

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Welcome, everybody, to day two of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting in Washington D.C. My name is Jennifer Bryce. The meeting, as you know, is being recorded. I will – I guess, Alice, do you want to start? We'll do a roundtable for attendance. At the moment, we have Mr. Matogoro online only. Thank you.

ALICE JANSEN: Alice Jansen, ICANN staff.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric Osterweil.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin Weissinger.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar.

---

*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.*

---

ZARKO KECIC: Zarko Kecic.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Naveed bin Rais.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. Alain Aina.

NORM RITCHIE: Donald Trump. No, Norm Ritchie.

NEGAR FARTZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia.

RAMKRISHNA PARIYAR: Ramkrishna.

PHIL KHOURY: Phil Khoury.

KC CLAFFY: KC Claffy.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Scott McCormick.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Phil, do you want to kick us off?

PHIL KHOURY: Thank you. Welcome, everyone. I'm just going to give Steve a chance to make an announcement.

STEVE CONTE: Yeah, sorry. A funny thing happened on the way to the forum today. On the walk between the hotel and the office – you know how long that walk is – I look across the street, and low and behold, who do I see but Cathy Handley? [inaudible] She sends welcomes and regards to everyone and hopes that this is a productive meeting. She's here for plenipot planning for ARIN, but she wishes everyone well today. So, it was quite a surprise to see her.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Thank you. Anyone has to report any scandal, injury, anything like that from last night before we press on? I'm going to assume it's okay. I assume everyone has noted that Boban cannot join us today. So at this stage, Mr. Matogoro is hopefully able to hear us, but can't participate otherwise. I think he's just dropped off [even from that.]

Okay, so today, the agenda is a little looser. It'll depend a fair bit on how we progress. The first thing I wanted to do was spend a little bit of time recapping yesterday. And that's by way of me presenting a few notes of what I think we've agreed to, and in some places, just to trick you, I've inserted fabrications, so you'll need to look at it with an eagle eye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: it's like reading the news.

PHIL KHOURY: To decide if it's [inaudible]. I'm actually joking, but I have filled in bits in there that may not have happened yesterday. So part of the issue is to get people to agree, disagree, change it, all that kind of thing, to make sure we've kind of put a pig in the sand for yesterday's pretty productive discussions, I think.

So once we've done that, I have a little list of the stuff that has to be dealt with, and I'd like to have a conversation with everyone about figuring out [which of that we need to deal with] with the recording off, and when we're ready to go into recording on mode and make the deliberations and discussions public. So just an issue of what we need to deal with, and that's a collective input-type decision.

And the other thing we just process-wise should do today, I think, is – again, open to debate about all of that – to do the leadership piece, and there's a little bit of mechanics around how we do that during the day and have people voting and if we need to vote, and all that sort of thing.

So for those of you who are interested in nominating for the leadership, you should think about that, because at some point in a couple of hours, we'll call for that and ask you to put your hands up to let us know who's willing to bear that load. So, any questions, comments, requests, anything for this morning?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm trying to understand the series of events that you have in your head that are not up on the screen. I think before we pick leadership, we need to understand what task is before us and what the major steps are. And is that the order you plan to do things?

PHIL KHOURY: Look, I think we need to get into some of that before we jump off, so I'm leaving that a little bit flexible, where do we arrive in the conversation before we sort of kick that thing off. It's kind of a tradeoff. It would help for the people who are going to have the leadership role to spend some time while we're here being the leaders, but also, people want to change to sort of think about what the challenge is in front of us and have a reasonable definition before they choose. So picking the right moment is – I'm guessing today is a good time to do it. Maybe we're not ready to go, I don't know. But I do want everyone to kind of be on notice about that so you're thinking about it before we arrive at that. Anyone else, other comments to start?

Great, okay. So, can we have the next slide, please, Jennifer? So, yesterday – I've [left] things out of the notes from yesterday, so I grabbed the rough notes from the staff, I've grabbed my rough notes, and I've tried to pull things out in some kind of order. This was being done at 4:00 AM, so its coherence is not guaranteed. But I [inaudible] these slides here, these four points, things that I thought were really team norms, team ground rules that people were asking for yesterday – I thought people were asking for.

---

So, I'd like to just sort of go through those and just rediscuss if we need to. If people would like to make some refinements to the language, words and so on, good opportunity to do so. None of this is set in concrete, but if we want to have a sense of what's been achieved in the course of the day, it's useful to just say yes or no to those. So just giving everyone a minute to have a look at it. Is that easy enough to read from there for your young eyes, Eric? Yeah? Good. Okay. I'm struggling from here.

So the first one is the one that we've pinched Naveed's sort of words around setting the frame for independent contribution, so people bringing whatever knowledge they have from their constituency group and everything else that they bring, they act as an independent contributor when they're here, and their communication with their nominating organization is customized to whatever agreements they may have had, expectations of their constituency, all that kind of thing.

So if you're in a position where there's sort of – for example Ramkrishna's one, that was as more structured request, and other places, people have been more than happy, it sounds like, to have you be just independently on the review team without any obligations. So I think that covers all of that. Any comments on first one? Clearly, it's a good idea to give you alcohol, [inaudible] team leaders, take note.

Second one is around the disagreements. So this goes to the issue of stuff being ventilated outside that hasn't been ventilated inside the team, and I'm thinking – that's my words for what I think I heard yesterday in terms of what people think is the right way [inaudible]. Mr. Matogoro, it's Phil Khoury here. Do you have audio both ways?

---

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yes, this is Matogoro, and I found that [inaudible] disconnected from the phone, so I'm not sure how [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY: Alright, well, we can hear you. You'll have to speak slowly, I think. The connection's not fantastic. But that's great, I'm glad we could hear you there. Were you able to pick up on what we're doing here at the moment? Can you see the slide on the Adobe Connect?

JABHERA MATOGORO: No – let me – in trying to see the [inaudible] proceed and then I catch up.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, thanks. I think towards the top on this list, I suggest that we have something that conveys our commitment to work as a team, to build consensus and support it as a team. We discussed that yesterday. I think it should be included in the ground rules.

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry, Denise, thank you. I think that's right. There's two issues in there, I think. Committing to work as a team is one issue. I have on the agenda

---

---

for later the talk about consensus and how that will work here. I think that's – there's two dimensions. I know they're connected, but I think we still need to have a conversation about that around the contentious piece. But I've got that [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL:

Sure. But as long as we're asking for people to agree to ground rules that dive into details about how they can express and move on with their individual perspective, it's important, I think, to put a team commitment at the top given the constructive dialog we had yesterday and the importance of stating something that should be obvious, but I think given this team's history, needs to be substantiated in the ground rules at this point.

PHIL KHOURY:

Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah, I think at some point, we need to discuss what do we call as a consensus, because it can be an [idea of] kind of consensus or it can be a majority kind of consensus with giving members a right to dissent, maybe by adding a dissent note or something. But we need to discuss at some point. Maybe it's good to discuss it later today and decide, and then we can add something like that to this. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY:

KC.



KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I think I made a comment yesterday about number four, which is my experience with these kind of groups, these multi-stakeholder groups, is that for the vast majority of the time, the vast majority of opinions are neither team or individual. So then you can represent it that way if you're going to talk to people outside, but I think this is a case where as Alain said, people just talk and they use their best judgment. And to some extent, if we're committed to what Denise said, that should work.

