the botnet profile.

So defining those profiles is probably one of the next things that we'll have to do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NOORUL AMEEN: Why did the percentage go down because you included spam? If you included spam, the percentage will become different. If [inaudible] you will get the actual trend of malicious domains and malicious behaviors, I feel.

ALAIN DURAND: As I said earlier, where we are going after the discussion from yesterday is to track all those four things differently. So there is one column where we only track spam, there will be one where we only track phishing, one that we'll only track malware distribution, and one that we only track

Session

---

botnet command and control, so that we will not have the effect of one overlapping on the other.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much. Does that conclude your remarks? Did you want to –

ALAIN DURAND: Yes, you asked me to make it –

EMILY TAYLOR: Yes, I really appreciate it. Okay, thank you very much. I'm going to open the floor for questions and comments, so thank you very much for that. I've got Denise. Does anyone else want to join the queue? Kerry.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, and thank you, Alain, for speaking to us about this, a very important and useful undertaking. Can you run through again the specific timeline you have for the phases and when we'll have public access to this?

ALAIN DURAND: What I've built here is a prototype. The prototype was built by looking at data from compliance, first metric M1, and from days to [for the] metric M2. On only five registries and five registrars.



Session

---

The first thing I need to do is to put pressure on Dave so that he can give me reliable data on the registrars. In order to do that, you need to have access to WHOIS data, so there's a cascading dependency here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAIN DURAND: Yes, so there is a [maximal] dependency here that we somehow need to solve, because one thing I will not do is to publish data that I think are not reliable. So we need to first make sure that the basis is right. So we'll be waiting on Dave to have something that is really usable on the registrar front.

Second, once I've done that, then I can extend my study to cover all the registries and all the registrars, because when I have only five – and that's the reason I didn't put real names, I've put anonymized data here. I don't want to put anybody on the spot when I have only five samples, a sample of five.

When I will have all the different registries and registrars, then I can start to derive those profiles that I was talking about earlier, and we can say worst can be grouped into this profile, worst can be grouped into that other profile.

It's not something I can really do until I have all this data, so when am I going to do that? My goal will be to start doing this in a workshop sometime throughout the end of the summer, because now realistically

we missed the opportunity to do it in Johannesburg, so we'll have to do it after the summertime, and to really come to the Abu Dhabi meeting with a full set of data and be able to show to the community the full set of data in Abu Dhabi.

Now, that full set of data may not be tracking everything in the sense of we may have only data for the last month or the last six months, because the tools have only been there for that long. And it may not be the final format that we will deliver the data.

One other question is, how will we make this available to the community? There are different options here. We can make some reports, like a yearly report or a bi-yearly report or a monthly report, or we can make the raw data that I'm using to build this graph. I'm not talking about the raw data Dave is using to compute this stuff, but the output of his tool for example, or the output of what we get from Compliance. This could go into files that should be distributable and could be made available as part of for example open data initiatives or any other interface that we may decide.

So if you [inaudible] in the reports at a certain frequency, we can generate that. If you want more details, maybe the best vehicle would be to go for that.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Alain. And a follow-up question, just for clarification, really. That didn't quite answer my question, so I understand you're waiting on Dave for better WHOIS information, that you're not having a public

workshop in Johannesburg. And I don't know if Dave can help clarify the timing on this.

I understand there is a dependency. Is it a dependency that is a complete unknown and so you won't know when you'll get all of the WHOIS data you need to build this out? And then also, I would argue that a global Adobe Connect conference call would be much more globally accessible than simply having a session in Johannesburg, so instead of waiting until the end of the year, why are you not scheduling a public, global Adobe Connect session so you can check the box on public discussion and move forward? Thank you.

ALAIN DURAND:

I will let Dave answer the first part of your question. I would like to address the second part first. The experience that we have running [these] workshops so far has proven that we don't get a lot of remote participation. We get more discussions with people in the room, that's just the way it is.

So I don't want to wait until the end of the year to have another workshop, that's why I'm talking about doing something perhaps like early September. And maybe we'll have another something, workshop in Washington D.C. or somewhere in the U.S. And of course, make it available to the community for remote participation. So that's something that we can do. Now, Dave, I will let you answer the question about WHOIS.

Session

---

DAVID PISCITELLO:

I don't have any insight into whether the current unveiling is going to make other options for collecting WHOIS available to us. We are not the only ones who are dealing with the rate limiting problem, and it's a topic of discussion across the community. And I suspect it's going to be a policy issue in Johannesburg.

Meanwhile, we're looking to see if there are other repositories that we can use, and some of that is going to deviate from John's goal of using the public tabs, but if the overwhelming consensus is that we should go forward with whatever we can do to expedite the process, then that's really the message that you should send to ICANN organization so that we can work within the organization and say, "Okay, how do we fix this?" And there are a couple of different ways that this might be fixed. What's the fastest way for us to do this?

DENISE MICHEL:

I'm mindful of time, but just to – and I'll take this up offline, but what do supportive and interested parts of the community have to do to deliver that message? Because I'm curious. I understand that you've received some pushback from some perhaps registries or registrars, but what you've heard uniformly, and for years, and officially from the Business Constituency, the Intellectual Property Constituency, the ISPs, At-Large, the GAC and SSAC, is that this information and data needs to be provided, it needs to be provided in a public way, and the public needs API access to it.