DENISE MICHEL: Also, just for new people, I think it would be helpful if staff sent around the – early on when the review team started, we agreed on general duties for leadership. We agreed on how we defined consensus and how we reach consensus. All of that's in the background, and as we – as Naveed has rightly suggested, we'll need to circle back, and with new people, look at that with fresh eyes. I think it would be useful if staff sent around those documents, it'd probably be a good stepping off point.

PHIL KHOURY: Question. In the terms of reference, there is some stuff which could be called ground rules, in the final terms of reference that was agreed. I have a memory of finding something else somewhere, but I couldn't find it when I looked for it yesterday. Is there another document other than that terms of reference, or is there a series of [dot points] around that?

DENISE MICHEL:                    Yeah, I believe the terms of reference includes the general approach to consensus, which tracks with the GNSO's approach to consensus.

PHIL KHOURY:                    Okay. Terrific. That's excellent. Anyone else comment on any of those four? KC, was there anything you'd like to add in the words to number four to pick up your caution that things are not – I mean that's aspirational, I suppose. You're saying it isn't always that simple.

KC CLAFFY:                        I don't want to be provocative, but I would delete it.

PHIL KHOURY:                    Okay. Any response, Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:                So, would it make sense to flip it around then and say in the event that the team is – that someone from the team is speaking about their personal perspective, to clarify that that is a personal perspective? As opposed to saying "I'll delineate things," just say if you know you're sort of speaking from your own, you know they may not be held by the team, just call it out. Or is that also just too much?

---

KC CLAFFY: I think that's fine, but I don't think that's what that rule was trying to protect against. Well, I don't actually know. Maybe that would be what we should clarify. But I think the concern that I – it's not that I don't share this concern, I just am not sure that rule would fix it or that any rule would fix it, which is somebody goes to SSAC and says, "Oh, man, they are just totally full of strife in there, they just can't agree on anything." Right? Exactly. I can say, "Well, that's my individual perspective, but here is the evidence."

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry. Yeah, Kerry Ann was next.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Apologies for being late. I think yesterday when I had tried to explain it on the phone, I don't think it came across as clearly as I wanted it to. For me, there's a distinction with actually saying substantive issues that the team is discussing, meaning that [inaudible] identified for the review, that we may have different opinions, and then you might have a dissenting opinion. I think that is what that was intended to capture. Personal opinion as to whether the team dynamics and what's happening within the team, that's something completely different. [inaudible] how you feel about the team. I don't talk about [inaudible]. I think substantive issues, especially for example when we're developing the scope of a review and the scope [of reference.] That's how I understood it. You may have one, two, three, four, five. One person [inaudible] like Eric would probably say, "That's rubbish." That's a dissenting opinion, and I think that's important in terms of the team for

---

Eric to feel comfortable to say within the team during our meeting “That’s rubbish.” He should feel protected to know that someone [will go and say] “You know, everybody agreed except Eric.” So that’s different than saying, “I really don’t like Eric.” And I can beat up on Eric because Eric is accustomed to that, so I can use him as a reference. But I’m saying I think we need to distinguish substantive issues for the review and personal opinion about team dynamics. I think it’s a very clear distinction, and that was intended to protect. It is identified for the review where you have dissenting opinions that we distinguish [to going off and rat out] and say “Eric was the only one who didn’t agree with us including in the scope these five issues. I wanted to include it but Eric didn’t want to include it.” That’s different. I think we need to distinct, and that’s what that was intended to cover.

KC CLAFFY: Number four?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Number four.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, but I think then you’re back to the case of most things are in the middle. So number four [inaudible] capture, which goes back to Phil saying, okay, what wording captures it? Somebody else should suggest some wording, I think.

---

PHIL KHOURY: Let's see. Naveed was next. No? Sorry, Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think we're conflating two different issues, as Kerry Ann mentioned, but what you're saying is actually in bylaw, so I don't think we need to document that. It clearly says any member of review team not in favor of recommendation of its review team – and this is about recommendations which are result – then it says that the result votes against the matter or objection to consensus may record a minority dissent to such recommendation which shall be included in the report of the review team. And there is an explanation. So that's already in bylaws.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, but that's not what she's saying.

KAVEH RANJBAR: No. So she mentioned two different issues, and one of them is already covered in bylaw, so we don't need to address that. The other one, which is hear, like internal team and like people might go and talk about stuff, I think we are going overboard with that, because for a good reason, ICANN is a very bureaucratic organization, so when things happen, people go back to the official e-mails or communication [inaudible] and we should also all commit to do that. People can talk, and there is no way to restrict that or control that, and we shouldn't even try. We should just all commit to what this team says is what this team documents as published outcomes, written down outcomes. And

---

then that's what we should do. We should put down everything to written down communication, and other – that really doesn't matter. I might go somewhere and say, "Oh, this team is working fantastically" or "it's a disaster," but people do not, should not and will not take it as an opinion of the team as long as they know, okay, everything this team does is based on their published communications.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think maybe we should – it's better to document that we agree that any official view of the team or how the team works is written down. Yeah, that it's documented.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] already said that.

KAVEH RANJBAR: That's for the recommendations. So again, as Kerry Ann said, there are two different things. Recommendations which is the outcome of this team. People might dissent, but this is about the internal workings of the team. There might be statements like, "Hey, we love the leadership of the team." That can be documented.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. I understand.

PHIL KHOURY: Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. I think maybe we're missing the point. I think I raised this point yesterday. In order to avoid any conflict later on when the team members communicate externally, if it's better to clarify whether they're doing it on individual basis or as a consensus on the team. So I think this is what number four is trying, but I would be more comfortable not using the word "discussing" here. Maybe it's "communication" or something better word that can be used here, because "discussion" can be formal or informal, and you cannot restrict that. Maybe we can make that a little more formal, like when you say "communicating," it should be officially, like when I'm reporting to my constituency, I should make clear whether this is my personal opinion or this is the consensus that has been developed by the team. So, in order to clarify this, we should have something, but maybe not discussing the review issues. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Can I make a request? [inaudible] put their hand up to have a go at redrafting that to capture the essence of that discussion and come back to us later.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Hello.

PHIL KHOURY: Yes, Mr. Matogoro.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yes. I'm aware of the discussion that is going out, especially around how the team should communicate in case of someone is sending out the communication, and I think to the matter of understanding that this was one of the issues that lead us to the opposing of the team. So I think we need to have a ground rule that will help us in future on addressing this [inaudible] so that if someone is communicating outside the team, then maybe the chair of the team should be aware or the co-chair should be aware, or there should be a way to know who's communicating out. Because I'm also aware that we are representing different constituents. Then we should also have a strategy on how to give updates to the constituents that you are representing in the team. I think in doing that, then it will help us address some of the past challenges that the team went through until we are opposed. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Thank you. Any comments, responses to that proposition? Okay, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, I was just responding to the suggestion, I'll a whack at number four. It sounds like one perspective is we should nuke it, another perspective is we should rewrite it, and Mr. Matogoro's point is the spirit behind number four clearly stems directly from what precipitated the pause. So there's kind of a whole lot in there, and I think I'd be happy to take a

---



---

whack at it, but I'm not sure I understand what the sort of overall view from the team is. It sounds like we're still a little bit unclear on what we want.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. KC.

KC CLAFFY: But I disagree. That's the fundamental issue. I disagree that number four is addressing the issue that happened that precipitated the pause. Nobody came to SSAC and said, "This is the team view." So I don't see how number four gets to it. That's why I want to nuke it, because I think we're getting already into too much process. I understand there's scars here we're trying to sort of protect against, but I want to make sure we're protecting something actually happened if we're going to do that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So that's fine. I certainly wasn't there, obviously, but I guess all I know is what we heard, and so I don't want to get into the whole he said she said, but I think the concern was that we understood that once something got said, there was a piling on of, "Oh, yeah, the whole time I've been really unhappy."

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible] that individual [inaudible]

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I know, and so that's why we maybe try and put guard rails around something that – like we're all allowed to speak, so we can't have a guard rail saying you're not allowed to speak. So I'm very sensitive that maybe we should nuke four, maybe we shouldn't. I just don't know what the team wants, so I couldn't –

KAVEH RANJBAR: So speaking for the board, I'm fully with KC. And no, at least from the board, I can assure you it wasn't about what people said. Not at all. It's all about what happened and what was visible in the team progress and what was documented. So it was not at all about what people said.

PHIL KHOURY: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just a proposal for the language which I think would address the feeling concern as Naveed said in terms of if you have a communication, an official communication on behalf of the team, I think we could put something like team members acknowledge that if they communicate – and I'm just adlibbing it, somebody can document – to their constituent, however we want to call the group, that any official communication is approved or consensus from the team, and any [other views] that have a consensus of the team, they would identify as their individual views. It's something that actually distinguishes that if they communicate – just because we did talk yesterday about a communication plan and the fact that when we have come up with a decision, we want to actually start

---

communicating with different groups within ICANN, there will be an official view saying, “Hey, I'm talking to the board and this is what we're discussing on these issues. We want your opinion or our views,” or “we're just informing you.” So those who would be informed and those who need some advice from or some – and that will be an official communication. [Say,] Eric, when you go to your constituent, we want you to [ask them this, communicate this.] Or all team members, when you talk, this is the message that we're sending to everyone at the same time.

This is usually captured in the Wiki whenever we make that decision, but if it is that we nuke it, it would have to – I think as a team we'd have to, as I said yesterday, agree that we are a team and persons should feel at liberty to speak, but recognizing that when we do communicate, it could be taken up as a ground rule. And now I think we have consensus that we accept that once we communicate outside, we need to ensure that we have this very clear. And I think if we document – I don't know if that makes sense.

PHIL KHOURY:

Steve. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yeah, because I mean reading the second point from number one, independent contributors, we're independent decision makers and contributors. And you expect that within the team and outside the team. So I don't expect -and I will not follow the rule that if the team says, “Oh, don't say that.” It's not the team's choice to tell me, “Don't

---

say this” or “Don’t say that.” And as I said, ICANN is a very bureaucratic organization, so I cannot go there and speak on behalf of the team and expect to be counted as a formal opinion unless it’s written down and sent as a team or as an individual. So that will be very clear. It’s not like I can go to them and say, “Oh, this team is not functioning and that’s a formal opinion of the team.” So I don’t know how we can address that or should we even address that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That’s number three.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, so that’s why I was kind of suggesting that if we do the communication plan, it’ll be clear when it’s official and when it’s not official. So I think the communication plan may solve the issue, because at the end of the day, any official communication leaving the team would be that we’ve agreed, whether you can – but any individual opinion, we can’t restrict individual opinions about anything. So I think once we agree, I think it could be nuked, once we agree on doing a proper communication plan.

PHIL KHOURY: Denise, I think, was next.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. At the end of the day, it will be our group commitment and our collective integrity and commitment to making this team work and move forward, and nothing we write here is going to change that if someone on the team decides to go off and complain about whatever. I'm confident just having spent one day around this table with everyone and on the phone that this team can get there and move forward and be really productive and contribute a lot, so I would support adding the team commitment language that I suggested a few minutes ago, and personally, I'm fine with all of this text and happy to move on. Thanks.

PHIL KHOURY: Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, it seems to me that I would say it sounds like we're leaning towards taking four off. In the event that we wanted to have something there – I think I'm in favor of taking four off, but in the event that we wanted something there, I think it probably makes more sense to say in the event that a substantive discussion has happened about the team outside of the team, it would be useful for team members to bring back that context of that discussion, and that includes if the team member brought the discussion up.

In other words, if you say something about the team in a hallway conversation you think is relevant for the team to know, bring it back. But I think, to Denise's point, if we're working as a team, that'll be

---

perfunctory. I don't think we need to put a guardrail around it. So I would lean towards taking four off, but if people want something, I'm happy to draft it.

PHIL KHOURY:

Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

I think one of the issues that caused the pause – maybe, I'm not sure because I'm one of the new members – was kind of a sense of disagreement maybe between the members that maybe propagated, and I think we're trying to identify that. There should be a mechanism to trace out whether some of the team members are disagreeing upon the direction that we're taking. So it should be addressed somehow.

For example, when you're communicating, as Mr. Matogoro said, if you're including chairs or some of the team members or the team mailing list in your communication, official communication with your own constituency, that this is the perspective you're carrying, that maybe one of the ways to resolve any dispute that is like arising from the opinion of a team member. So we should have a way to identify whether some of the team members having any dispute or any disagreement with the rest of the – or with the course of direction that we are taking. So I think we'd say it's critical that we have a mechanism to identify, because that is a key to resolving disputes that will be arising. Thank you.

---

PHIL KHOURY: Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: I don't see the problem in that, because if I have a problem, I'll bring that up, and that's part of teamwork. And if I'm going to ccNSO telling that something is wrong and I didn't bring that up with the team, that's out of scope. So I don't think that anybody will take that as granted.

PHIL KHOURY: Just – I'll come to you in a second, Alain. I just have to say that the purpose of the ground rules is to try and put in some writing what the feeling of the team was. There isn't actually a jail you can be sent to for breaching any of this. This is not a contractual thing. So what we're trying to do there is kind of get the essence of how people would like each other to behave there. So in whatever you settle on, just bear that in mind. Alain.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. I think by default, the co-chairs are responsible for our formal external communication. So I think we should acknowledge that and then know that if any member which his not co-chairs is talking at the outside, the communications should only be based on the facts available publicly. That's all.

PHIL KHOURY: Steve.

STEVE CONTE: Just one item to consider in this conversation too. I think as we know the plenaries are all public and recorded, and so it's very easy for anybody to go back and review the recordings. At the same time, I think there were some very valuable off the record discussions in Los Angeles, and I think we should be mindful of the reason why people go off the record is to have frank and informal discussions before they go on the record. And I think that's important to protect that so this team can function in its best mode. So maybe just at least be mindful. I don't know if there needs to be language, just be mindful that off the record discussions should be protected in some form or another and the official result of those off the record discussions when it goes back on the record is for discussion, but maybe the offer the record should stay in a what happens in Vegas stays in Vegas-type mode.