Session

---

What's missing? And I don't want to take up any more time because I know we're on the clock, but –

EMILY TAYLOR: [inaudible]

DAVID PISCITELLO: Making this very simple, the current way of doing this for our project is using public WHOIS service. There are other WHOIS repositories that we might be able to make use of that we currently don't have access to for any number of reasons. If we go back now, having heard from the community yesterday and today, and how Göran was there, we can go and say, "Look, we need to solve this because people want this yesterday."

So give me a couple of weeks to go back and bang on tables and say, "We now have people who want to see more," and this is now something I percolate up to David, and David walks in and waves large numbers of euros in front of Göran and says, "Here." No. It's just something we have to sort out. Because as I said, up until this point, we were trying to understand not only what we could collect, but what issue the community faced when they were trying to collect it. So we've exposed those. Beta did that. To get to production, we probably have to do something a little bit different.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: I have a question. A couple of questions, actually. My recollection – and I hope you'll correct any misunderstandings – is that bulk WHOIS provision used to be a requirement for registries and registers, and it sort of disappeared in the RAA 2013. Any plans to reintroduce it? In other words, my understanding – and I'm getting blank faces, so I might be completely off –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, it's not your – let David answer this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It probably goes without saying, but staff can't reintroduce something like that. That's not our job.

EMILY TAYLOR: Of course not, no.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If the community wishes to in the next version of the RA and RAA reintroduce – I don't know the history of the bulk WHOIS stuff.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Margie does.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. If you want to talk to it.

---

Session

---

MARGIE MILAM:

Yes. I lived that one. I was on the negotiating team for the RAA, and frankly, at the point when we were negotiating that, the data was not being provided. And so if you take a look at the new provisions that went into the RAA, we got a lot of new WHOIS-related things. There's the specification on privacy proxy, the specification on accuracy, got the verification requirement. So it was just part of the give and take, and that was just one that there were no registrars providing that data on a bulk basis. And there was a provision in there if you looked at the language that that obligation was related to the early days of when we only had one registrar, and there was some clause – and I'd have to pull it up, but related to if the market had changed and the competition was sufficient in the registrar space, then that was like the trigger point for the bulk provisions. And so there was a sense that the market had changed from when it first appeared in the RAA, and so it was negotiated out.

EMILY TAYLOR:

It does seem rather a perverse outcome that ICANN which requires the provision of WHOIS by all of its contracted parties isn't able to access any information about it. Had access to it, no longer has access, and is potentially put into the position of paying for it from third parties whose collection techniques and up-to-datedness is unknown. I'd just like to make –

Session

---

MARGIE MILAM: If I could follow up, it wasn't free either. The obligation was for \$10,000, I believe, you'd make the data available. So even in this scenario with however many registrars you have, it would have been very expensive to do. But in any event, it got negotiated out in the 2013.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you, and thanks for indulging me that question. Kerry, you've been waiting for a while. And then James. Sorry, David, did you want to respond?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

EMILY TAYLOR: Alright, so Kerry and then James. And please, we do have Alain and Dave here, so do make use of them.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: My question is a bit boring compared to the one that Emily asked. From a research perspective then, health indicators usually help the end user improve based on not just knowledge of the risk and how bad they look in terms of when they see the results, but is there any room for the research team to actually identify possible root causes and be able to give recommendations generally from a more macro picture, not micro?



ALAIN DURAND:

I'm overweight. I have measured that. And recently, I had to make a very strong policy decision to go on a diet. The deliberation coming to this policy decision I've been trying on for a long time, but at some point, reached my tipping point and said, "I have to enact a policy and have to follow through with it."

I think this is exactly the same thing here. The first thing is to become aware of a problem. So we can get data like this. And yes, as [inaudible] I would love to see some correlation, but I'm not really going to go too much into correlation until I have more confidence in this data.

So yesterday a number of correlation that were suggested, notably about pricing and some of that, getting pricing data might be even more difficult than getting WHOIS data, and I think that's an understatement. But if at some point we could get all the data that we would like to correlate with this, if it also has become available, that's something I would really like to do.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

And the reason I ask is only from the recommendations standpoint in terms of what we are able to actually recommend and benefit in the community for its resilience. And so it's just to see if it's something that is possible, so if it is –

Session

---

ALAIN DURAND: So right now, the remit that I got from my boss – and I’m sure they can clarify this – is that we have to provide the data and not make recommendations.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The genesis of this project is actually one of the – I always get them wrong, it’s in the strategic plan, one of the strategic objectives or goals – I always get the wrong word – that specifically said that we were tasked to come up with metrics to provide indicators of the health of the Internet’s system of unique identifiers.

So sort of the end user for this is actually the policy making bodies, because what we want to do is have an ability to determine if the impact of a particular implementation of a policy has a net positive impact to the health of the Internet’s system of unique identifiers or a net negative impact.

Once we have an indication that there has been a change, we may be in a position on the research team to go in and figure out just why exactly that’s happened, and if it’s negative, maybe mitigate the negative causes. But the very first thing we have to do is establish the baseline of whatever health means in this context, and be able to ensure that moving forward, we’re able to track changes in that baseline.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. James, and then I have Eric and Denise. Denise, are you asking for the mic? Yes.

Session

---

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks. Two comments and a question, I think. First of all, just for people who are new to ICANN as well, we were talking about the RAA, the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. Just an important thing to note, that's a bilateral thing. That is not a community consensus policy, and is what's called within the picket fence. So it's not something that the community comes and says, "We want something back into." That's a separate process. That's my position on it anyway.