PHIL KHOURY: Thanks, Steve. Can I just check and see? Are we being recorded? I think we might turn the recorder off. There's nothing burningly private about any of this, but we might leave it off until we're ready to go, deliberately go on, if that's okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Brenda, can you pause the recording, please? Thank you. Okay, we're reconvening for the afternoon session, and this is day two of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting, and the session is being recorded. Phil, over to you.



PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Just a process matter, I have asked Steve to be the traffic controller on the sequence in which people raise their hands, as I'm failing dismally at that part of the job. So Steve's going to help me by looking at me knowingly, wink accordingly [inaudible]. I think we'll at least stick to the convention of picking up your name tag to aid in memory of how to run that. So I appreciate that. Thanks, Steve.

Look, this will be a sort of messier session, so if we've got to start with this document, maybe Denise, I might ask you since you're co-chair and have the history of it all, just to in terms of – kind of guide us through the points in the document where the action should begin.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Where is [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: It's up on screen at the moment, so you could either –

DENISE MICHEL: What would people like to cover? Do they want a little bit of history of how we created this and when we discussed it, when we agreed upon it, when we reviewed it? What would be most useful for people at this point?

PHIL KHOURY: Direct the question not new members of the team?

---

DENISE MICHEL:                    Yeah. New members.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:                I think the scope and how we define the consensus. We can discuss it, because I'm supposing this is within this document. So we can go through it and have a discussion on it.

KC CLAFFY:                        One thing I'm interested in is if everybody, the old members think it's still fine, or if there's anything specific you think should change, what is it?

RUSS HOUSLEY:                 The front parts are kind of background, tell us what our mandate is from the bylaws and so on. So I don't think there's anything to do there, but I would like to know whether the scope of work parts and the people are happy with. Obviously, the timeline needs revisited, because we're not going to finish by June. That would be last June. And the decision-making part we just need to make sure that we're still happy with, and then I think that the electronic tools and outreach sections are probably still the same. So anyway, I just think we just need to step through and say – find out where we don't have consensus.

---

STEVE CONTE: Before Negar, I'll try to give new members a chance. So Laurin, did you have anything that you wanted to add to? Okay, not right now. Thank you. Thanks. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I just wanted to note for the benefit of the entire review team members that the template that you see used for this terms of reference, as I'm sure many of the review team members from the start of the review will agree, was not the best template out there. It was missing parts that are probably more substantial under the new bylaws, and so we have an improved template that has been put to use by other review teams and has proved to be successful, more comprehensive. We have a clean version of that available. Obviously, this doesn't have to be done during the current conversation, but I just wanted to let everyone know that at the time that we are ready to update the terms of reference, we might want to consider using the new template for better features and format.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does it have new sections that are not in this one?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I believe so. And let me turn it over to Alice, because I think she knows it by heart, better than I do.

---

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, I read it every night. No, essentially, there are a number of sections in there that are operating standards-related, like we were mentioning earlier the – like if someone is not really active on the review team, there are some provisions for that in there. We also have a modus operandi section, and also a section that's dedicated to identifying duplication other ongoing work within the community and the need to make sure that there's no duplication in terms of scope. And then obviously, the caucus group is also recognized in the terms of reference with a mechanism that you can use to go to for guidance and so on. And we're happy to walk you through the new template if that's helpful, but yes, there are some sections in there that are new.

PHIL KHOURY: Can I ask, would it work to work from the existing one, make it as you would like it to be, and then there's another step where that gets translated into the new template and you can check that off and deal with any extra bits in it? Does that work okay for people?

DENISE MICHEL: No, I haven't seen the new template, so I think before I agree to that personally, I'd like to see the new template. Yeah, to see if that is something that we want to do and that we need to do.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, so we need to start getting on with it today. We'll work with the current one. Kaveh.

---

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you. I just want to say if you're going to start working from the existing [inaudible] and basically also discuss the scope, it's important to look at the board letter from June 2012, 2017, which actually raised some concerns about what was published. Some of that were addressed, but some were not, and I think that's important that the review team reads that and considers basically those recommendations from the board. You can find it on ICANN correspondence page from 23rd of June, 2017.

PHIL KHOURY: And Kaveh, did that specifically address the scope issues in particular, or a whole lot of issues?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, it has four items on scope and two items on terms of reference [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, when there were questions raised before about how we got to this point, an outline was created with the appropriate length, so I'm going to send that to you guys.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

---

DENISE MICHEL:

Okay. So, do you want me to just sort of start walking through it and then people can stop for questions? So, as I noted, the bylaw-required operating standards were not done when the SSR2 – I guess weren't done, certainly weren't done when the SSR2 was created. Staff provided the team with the template that was used for this, and it was the same terms of reference, scope, template that the CCT review, the consumer trust review that's still ongoing was using, and I think other reviews as well, so that's the template that we used.

In terms of substance, probably the best thing to do would be – it's rough noted, the first part is sort of a pro forma notation of the relevant bylaws for the team to skip to definitions. It's probably the first substantive part to address. There we go.

So the team felt it was important to note the key terms that are associated with the work, so you'll see here working definitions for security, stability, resiliency, and unique identifiers, and then it goes into the focus of the SSR2, so the scope of work, breaks down the bylaw requirements, addresses broadly the work that the team intends to address related to each of those. I'll just kind of give you an overview, perhaps it might help as a stepping off point for your discussions.

Again, this terms of reference scope was intended to be a high-level guidepost of how the team would be turning the bylaw requirements into the actual work of the team. We then laid out a general timeline that obviously needs to be updated now, and then next, there's some information on the operation of the review team. It's towards the bottom of page five, that's where you'll see a section on decision-

---

making. It references the relevant text from the bylaws, indicates that the team will operate by consensus.

This means that all team members agree on a position or only a small minority of team members disagree but most agree. To the extent the team is unable to achieve consensus with respect to any recommendations, its reports and recommendations will include minority views. That's footnoted and indicated that the nature and use of consensus and minority [inaudible] by the GNSO working group guidelines. The GNSO working group guidelines cover all of the work that's done on consensus development that's done by the GNSO and all of its groups and goes into further detail on consensus development and minority views. Indicated that –

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Sorry, Denise, can I pause for – so just as an example of what Denise mentioned, that was one of the recommendations from the board letter, exactly the sentence Denise read, will include minority views. It says the parameter of minority requires clarification. What is the minimum number of dissenting RT members that would warrant inclusion of minority views? This is the type of questions that – just wanted to – thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Right. Yeah. And that and the board input that eventually was received after the terms of reference were finalized was discussed, I think, at the South Africa meeting, so there's records of that in the minutes. So, it

---

notes that we can make decisions face-to-face, via teleconference or the e-mail list.

Then it goes on – on following page two, address leadership, the three people who agreed to serve in leadership – the only three people who agreed to serve in leadership when the SSR team was first created were Emily Taylor, Eric, and I. The team agreed on specific responsibilities for the co-chairs, and then also noted specific responsibilities for review team members. All of that is documented on page six.

Then it addresses electronic tools, noting the use of the e-mail list, the public archives, how to deal with confidential and sensitive information, and the use of review team Wiki. Then finally at the bottom of page seven, there's a note on outreach our commitment to conduct outreach to the ICANN community and ensure public access and opportunities to provide input on the team's work from interested community members, and our commitment to present our work and hear input from interested communities.