Secondly, I just wanted to state that metrics are great and they're really good, but I will point out that myself and a number of others in the public comment for ITHI said there are concerns over some of the taxonomy and remit and the scope of this project with regards to what is ICANN's role. So I'm not going to go into it, but just myself and a number of other groups were concerned about that.

And then the question – and I think David kind of just answered this – is who's the target audience? Because I think when this kind of started and was launched with the original taxonomy and the phraseology was very kind of end user-focused, but if that has now shifted to be more of targeting it at the SOs and ACs for their policy processes, then that probably fits more into what I think would be useful.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I'm sorry. The intent has always been a mechanism by which we can provide information into the community for whatever purposes the community has. Most likely, at least in my view, is to provide input into

the policymaking efforts. Other folks might find it useful for other reasons, but our role in the context of OCTO SSR is to actually – OCTO generally, SSR in particular – is to provide input and information to the community and the organization to facilitate us getting our job done.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hi, Alain. Real interesting stuff, as you've heard probably repeatedly for a while, so I'll pile on to that. But I think just to sort of clarify, I think I heard Kerry-Ann's question I think was a good one, sort of like, "Help me understand what the model is." And I think I heard David basically say the point of the metrics is to help influence or to illuminate issues that are relevant when policy discussions happen, and then to take your example of one sort of BMI and how that relates to overall health, there's a model there. There's a model that shows that if a person is overweight, it has a contributory effect on one's health as defined by –

EMILY TAYLOR: We don't need to go on about this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: All I'm saying is I think what Kerry-Ann was asking for was, what's the underlying model that connects what you're measuring with what will be effectuated in a policy? Because right now, I think what I read

between the lines is while your analogy is very clear to us because we have context, it's not as clear from the data right now.

ALAIN DURAND:

When we started this, we spent a lot of time looking at this "problem space." Initially when we started the project, I called [it a] disease, and part of the public comments that we received is not only the Latin names that I used to describe those were not welcome, but the term "disease" was also problematic.

So we've decided to stay away from that, but the discussion that happened then and the different categories that have been created were done essentially in two of the workshops that we had last year, but mostly one with the [inaudible] community, which is the anti-abuse community.

And where they really piped in and said, "Those are problems that we have, and those are how they actually manifest themselves. So we broke this down, and it's on another slide deck. I don't know if it's possible to show it or not, but we broke this down into different categories, as in, what is the definition of a problem? What are the symptoms? What are the effects or the side effects of those? Can this develop into something more serious? What are potential treatments?"

So all of this, yes, we have done in the different categories. And that's how we arrived to the definition of those five categories here. So for each of those, we have done this analysis, and how we started was simply to look at the webpage from one of the big medical centers, and

Session

---

we looked at their approach to describe disease, and we tried to replicate this.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

[inaudible] A quick follow-up to the clarification. When you have time, have you gone through the research done by the – there's a project called Cyber Green, and the researcher, her PhD – I'm not totally in agreement with everything that [inaudible] just for the record, but her approach was similar, and she faced a similar kind of challenge in terms of the terminologies used. It's now up and running as a part of the global [inaudible] initiative now, but it's something worth – I don't know if you've looked through –

ALAIN DURAND:

We did. At the very beginning of the project, we did have a number of conversations with them. There were a number of differences between what they do that were problematic for us, and we decided to not go exactly there. David.

DAVID CONRAD:

Yes. Actually, about two hours ago I was actually chatting with Yurie on my computer. As you probably know, CyberGreen changed their model of how they're operating. We had initially interacted with them back when they were doing work with CSIRT Gadgets. That interaction, we were both just going in sort of different directions.

Session

---

The stuff that Yurie has been doing more recently, I think we should probably take another look at. And Yurie and I have been having fairly constant discussions. She's in funding search mode, and I was hoping to be able to do something with her, but I had my budget whacked a bit for FY18, so that didn't sort of pan out. But it's something we're continuing to look at. And obviously, we have good relations with them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID CONRAD: I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID CONRAD: Yes.

ALAIN DURAND: So there were other projects that we looked at back then. Some project [that is] trying to find another composite score that will be more like your credit score. But some of the pushback we got was, well, we don't really understand how this is computed. And so instead, we decided to go with this approach where we tried to have a model for what were problems and how they manifest themselves, and then we compute

Session

---

individual metrics that people can recombine then whichever way they like.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Denise is next. James, can I just ask, is that an old one? Oh, yes. Okay, thanks.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. I want to take a bit of an issue with the contention by staff that this will be used or should be used in the policy development part of ICANN. I think that's true, but I think there's a whole range of uses and applications for ITHI.

Once you get it up and running and into the public domain, I think registrars and registries can use it to inform their focus and spend on best practices. I think SSAC can use it in their work. I think the Board could use it in their strategic decisions about how to allocate budget and future programs. I think there is actually a whole range of uses for ITHI. I think you're limiting yourself when you say this can be used for and should be used in policy. I completely agree with that, but I think there's a whole range of areas where the ITHI when done and in the public domain can potentially contribute in the ICANN sphere. So I just wanted to note that.

Second, I'd like to make an official request that you send an e-mail to the Security Team with your timeline and next steps so we're really clear and we can help sort of track the progress and really understand



Session

---

how both DAAR and ITHI are going to unfold and on what specific timeline.

And then I have kind of a left field question, and I'm not sure who to ask this of. But can you declare abuse in gTLDs as an emergency situation and access the WHOIS data in EBERO, the Emergency Backend Registry Operator system?

ALAIN DURAND:

Let me start with the first one, that'll be easier. I think the point that we're trying to stress by saying this is to provide some light in the policy discussion is ICANN staff is not in the position to make decisions with that data. We're not going to say, "This is good" or "This is bad." We are not going to make value judgment. But if other people want to take our data and do what they want, more power to them.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes, I think we're in agreement, I'm just saying there are lots of applications.

ALAIN DURAND:

The second question – actually, I'm going to request for us to forward you a timeline. I would just like to ask you to clarify what timeframe are you looking at – the next 12 months or the next five years?

EMILY TAYLOR:

[inaudible]

Session

---

DENISE MICHEL: There seems to be some uncertainty as to how this is going to roll out and when, and if this is something that we want to, when we get to that point, consider more fully in our work and in our assessment of SSR1 impact as well as what we're going to address more broadly, I at least would like to make sure that I understand the timing of this. So it sounds like you've got a little more planning to do and clarification in terms of WHOIS access and other things, but I would like the team to be kept apprised of the specific next steps and [time stuff.]

EMILY TAYLOR: I think we can certainly all get behind kind of keeping in touch, saying –

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

EMILY TAYLOR: Kerry-Ann then Cathy.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, it's just a [continent]. Only they're asking in terms of why. It's because I think you are pretty clear in terms of needing to have more access because right now this was based on size. So for me, I think I've accepted that. This is at a very nascent stage. When we do get to the [inaudible] we may want to recommend about it, I think that's when we

Session

---

could check back in to see the progress because it may involve as well since today... So I don't know Cathy is –

CATHY HANDLEY:

Yeah, thank you. I now work that's also being done on your project. And Dave, you both gave what appeared to be as clearer timelines as you have right now because you're not standing after by yourself. I know you're working with RIR [inaudible] to bring in on that. And I'm curious, too. I mean, it was a real... Maybe in six months, they have a better idea but right now I'm afraid what we're going to get is what we heard earlier and yesterday is we're working on it and pedaling as fast as we can.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Could I suggest a way through, which is as you can tell from a lot of engagement, your work is a great interest. It obviously is an early stage and it may be that James hinted at some – it may not be a smooth [cost] to getting this open and available to everyone within this timeline of our work. Could I ask that we keep in touch that you let us know of any major developments? But also, one thing that we... I just like to put out there as a suggestion is that at some point, if it looks like it's going to be a battle to get this open, I think it might be, is there some way that we can have a briefing about your early findings with whatever confidentiality might surround that? Because I think it will be important to our work and that's certainly something I would personally appreciate.

Session

---

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. I don't... There isn't any controversy here. If you have a clear timeline, let us know and keep us a price of your work. You don't think you're going to be in Johannesburg but I think there may be a chance that you will and there's been a suggestion of the public Adobe Connect.

You mentioned Abu Dhabi as a place for a more robust engagement. And you know it sounds like you may have a D.C. workshop. So it sounds like this is evolving, which is fine, I understand that. I just think it will be useful for you to – when you have more clarity, let us know and just to keep us a price of your work and I still have my EBERO question out.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you. I'm going to go to Dave.

DAVE PISCITELLO:

We are to the point where we're confident about our registry data and I think that we will probably be able to resolve the zone file issue before we'll be able to resolve the WHOIS issue. So if having the registry results available earlier than the registry and registrar results is useful, then that's used to be back from you to us.

So yeah, we should be able to generate some monthly reporting by June and then it's a question of people understanding what we're doing and understanding that's experimental. As John said, there's going to be

Session

---

sensitivity because it's going to have a lot of information, it's going to be controversial.

[Goran] stood up yesterday and I think most of you were there when he said that this is one of his [pet] projects and he's very keen to support it. So we'll carry back what you tell us. Now, if having that information now is valuable, then he and the Board are going to have to decide how they want to handle the question on you.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much. Let me now go to David on the EBERO question and then I think we are probably done on this and we can spend our last 40 minutes also planning for tomorrow and raising AOBs, so thank you.

DAVID CONRAD:

So my understanding of the way EBERO is invoked is breaches of certain SLAs and the policies are pretty clear about how the EBERO is invoked and the implications of that, the problem is that in order to – if an EBERO is invoked, it means that some registry has just been switched over to another registry and I don't think that would be able to solve the particular problem that we're having.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Okay. Denise, I can see that you want to respond to that but I'm going to ask you to take it offline. Did you want to?

Session

---

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I want to go just one second as to where we were.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. One second as to where we were and then let's move on to AOB.

CATHY HANDLEY: I think given where the conversation has gone here, I'm sure David is going to do it, Dave will do it, Alain will do it but you've heard enough input from us that you can go back and say, "Here's a push. These guys are wanting schedules and wanting to see some concrete information." So maybe that will help push things along.

ALAIN DURAND: We would pass this along to also the other parts of the committee that's working on this saying that is a request for schedule and we try to compile this and send it to you as soon as possible.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. So with that, I'd like to thank Dave and Alain very much for your time and your work.

Okay. So, we're going to squish in 40 minutes what we originally scheduled an hour and a half for. What should [inaudible]. And Any Other Business, recap of any action items. I hope somebody has been capturing action items that we've been throwing out. Also I'd like to spend a bit of time thinking out tomorrow how we're going to spend our time and any closing remarks.