Page eight addresses meetings of the review team, general rules for the conduct of meetings and transparency commitments, again addressing the need for how to treat off-record discussions when needed. Much of this is, as I said, a template language that was received previously and used previously by review teams.

Then there's a note on subteams of the review team noting that we can create subteams when we feel it's necessary and how the subteams are going to be run and how they feed back into the full review team. There's a note on independent experts, noting the bylaws address the



---

use of independent experts and the fact that if we feel there's a need, we can pull that trigger. And finally, there's a note on travel support, again, using the template that was provided.

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry, Denise, there's two words missing from that travel paragraph, first-class.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

PHIL KHOURY: [inaudible] for people just to [inaudible] that overview, the proposition that [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Just one second before we start the queue. Zarko, you weren't here when we started, I just want you to be aware that we are recording the session. Okay, Naveed and then Laurin.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. I just want to know that there's something that we call in SSR2 as an observer list, so I don't see any mention in these bylaws about what are the role and why do we have this, like what is the difference between those observers and the general outreach community that we're having. So at some point, I think we need to mention in the document that there's an observer list and what was the purpose of

---

creating that. Second, I think that the timeline anyways need to be updated because it's already past the deadline that we are having. So maybe we can update it. But I'm still missing the discussion on the scope. The scope is there, but I think we need to discuss what kind of scope, and we need to update that. And the last thing is I can see that based on the scope, those sub-streams or chunks were created, but I'm not sure there are some "shalls" and there's a "may" in the bylaws. So I'm not sure if any sub-stream or chunk was created on those "may" which have I think three or four bullet points in the bylaws. Thank you.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Laurin and KC.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Quick note based on Kaveh's comment on stuff from the board. In our Wiki, stuff doesn't link properly to some of these messages. That should be fixed if possible.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, correct, and I just sent an e-mail with links because I saw that. So check the e-mail you have.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks for flagging that. KC?

---

KC CLAFFY: Are we supposed to comment on specific text in that document yet, or that's not yet?

PHIL KHOURY: I was wanting to check with people. Denise has given us an overview. It seemed like the first place where people might want to have a discussion about it is –it'd be probably worth doing before we proceed – the definitions, people comfortable with the definitions to sort of lay the ground before we move on.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] That was my first comment on the text, which is, why are we not citing some standard community definitions? Why are we making up these things as if it's our job to make them up? Aren't they written down somewhere in some ICANN bylaws?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, if I may.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, actually, the SSR OCTO staff [inaudible] some definitions with the community that these definitions with the community and provided those publicly, and I think those are the ones we –

KC CLAFFY: Can we cite that? Can we cite some other thing of where we got these?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I think it still appears on the ICANN website.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

PHIL KHOURY: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I believe the last, KC, was because when we started, we couldn't find one source for SSR. So I think it took like half a day meeting trying to define what was SSR and figuring out the solution, and that was the solution we came up with, to just get a definition.

KC CLAFFY: I think that makes it more important to say we didn't make this up, we got this from some –

STEVE CONTE: I'll put myself in queue just to address that when we convened for the very first time in Copenhagen is when we started discussions about the definitions of SSR, and I was tasked and asked to go look for that, so I

---

did a search– utilizing Google – for those definitions on the ICANN website. They are mostly consistent. The [inaudible] by the SSR team at that time, and then –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: SSR1?

STEVE CONTE: No, the SSR staff.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Yes, sorry. And we also ran into ambiguity about the term SSR when we talk about SSR team and staff and things like that. So –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Exactly. John Crain’s team at the time wrote the first framework and then continued it. Now that his team is enveloped in the office of the CTO, OCTO is responsible for updating the framework. The inconsistencies were minor. The framework has the definitions, and then the definitions part of the website had slight wording differences, but not of substantial words, more of [is] and things like that. So for the

---

most part, the wording on ICANN's website is consistent. The review team, to my recollection, took the wording from the framework to put into this document.

KC CLAFFY: I just want a URL on the page with a footnote to where we took the [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. I think we have a – I have a Norm jumping in here really quick.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, so a note about the definition of security. [inaudible] misuse, and if that is a cause of people wondering about the [inaudible] scope, we should either refine that or not.

PHIL KHOURY: Comments on that? Seems like there's a question about where you do that refining. There's a strength having this cited and straight from the ICANN framework, but if at the level of people's understanding, we need to have some more definition, maybe rather than changing the definition here, there's some layer below where you pick that up. Does that work?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] the document if I recall very well said that they are not asking this review team to work on this refining of security, so I think

---

the board letter said something about that, that we are not asking this review team to refine the security. And I think the agreement was staff should work on it. I don't know if you guys remember.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I'm not – I was going to say something that's a bit different from what Alain said. I think I was leaning more towards what Phil was suggesting. The definitions is really just to make sure that everyone understands what does security mean, what does stability mean, what does resilience mean, and then within the workplan in terms of the scope of what we're actually reviewing within those definitions is where it gets refined. But we had wanted initially to ensure that we had consensus throughout the community that when we do say SSR, the community understands what we started off with, and then the workplan actually refines that scope.

STEVE CONTE: KC, you still have a card up.

KC CLAFFY: I didn't mean to, but now that you said that, I'm just worried that it sounds from what Steve said that the definitions more or less came from ICANN staff. So I would not call that community consensus on the definition.

STEVE CONTE: I'm sorry, can I clarify that?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

STEVE CONTE: The definitions came from the SSR framework document that was written by ICANN staff. The definitions themselves, according to John Crain when I asked him about this, were through a community process. I don't have the process behind that. He said that it was created through community consensus and that in order for the official framework definitions to change, he would have to put that back through a community consensus process. I don't have the details behind that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: I'm sorry, [inaudible] because I was clarifying –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, but I want to add on your clarification.

STEVE CONTE: Okay.

---



NAVEED BIN RAIS: I think that this framework work was also part of one of the recommendations from SSR1 for ICANN to work and publish and go through this community and have this come – the SSR framework was one of the recommendations from SSR1.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: I just mean – again, sorry to be academic about this, but I want to point to a URL that is evidence that there was community consensus on this definition so it doesn't look like we pulled it out of OCTO, we pulled it out of our hats. That's all.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think we should ask the staff to look into that and give us an answer, if we can find evidence of that.

KC CLAFFY: Especially if it was a recommendation out of the SSR1 and it didn't really happen in a way that there's evidence that you can see that it happened. That's all I'm –

---

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

KC, just in terms of [inaudible] process, one of the discussions we had that we spent a good length of time on, one of the things that we recognized is that if we're tasked to review the SSR of ICANN and this is what is being used within ICANN as the definition as well, it makes sense to review based on what they have, because if you think about what are they implementing, it's being implemented based on these definitions. But then what is security, what is stability, what is resilience? From that perspective.

Our review team would have to be reviewing at the same standard that they aim to maintain. Otherwise, if we go off on a tangent and have like a whole new definition, it will never probably meet. I'm just thinking through, because as I said, it was a long process, and we had come up with just going that route because we have to be reviewing what is actually in place, if that makes sense. But if we have a whole different set of definitions, it will never align with what is happening. So I know that – I think Steve can correct me – I remember it was more than just like a Google search, it was checking every doc [inaudible] a search through all the documents that mentioned security. There was a document that had a reference, you had produced something in the Copenhagen meeting that had a few references. I don't know if anyone recalls.

STEVE CONTE:

I had a slide deck [inaudible] I'd have to look for that again.

---

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, but he had acutely pulled together and actually looked at all of it, and then we had [a consensus,] “Okay, this is how we should proceed, because holistically, these are the definitions that were available.” I think that makes sense.

KC CLAFFY: It makes sense, it just doesn’t address my concern.

STEVE CONTE: Alright, so before I take this as an action item, I'm hearing from two members of the review team to go in and look for concrete process of how these definitions were created, but based on consensus model, I want to get consensus to take that as an action item. Is the rest of the review team looking for this question, or these are one-off questions from review team members?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Actually, I did google that, and apparently, this is a GAC thing, so it’s not that hard. It is on ICANN website, so I would give it two more minutes, maybe I find it already.

PHIL KHOURY: I think – give Kaveh a few minutes just to sort of dig it out. So there was a process for weighing up the different ways you can attack that. In the end, what Kerry Ann is telling us is the decision was made on the basis, well, that’s the working definition that ICANN are using, and therefore, that’s not a bad place for the review to start. Kaveh will try and figure

---

out if we've got the trail that runs back to whatever the community process was so there's a reference, citable authority for those definitions. Yeah? And we'll move on and come back to it when we get the answer to that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

I'm just wondering why do we include the unique identifiers definition here, because it's about SSR, and if we keep explaining other terms, then in definition of unique identifiers, we'll get other terms, and then you have to include that. So you get yourself in a loop. So maybe there's a reason of defining unique identifiers here, but this is something that is already defined by ICANN, what is unique identifiers. Why we have to redefine again here?

STEVE CONTE:

Denise, then Kaveh.

DENISE MICHEL:

As I recall, for the sake of completeness, because the bylaw mandates that this review cites the unique identifiers. So I think the team felt it was appropriate to include the working definition that ICANN uses because we have a bylaw mandate to address that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Sorry, is it the same definition that is available on ICANN website about unique identifiers?

STEVE CONTE:                   Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL:                I believe that's where we got it, and channeling KC, I think it should be cited.

STEVE CONTE:                   Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR:                So yeah, I found it. The draft statement of ICANN – this is the document – draft statement for ICANN's role and remit in security, stability and resiliency of the Internet's unique identifiers, it was published in May 2012, there's a link, and revisited following public comment and discussion at ICANN meetings in Prague, June 2012, and Toronto, October 2012. There is another link, and I can send it. So that's what you were looking –

STEVE CONTE:                   Thank you. Kerry Ann, do you still have a card up? Thank you. [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY:                  Alright. I think that covers off definitions for the purposes of this document anyway, yeah?

---

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: I still don't know – I'm going back to the board letter that was brought up earlier, and that asked a specific question regarding basically the definition of security, so does misuse include things such as copyright infringement which falls more into the idea of abuse? So does this group also look at abuse and abuse mitigation, or do we draw the line on the technical aspects?

PHIL KHOURY: The answer that was put before, which may or may not be adequate, was that answering that question should be a function of the workplan, the priorities, to say we've ruled it out or ruled it in. So that was what the response was.

---

STEVE CONTE: Denise has her card up.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. De facto, the SSR – assessing the implementation of SSR1 gets us [inaudible] into abuse mitigation, so I think there's that, and I recall the intention was to address DNS abuse as part of this and is being included in it.

STEVE CONTE: Alright. Kerry Ann, and then KC.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And just a follow-up on what Denise said, Norm. One of the things that we had discussed to give context is in terms of limiting it, when we recognized that other review teams or other groups were actually doing the work, we didn't try to duplicate it but acknowledge it and actually read it. At the time when we did this – I don't know if you all recall, the DNS report was being drafted, so we had a briefing about it, we had – persons were encouraged to read the report when it came out about DNS abuse. So we tried to ensure that the work that we did, which I thought in terms of limiting it, it would be in the workplan where we know that other works are happening, other review teams are looking at it specifically, it's not for us to take more specific reviews and try to do that, because then the work became too large.

So the workplan is how we had proposed to actually limit that, and as [we] said, it's not to go too wide, especially when it comes to the more detailed technical issues, because we won't be able to delve deep into

---

technical, but it's to make sure we acknowledge what needs to be reviewed, say what our limitations are, and then point where we think that we have gaps that probably need to be addressed. I think that was the mindset at the time for this.

STEVE CONTE: KC?

KC CLAFFY: Norm's comment [inaudible] into the next paragraph where I think it really [inaudible] so maybe I'll wait until this thread is [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Phil?

PHIL KHOURY: Maybe this section needs to actually specifically say that so that it doesn't sort of float here alone. And you could add a sentence or something into this section that says something like these are the definitions, the team's scope of work addresses which parts of all of that come onto the agenda or in some sort of way. That's one way of tackling it.

STEVE CONTE: So yeah, I think that's a great idea, is to explicitly address those points that have been raised regarding the scope and we update it, like



---

whether we think is that irrelevant or not is relevant to others, so we need to address it.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay. Can I remind everyone that we're being recorded and we're doing a pretty terrible job of announcing ourselves before we speak? Apart from Naveed who gets a silver star for being the best at doing that. So, focus. This should only take a couple of seconds. Well, let's just walk through it, I think. I'm going to throw this over to KC. I think you had something to say about the first paragraph.

KC CLAFFY:

Right. So, actually, the second paragraph, because it goes right to Norm's concern about copyright and whatever else. So you've got a parenthetical comment there that says the elements that are within ICANN's authoritative scope – man, that's a landmine right there – and then you've got another comment – not a comment, you've got the word “clearly” below, “clearly within ICANN's scope and remit.”

My recollection from the extent to which I watched SSR1 is that that was a big issue, having flashbacks to Phil's assessment document where we said that we didn't really all have consensus on what was within scope. So I think this word “clearly within scope” feels to me like it's not going to be clear what's within scope. That's part of what our group is going to be interpreting, and maybe now the answers would be different than they were ten years ago because the world is a different place and bla bla.

---

So I'm wondering how this very strong language about "authoritatively within ICANN's scope" and "clearly within ICANN's scope" got in there and how in the heck do we know where those lines are. [Isn't that] part of what we do?

PHIL KHOURY: I think we have two versions of the document here.

KC CLAFFY: No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Which page are you on, KC?

KC CLAFFY: I'm on [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY: So, people are understanding KC's point.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

---

PHIL KHOURY:                    Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:        [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY:                    Just four lines down on the whiteboard or whatever it is, what's in parentheses, I think, is problematic for me, at least I don't understand how we know that in advance. I thought that's part of what our job is maybe. And then the second is the same thing, which is the word "clearly." Third to the left line, "clearly within ICANN's scope and remit." And it goes right to Norm's question about copyright. Like where does copyright fall? Do we all know? Do we have consensus about that? ICANN's authoritative scope, does that mean we can't talk about it? I just don't know what you guys thought before.

STEVE CONTE:                 Kerry Ann?