Session

---

So first of all, is there Any Other Business that anyone would like to raise? Okay. I'm not seeing anything. So has anybody been capturing action items as we've gone? Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I'm sorry.

EMILY TAYLOR: Are you ready to –

DENISE MICHEL: While she's playing it up, may I note? I think I know I've been jotting down to the additional like request for information, someone mentioned the report that I think would be useful to have, so I started to have a running list of things I'd like – the copies of them some additional information. I would suggest that we provide this perhaps to staff who can sort of just make a big list of all the additional information and questions that we have and help us organize that and bring it back to the team when you can. Does that [inaudible]?

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. Yes. And also to use the list rather than using the time [now]. James?

Session

---

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. So that brings me onto an AOB item that I just thought of. I've said this on the last call that I raised this to the co-Chairs. We, as a Review Team, need to have a discussion about the confidential disclosure framework that was provided by ICANN staff. And I've said that I have concerns about this and I have had a very quick chat with Sam Eisner and council at ICANN. She's happy to have a discussion with either myself – I'm pretty involved in that [thought] and then I can bring it back to the team or we can ask her to have a larger discussion.

I'd love to get a feel for what people would prefer. I have two very specific concerns because I drafted the Bylaws language so I know what our intent was. If people are happy with myself and maybe one [over] two of the co-Chairs to go and have that discussion with them then come back to the group or whether we want that in a plenary discussion, I'd be really happy to get feedback from that.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you, first of all, for suggesting that. Now, I'm very happy to work with you on that, Kerry-Ann, as a lawyer, you might be a good support on that. So my preference is I can just sort of – and if there is any other ideas around the room but your [inaudible] to just go and try and check it out maybe with one or two others would be really deeply appreciated. And then if we need to take it on in a group way, we can do that. But... Denise?



Session

---

DENISE MICHEL: I think for some historical context, I don't think any other Review Team members although they were given the opportunity to sign NDAs, I don't think they ever did. And it would be good if – I don't know. If that has the ability to actually get that impression but I know just from personal experience that no prior Review Team of which there have been many as a team have ever gone forth with signing NDAs and definitely most team members did not.

So just as a point of historical fact, and I do have concerns about... As a professional working in this space, I have concerns about signing an NDA that may be interpreted too broadly and may be interpreted to restrict my access and use of data and information that I get from a variety of different sources including ICANN. And I also question whether we need an NDA to fully do our job. I can take this offline but I just wanted to go on record about my concerns.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Karen and Margie, I have with some information on this.

KAREN MULBERRY: Could I, if I could? I could speak to the first SSR1 report. They clearly noted that they didn't request any access to confidential data and they did not sign the NDA. So in terms of SSR1, they were very clear in their document on what they did.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Or we could follow-up to see if there were any others. I wasn't involved in any of the past ones, so we can certainly take that as an action item.

EMILY TAYLOR: I can speak to the WHOIS review way back when. I don't recall us entering confidentiality agreements. What we did with sensitive issues was to invoke the Chatham House rule and have a private discussion, which is non-attributed and wasn't broadcast in the same way, so that's another way of working.

I think James is first and then Eric.

MARGIE MILAM: I'm sorry. I also had an additional comment that even though that whatever happened in the past, we're under new Bylaws and the new Bylaws have a provision for confidential information and actually in reference on NDA is part of that. So what you've been distributed, you're the first – because you're the first Review Team after the new Bylaws and that's the first document that – it was drafted for this purpose after the new Bylaws. So we're very happy to talk to James and all of you about how this fits in with the new approach.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: James, do you – this is clearly a big error. Thank you very much for raising it. Are you happy with that as sort of next step to go and work with them?

JAMES GANNON: Yup.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay.

JAMES GANNON: It will actually take two minutes just to bring everybody up to speed on some background on why this is new. So Denise and Karen, that's actually correct. There was never NDA sign on previous Review Teams because this clause did not exist.

So during the accountability work when we are incorporation, what were the AoC reviews into specific reviews in the Bylaws, we realized that we were losing a potential piece of leverage which was that the NTIA was sitting on the other side of those AoC reviews.

As a result, myself and Steve DelBianco basically said that there wouldn't potentially be a need for the community to have a Bylaws-defined mechanism to request documentation. That was incorporated into the Bylaws language that we didn't put in. And the idea is that instead of going through the DIDP process, which exist at the moment, which is the ICANN's version of the freedom of information, which is a

Session

---

very longstanding thing that's been there but has an 86% rejection rate. And yeah, I currently hold the record for the most number of successful ones, so I'm obviously doing something right with this [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

JAMES GANNON: Yeah. But yes, it was to enable a team like this if we encountered roadblocks to have a formal Bylaws-defined mechanism to go through. And that also include an escalation framework, which goes to Ombudsman and Board members and – there are a lot of things there. It's important to note, we are the first Review Team to operate under this Bylaw and on operation with this Confidential Disclosure Framework, which is why I'm making a deal out of this.

Sam is very supportive and she will engage with us on this. We are the first one to do this, so we need to do it right. We need to set the standard for how that CDF is treated and set the standard for how the Review Teams work now under the new Bylaws, and how we manage that relationship with ICANN, the organization as the group that is tasked with reviewing it without the NTIA sitting there as the counterparty to make sure that it's done right. We need to make sure we are doing it right.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Noted. Thank you. You'll be seeing the notes around the [inaudible] and the support, so if we can take the action item very kindly of you to volunteer to go and [inaudible] about it and perhaps, Kerry, could I ask you to support if necessary and maybe you can report back to a not too distant future [inaudible] the call?

So is there a slide just showing the agenda for tomorrow or shall I do a dramatic reading?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Is that the end of today's [inaudible]?

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. So we can kick-off at 8:30, so a little bit of a lying compared to this morning. And James has offered to lead a session. Thinking about the way we're going to work, I think this is really key section. We have very much been in information receiving mode until now. We've had some very fruitful discussions today but now it's really kind of we're going to get down to it.

Then the second section I think I'm chairing tomorrow morning, so the next – the second section will be developing a work plan and timeline taking us up to lunchtime.

Session

---

Eric then to be the Chair – you chair in the afternoon. We will be discussing about subgroup, so we're very much in kind of working methods and how we're going to go about things and when we're going to do things. And then, after tea tomorrow, we're going to talk about outreach and things that we need to discuss. So this hopefully recap on action items.

So I'm seeing... I'm going to take it from... So who is first? Kerry-Ann was first.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

EMILY TAYLOR: Jennifer.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. So you've got the action items from today have you? Okay. So let's go see Kerry-Ann and then Eric. Anybody else wanting to take the [mic]? Oh Margie, is that... Not now? Okay. So Kerry-Ann and Eric.

Session

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Kerry speaking. It's brief. Just a quick distinction between work approach, SSR2 work approach and the subgroup discussions. I'm just thinking that the work approach will determine if we do subgroups, so just wondering, what's the difference between the two discussions? Or is it an assumption that we'll agree on the work subgroups and then go in more detail? I'm just trying to see.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. I'm going to read the little bullet point. So the first session is looking at how do we propose to approach [all of it], blocking out actually the main tasks, the main issues, how best to work in each block and what's going to be the most fruitful approach, how do we assign, how should we assign membership. That's not necessarily doing the membership, so we're not pushing ourselves to really get to conclusions on that but just really blocking I would say in that early session.

And then after lunch when we come back to discussing subgroups, we'll be thinking about what the suitable topics of subgroups and identify group members. So be prepared to think about what area you feel you're best able to contribute and be prepared to carry that forward if necessary.

And we have that room next door, so if we're really getting ahead of our self, we can just break out there and then and have some subgroup meetings or so. Does that provide the clarity that you're asking for, Kerry?

Session

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just a little bit because one of the things that I'm wanting if it will be captured in the morning session is in determining these subgroups, I also have to think about the ICANN staff support and how that works. Because as I said, I keep thinking based on regional blocks as well, not just subgroups in terms of themes but also regional blocks and I immediately think about Denise and me [inaudible], the three of us and Cathy were kind of in the same group – not continent but we're very close together. I mean, [inaudible]. We can fix it quickly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Involvement].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No. But in terms of –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You're forgetting me, I'm [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Oh, yeah, I keep forgetting Eric is there. Yes, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Inaudible].



Session

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: He's close. I was just thinking that I don't know if that is included in the how we approach our work because how we can access the things that Margie wrote earlier about transparency of the recording of the information, that kind of [content]. I don't think that will come up in that discussion. If not, can we put it as an additional item on the [how we] approach? And then I think that will then determine the subgroup discussions because it is blocks based on themes or regional position and then it will make a difference [inaudible].

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. And I know that you're unable to join us tomorrow, so I really appreciate you thinking ahead and thinking about your contributions for those discussions.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Because I'll be on remotely. Once I'm at the airport – I'll get to the airport about 8:00, so I'll be on remotely until the plane takes off at 11.

EMILY TAYLOR: Brilliant. Eric?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, while you could be –

Session

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. So that was a good warm up for what I was going to say. So I think at this point we had a number of briefings not as many as I think we ultimately want to have but we've basically been briefed through the beginning of this face-to-face and we've had a number of sessions and other face-to-face before that. I think it's really time for us to start thinking about what are the SSR issues that we think are topical. I think right now I could come up with a short list of three that are broken out in the sub-list and I'm prepared to do that to prime the pump but I think everyone in this room at this point should be able to reflect back knowing that the rest of us will do the same of what are at least one or two things that we've at least heard this week if not worried about in general that are SSR issues that we think if we have one thing to do, that would be the thing that you would choose, and we should start throwing that out.

I know when a sort of... like project onto change how to run the first session but I think the first session is a great point like I'd be more than willing to start it off and I hope the rest of us are in the same frame of mind, willing to start it off with, "Okay, I think universal resolvability." I think that's a necessary issue that we should take up. It's very broad and I'm not sure exactly where we take it but I think we sit down with something like that and we start pulling it apart.

Bernard said earlier, the face-to-face is where we like work stuff out so that we can get work done in between. If we don't work it out tomorrow, then we really missed a serious opportunity and we are going to have like a fraction of the team for a fraction of the time in Jo-berg and it's not going to be the same as this.

Session

---

So I mean, I think it would be great if we'd go around the table now but I suspect it's probably a little too much putting on the spot of just like start coming up with ideas. We can ask staff to please record our stream of consciousness. We'll read it back tomorrow or we'll just wait until tomorrow and everyone can think on it overnight. I'm happy to talk at the bar. By the way, I'm happy to talk at the bar. The bar is [inaudible]. I'd be happy to talk.