KERRY ANN BARRETT:         So the language for those paragraphs was because we were trying so hard to stay within ICANN's scope, so during the meetings when the language was drafted, I recall it was because of long discussions about the fact that some of the persons in the room were very cautious that they did not want to step outside of ICANN's – the board's scope. So it's a whole discussion as to how to – just giving you context [inaudible] the conclusions. So discussions were swirling around what is ICANN board's

---

role as opposed to ICANN the institution, as opposed to the persons – because at the time, IANA was transitioning – as opposed to what IANA is doing, and there was this whole thing about, okay, then you have the registrars, then you have the IANA transition. So this was trying to capture the concerns that some of the team members had at the time saying don't worry, we're not going to go outside of ICANN board's scope or what ICANN is responsible for, because of that transition with what IANA's functions were to the IANA group. So we can – I think there's room to probably read it again with fresh eyes and probably clean the language, but it was really to address concerns that persons in the room had to ensure that we did not overstep.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Which still ended up seeming like we tried to overstep. But [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: [inaudible] Kaveh. We do have a queue.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, the intention was to try and correct that.

STEVE CONTE: I'll put you in it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So you picked it up rightly, which is good, so I think we can look back at it. But the idea was when we finally decided on the scope, it's what is required of us in bylaws, which aspects are we looking at, and how we could fix it.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

STEVE CONTE: [inaudible] do you have a card up?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's all.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, thanks. I agree with Kerry Ann, and also want to make a connection back to something that Eric has said previously, and that is we've been carrying out our remit, which is inexplicably linked to the remit of ICANN. There may be occasions where we want to look broadly so that we understand the interconnected and broad nature of SSR on the Internet, and just because a piece of it may reside within the IETF or somewhere outside of ICANN's scope, there may be times where we

---

want to make sure we understand the big picture to then zero into the part that ICANN has a responsibility for and make some recommendation on that.

So in part, we were trying to capture that interconnectedness, reinforce our commitment to following the bylaws, issuing recommendations where it is appropriate for and connected to ICANN's responsibility, but there may be times when we have broad-ranging discussions or research that looks at a broader view of something before we zero in on work.

STEVE CONTE:

Kaveh, did you want to be in queue at this point?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So, very quick, I agree with Kerry Ann, except she said ICANN board's scope. It's not ICANN board's scope, it's ICANN's scope and remit from the mission. And I also see Denise's point, but just to say that there are – again, this is one of the things that there are different opinions outside. Formally, I don't remember anything being discussed about this specific point, but for example, one phrase I hear from one of the constituencies in informal discussions – so this is not something to rely on, but just to see that people perceive these things differently – was that we're not going to found a review team to basically go for a witch hunt for security issues all over the world.

This is how people perceive these things. And we either have to educate them or explain why we are going for this kind of scope, or if not, we

---

have to stick to what's already defined. So we have to consider that this team, even if it wants to do more, if there are rational reasons, for example that we need to discover more than what's within ICANN remit to understand that complex system, that should be explained to the community so they understand why we are doing this large [inaudible] which is seen by at least some as doing much wider project than what's expected.

STEVE CONTE:

Naveed, then Denise and Kerry Ann. Okay, thank you.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah. Like reading this text, it appears that for example if I concentrate on the word "clearly", it appears that the review team limit itself well within the boundary of ICANN and does not want to go to even to the edge of those boundaries. "Clearly" means that if anything is vague, the review team is not going to touch that even if it is within the scope of SSR. So if the review team agrees on that, then we should have this word. Otherwise, we should not have this word "clearly." Because "clearly" is a very [vague] kind of word, and we might not know what it actually means. And as far as authoritative scope is concerned, I'm not sure what was in mind, why we were writing this, but there are many systems that ICANN has no authority upon based on for example the ccTLDs and the scope of the government, authority of the government, the content itself. I'm not sure what we mean here by the authoritative role, but we need to explain what that means.

---

So maybe it goes to that for example we don't have any responsibility as an ICANN organization or community over the content or the attacks that concern to those contents or stability or security of that. So maybe that does not fall under the authoritative role of ICANN. So this is what I understood by reading all this.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. KC?

KC CLAFFY: Let me try this another way. Listen, I'll play my fresh eyes card. If I read this text, it looks exactly like what Kerry Ann described, that this text was put in, these words "authoritative" and "clearly" were put in to counter or preempt accusations of mission creep, which happened in SSR1. Of course, it happens all the time. This is ICANN. So I believe that it creates an opportunity for attack of the report because people will use this phrase and then say, "Oh, look, this section six is outside of the authoritative scope." People are going to do that anyway. I just don't think we should give them ammunition in the terms of reference by saying, "Look, we think we know what authoritative scope is and we're not going to go outside it," because then we'll end up with arguments about that we violated our own terms of reference. I just think it's not – I would remove those words [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]



---

KC CLAFFY: I would remove the parenthetical comment because it looks like, “And by the way, we’re going to stay inside our swim lane.” Like of course we’re going to stay inside our swim lane, and we’re going to get accused of not doing it anyway. So why are we making the argument happen right here in the first paragraph of the terms of reference? And clearly, because I think we’re not there yet. People would disagree today from ten years ago with what’s clearly within ICANN’s scope. GDPR puts different things in ICANN’s scope. So I just think this is doing more harm than good.

PHIL KHOURY: So there's a proposal on the table, delete the parenthetical remark and the word “clearly.”

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Yeah, agreed.]

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. I'm seeing agreement, nodding of heads. Let's call it a decision.

STEVE CONTE: Denise, you're next in queue.

DENISE MICHEL: I agreed with the edit that KC proposed, although I don't necessarily agree with your comment [inaudible] our perspective that SSR1 exceeded its scope.

---

KC CLAFFY: No, there was accusation about [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, yes. Okay. Great. Yeah. The bylaw language for this review is incredibly vague and big and 10,000 feet. It's very broad, yeah. It's very broad. It allows for a lot of issues to be brought in, and one of the things that makes this one of the most challenging reviews of ICANN is because it forces a collection of strangers to immediately decide what is going to be within the circle that we address. Yeah.

PHIL KHOURY: Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. So, personal opinion here, but if you read that sentence after removing the parentheses, it reads as "Identifying that the unique identifier system within ICANN's purview of fixed systems that are not within ICANN and the review team is going to consider all issues in its entirety," meaning that – to me, it sounds like now the review team is saying that they understand there are systems that are not within ICANN's purview, meaning that ICANN has no remit to work on them, and therefore the board cannot pass recommendations or accept recommendations that affect said systems, but we are going to be looking at all of them anyway. And that by itself raises a red flag because that becomes an issue where someone says, "Well, listen, this is not within ICANN's purview, why are you saying clearly that you're

---

going to be looking at everything when you know we can't do anything about it?" Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks. I don't agree with that reading. I think that the "however" later on in the paragraph makes it very clear that we will then focus our recommendations on the efforts that are within ICANN's scope and remit. Personally, I feel comfortable that that's consistent with the bylaws, gives us appropriate boundaries, and [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE:

KC, and then Laurin.