EMILY TAYLOR: Are the people ready with a list of their like greatest hits? Shall we go with Eric's suggestion of just sort of throwing some stuff out there? James and Kerry, both [ask] and Bernie asking for the –

JAMES GANNON: Me and Eric sometimes have the mind meld going on because I was about to ask can we give the group some homework for tonight, which was actually that to come up with two or three topics.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Am I [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Actually, I was, too.

JAMES GANNON: Well, it's getting creepy. But no. And I want to make it clear that –

---

Session

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] said no.

JAMES GANNON: No. I want to make it clear that the subgroups that I propose are what was in my head that day when I wrote the Word document and it is not exhaustive, it is not meant to be dictatorial to say that this is the way it's going to be. I want people to come up with ideas of what they think we are going to look at, and then let's bundle those opening to groupings that we can then build the groups around.

My [inaudible] were there basing on what I'm interested in basically and to kick off some discussions on here is how we can bundle things together but they're not meant to be here that we're going to do it. And that was what I was going to hope to do is that from the group, it's like let's try maybe throw together a Google Doc or something, that basically everybody throws in their ideas into. And then tomorrow using the ones that I've started with, we can start [inaudible], "Okay, this topic area, we can go into this. No, we need a new subgroup potentially for this group [where] there are barriers," and then start building it into, "Okay, well, this is what our final subgroups will look like."

Because I want to take on board the comment that was made earlier though. We are only 17 people. We can't have 10 or 15 subgroups. We need to keep it manageable so we need to do a portfolio consolidation exercise where we take all of our topics. We bundle them together and come out with a solid group, the subgroups tomorrow morning.

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. Eric seemed to be ready with a starting point. So could we have Eric create the Google Doc and everyone just jump on and add stuff?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I'm happy to give that a shot. I'm just checking right now because there was a corporate [inaudible] that was about to come down that we're no longer going to be able to use Google Docs and Google Drive but I don't think it's happened yet because I'm checking and it looks like I still can. So I think I can and at some point I may ask complete transition.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm happy to do it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But then I won't be able to share it here. I won't be able to use it. So I'll start it off and then just –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible] personal?

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Karen?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Not on your [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I have to get off my [inaudible].

KAREN MULBERRY: To assist, ICANN has a Google Drive where we can create the doc and send the link out to everybody and it's repositied in that drive and then we can link it to the wiki page and everything is all [copacetic]

EMILY TAYLOR: That sounds wonderful. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Go Karen.

EMILY TAYLOR: So Karen, could you set up the document and whoever's got any energy after this day, please throw in their ideas? I have loads of energy here of course. Now, I've actually lost track of who's on the list. Kerry, were you asking for the mic? Anybody else? Okay, Kerry.

Session

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Well, just a quick endorsement of what James said and I think just to add more homework not today but I wanted to take up Zarko's volunteering for probably the next conference call, that once you've come up with this tomorrow in terms –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Oh, is that [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. [Inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Not so soon but take up his offer. The time in probably.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Most probably.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

---

Session

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, but whatever the next conference call is like –

EMILY TAYLOR: I think the next conference call would be a week on Tuesday.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. Just the suggestion that he made in terms of once he's come up with the different topics and then we group them, I think then if he could take the SSR1 recommendations and start to fit them under the same themes of whatever the larger groups are at that point, I don't know if you heard me – volunteering his services.

EMILY TAYLOR: Would you mind just repeating what Zarko has volunteered to do?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: This kind of [inaudible] on what Eric said and James [built on] and just to add another component is that once we've [inaudible] our brains on a paper with the different topics. And as James said, then we can start to think what the subgroups would look like based on grouping those topics. I think another exercise after that would be what Zarko suggested in terms of looking at the – I think we should look at the recommendation through those lenses.



Session

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Both for recommendations and the action plans.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And the action plans. Through those lenses and then we'll be able to pull them into those [groups] and it will fit. It will fit more nicely. So it's just a layer on top of... So, Zarko, that means your work won't start until we've got these subgroups but then your work with [inaudible].

EMILY TAYLOR: So the first thing that's going to happen –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I heard you.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay. So the first thing that's going to happen is that Karen is going to create the Google Doc, share it with us, Eric is going to populate it. People, please jump on because the more input we have, the better tomorrow's first session is going to go. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So if I can be a little bit bold, and actually, this is probably a lot and a bit bold considering for me that says a lot. I think it would be really nice if we took the presumption that everyone in the group should have something to say on that document and I think it's fair to annotate an idea. It's like if it really was a similar idea, there's no reason to repeat it

---

so much as to put down. This is why I think it's a good idea or here is a sub-bullet. I think here's the high level but low level, don't forget about that.

I think everyone in this room is on the team and I think it's really fair, you can prime your juices by looking what other people said. It's not cheating but you should add your two cents by some point, and I think it hopefully will prime the pump. So if it's like, "I don't know where to start. Oh, that's a really good idea. Well then, don't forget about this," we're [on] here for everyone, right? So is that fair?

EMILY TAYLOR: Well said.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well said. I second that.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. Jennifer, I think this is your moment with the action items from today.

JENNIFER BRYCE: We have a couple of action items regarding materials that we should circulate to the SSR2 list. Dave Piscitello is going to share some links to [articles] regarding the threat mitigation discussion this morning and his qualification of threats, as well as the link to the ICANN technical portal.

Session

---

It was a request for Alain to provide the SSR2 Team to remind of their health indicators project.

James and Cathy and Denise are going to work together to draft an RFP for a specialist check for [inaudible].

ICANN.org together with I think some input from James will investigate Slack and some other cooperative tools that the team may want to use. Again, James will take every next step to represent [inaudible] at the NDA concerns.

And Karen [and the] ICANN.org – circulate a Google Doc for the homework activity if our Review Team members could show their input on that this evening.

And ICANN.org has an action item to cancel the next call, which is Tuesday.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Could I just then observe that James seems to have volunteered for rather a lot of those action items and I would encourage any group members who feel that they can take some of that burden from James to please step forward and do so.

JAMES GANNON:

Are you going to make a comment about [inaudible]?

EN

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Cathy has just asked if we could officially cancel the call on the record and that will help people who are working remotely or observers to understand our thinking. Who was [looking]?

[DAVID CONRAD]: I'll never comment on James because he always delivers.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

[DAVID CONRAD]: No. Just a few notes on the action items on the NBA concerns, I thought we agreed there was going to be three people, right? It was Emily, Kerry-Ann, and James. Right? And on Alain's stuff on the health that we started out with asking for a date and then with just keep us abreast, right? That's where we ended up.

EMILY TAYLOR: Mm-hmm.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I want the current timeline in the e-mail.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

---

Session

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks. And [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Now, just to clarify, the only reason why I was kind of hesitant is because I wouldn't want them to have to put that in writing. Now, I think the takeaway from the discussion to understood was that they will use the request from this meeting as a driver to get a schedule for us to – so we're kind of like in writing now. I don't know – that was the [inaudible] I remember is that they walked out with that on the [inaudible].

EMILY TAYLOR: [inaudible] but there was quite a lot of pushback from the room.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. And so, there may have been a misunderstanding of what I was asking for. Not pushing on anything but they've articulated a couple different schedules and so when they have clarity on what their next steps and schedules are, would like to be a [inaudible] of it I think. And I think that's in line with what [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And it's just what they walked away with [inaudible].

Session

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. Thanks for that clarification.

[DAVID CONRAD]: Yeah, that was more than [inaudible] into the last version of what I understood.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. So I think we're all square on that. Denise, you have a few other action items?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Let me see. Yes. So David Conrad had suggested that we ask SSAC and RSSAC for their current activities, things that they're working on and perhaps tomorrow we can discuss how we want to handle that, request whether we work through the people on our team that came from those communities to convey that or some other mechanism, but I think that would be a good thing to touch on.

There was mentioned an EU threat landscape report, it would be great to get a link to that if we have [inaudible].

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: Boban forwarded that to the list already.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Let me see. Sorry. I had messy notes.

EMILY TAYLOR: Would you like to follow-up [inaudible] the e-mail –

DENISE MICHEL: I'd be happy to [inaudible] the e-mail list.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I think those are the... So that I can see right, I'll read through my more extensive notes and e-mail [inaudible].

EMILY TAYLOR: [Inaudible], Denise, thank you. Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Denise, from my notes on SSAC and RSSAC, I believe what David had recommended or at least what I wrote down was that this group asked

them to come in and come and present how they see the landscape, what they're working on, what their concerns are, not the group and decide to just ask them to send in a report. That's fine. But I'm just saying my notes are that. And the second point, you had a lot of extra material requests and you were going to mail that to list and staff was going to compile that, right? Thank you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

It was a similar comment and I think just to add to Denise made me remember that when we spoke about the GSC to have some kind of briefing from them as well. I think that was important because that helped us to contextualize the training aspect that kept popping up during the presentation. So I just wanted to put that on the record.

EMILY TAYLOR:

I think that's a Global Stakeholder Engagement group. Okay.

Does anybody have any other comments or queries or remarks?  
Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Not really to [inaudible] the action items. So it's actually a communications request. We'd like to do a post kind of meeting wrap-up of what was discussed to share with the community after the meeting. So we'd recommend doing another blog. I'd like to do Q&A perhaps with one or two Review Team members. So this is a call for our volunteers for that. You don't have to volunteer right the second but if



Session

---

we can maybe get 10 minutes tomorrow to have a quick chat, I'd be grateful for anybody who would like to volunteer. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR: James.

JAMES GANNON: So just on process for Comms, it's a request again I meant to make before, and if the co-Chairs or staff are going to – if you come on behalf of the team, can it be sent for like a 24-hour review or indicate of this [inaudible] review before. I just note the last few times I think there's being two Comms that were left out and we haven't actually seen it before. It's been published. So just give us some time to have to look over in case.

EMILY TAYLOR: No. That's a very fair request and apologies for that. I think that's just our eagerness to remember to keep communicating because it's difficult to do that. But absolutely, we will [inaudible] is that we will do our best.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

Session

---

EMILY TAYLOR: I will not do that again. I'm very sorry. So, everybody, thank you so much for your engagement and your contributions today, and thanks for making it to this meeting. It's really been a very, very encouraging day. I'm looking forward to tomorrow. Remember your homework.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

EMILY TAYLOR: No excuses. Don't leave it on the bus. See you tomorrow at 8:30.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And we'll have brainstorming in the bar immediately following this session.

EMILY TAYLOR: Excellent.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't think that's a joke.

EMILY TAYLOR: No. Except for Eric.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

---