KC CLAFFY:

Now that I'm reading it with your lens, I agree with you. That sentence is somewhat broken without the parenthetical comment. But if it's broken without the parenthetical comment, it was broken before the parenthetical comment. A parenthetical comment should not break a sentence or it shouldn't be in parentheses. So I agree that maybe some revisiting of the wording there, but it may be that as Denise says, a later sentence if we could somehow merge it, it might fix it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

[inaudible]

---

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, but it's a few sentences away, so I'd have to rethink it. But I agree with you, there's some issue there. Maybe there an editing [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: As I said before, I think we should take into account that there might be some stuff that we have to mention and say, "Look, this [helped by] focusing down" so that the document makes sense. And I agree, we might want to do some light rewording on this stuff, but not something that will take us the whole afternoon.

DENISE MICHEL: What if we bold the "however" sentence? [inaudible]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah, I did, and I do agree that the clarification down below helps frame everything, but I think it may just be too far below in the paragraph so that people may not connect it together. That's the only thing. Otherwise, if there's some sort of rewording to bring it together, I think it may read just fine.

STEVE CONTE: Denise?

---

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. In the interest of moving us forward, I would recommend that we start this paragraph with “The SSR review team will focus its recommendations on those efforts, issues, policies, systems and identifiers that are within ICANN’s scope and remit.” And then if you want to repeat that again in the “however,” that works for me as well, but are people comfortable if we put that text at the beginning of this paragraph to provide context up front?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Something like that. I think we can go off and reedit for flow later, but I agree that all the stuff is there and we should move on.

STEVE CONTE: Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm not sure if we need to decide on this right now. Maybe we can highlight the issues, but this document, it has to go to a revision, so I'm assuming that at some point through mailing list we're going to have – like we can share it in the Google doc and ask people to contribute to it, and if there's an issue that we need to really discuss, then we spend time over it. Otherwise, the text can be – different people can have different opinion of how we put it.

PHIL KHOURY: Can I just ask, are people okay with just charging someone? That could be the staff and I or a member of the team to collect up these

---

comments as we go through and provide a first draft back to people so we're not drafting [in an 18-person committee]. Yeah? Is that okay?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. Agree.

PHIL KHOURY: You want us to do it, or someone on the team want to take the job of the drafting?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Happy to continue [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Alright, so –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just [inaudible] comment. So, I agree that we should not try to decide on things. I think it's really important to have a discussion [inaudible] for everybody to agree on the consent behind things, otherwise, the editing may go forever. So I think this thing I think was a useful discussion to have, and I'll not worry for the time we spent on it, but the editing comes later, then the editing will be easier if we all agree on what we are trying to address here.

STEVE CONTE: Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sorry, I just wanted clarification. I wasn't sure what Laurin suggested in terms of us doing the edit to the terms of reference to put the draft up for the review team to review, or were you taking ownership of making changes?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm just tracking the changes in a Word document and I could send it to staff so you guys can do what you're supposed to do.

PHIL KHOURY: Good. Thank you, Laurin. Alright, so look, anything else in that – that's a pretty important paragraph, anything else in there that people want to test the reasoning for or challenge?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that the bullet point on minority [things] we ought to be discussing in a way, but I don't know when. The point on how do we deal with the minority, because I think this was one important issue because in this review, which is [technical sometimes,] we should not treat minority as it should be by default in other constituencies, because here, some of the work is tech, and when it's tech, I could be a minority, but my points could be strong enough to be considered not to be treated as just a minority, etc. So this minority thing is, I think, we need to see how we address it.

---

STEVE CONTE: Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, this paragraph that we're discussing, it's an important paragraph, I agree, but what is not clear for me is this paragraph is followed by all the mandate or the scope of the review team that are optional, like it is followed by all "mays." The review team may do this, may do this. So maybe this paragraph is wrongly positioned, because it summarizes what we need to do under the "authoritative" and "clearly" and everything, but followed by all "mays." Like if you read all these 2A and later, these are all "mays." So maybe we need to put this somewhere else, because the "shalls" are about this paragraph already in that the review team must do. So I just wanted to point this.

ALAIN AINA: So I think this paragraph was just backing what we're supposed to do for the "shall." Can you scroll it a bit down, Jennifer? Okay. Then we had [inaudible] "shall". Or scroll up, please. Yeah, I think this paragraph we're discussing was to back what we will be doing for this "shall," so this paragraph, we were discussing what we explained how do we approach, how do we address this point, the SSR team.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, I think in that case, it should be –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]



NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] responding to – that case, it should be explicitly pointed out that this is an explanation of [inaudible]. Because the paragraph is followed by the list of investigation topics and all that, and it seems that the “mays” are followed [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Negar, and then Norm, and then Denise.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I just wanted to provide clarification that as these items, 2, 3, whatever are noted in the document, they are direct extracts from the bylaws, and the “mays” essentially giving the review team the freedom to choose to pick up that topic as part of their scope or not. And it’s not an indication in my view – if I’m not reading it wrong – that the review team may decide to do this in terms of this terms of reference and scope item, they’re just directly quoting the bylaws. And the follow-up conversations are sort of discussing what the review team will do with it.

STEVE CONTE: Norm, and then Denise.

NORM RITCHIE. Yeah, I want to get back to this idea of what's a definition of security, and does it include abuse. And the reason I'm saying that is that's going

---

---

to get kind of fuzzy when we start talking about the changes to WHOIS. If we are not covering abuse, then that becomes a very fuzzy issue on whether it's included or not.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Misuse is in the definition.

NORM RITCHIE. Well, misuse, yes. So misuse is there, but misuse is an incredibly broad term that's ill-defined. So [inaudible] what is abuse, and around this room, we get like 20 different definitions, and some will be more inclusive and some less. So we either bite the bullet and define that or we make a statement in there saying something like "for clarity, this is how far we will go," if that makes sense.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

STEVE CONTE: Okay, so I have Denise and then Laurin, and then Kerry Ann, and then Alain.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. To pick up a few threads here – [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL:

Okay. I got confused. To pick up a few threads here, yeah, the terms of reference were organized, as you can see, at the top of page four, from the requirements in the bylaws, and then the team decided exactly to address every excerpt from the bylaws, and that's how it's organized. And Naveed, great point, you feel that's not quite clear. And I think that would be an easy thing to clarify that we're addressing each one. There are a whole host of things that get the SSR2 review into a number of DNS abuse areas, everything from SSR1 recommendations and assessing the implementation of that to the registrar accreditation agreements and ICANN's purview and responsibilities. And I think some of the work that the OCTO SSR team has done on say for example the DAAR reports, there's ample, I think guidance of ICANN activities that would give us plenty of fodder to define more clearly DNS abuse.

My caveat there is that I think it's important for the team to wrap up this scope document and terms of reference document as soon as possible. It would be awesome if we could leave D.C. with this basically put to bed. And if we feel like we really need a much deeper dive into the lovely area of abuse, I would suggest that we add a footnote that discussions and research continue on DNS abuse and the team reserves the right to provide additional clarity and guidance on that item.

STEVE CONTE:

Laurin.

---

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So essentially, Denise already said what I would recommend, let's just footnote the misuse and put in what we think belongs there and what doesn't. Agree on that [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think I'll come back, just wanted to some of what Denise said, so I'll come back to it.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Thank you. Alain?

ALAIN AINA: Yes. I think that – a good point, and that this reminds me of the time that we spent and [inaudible] having updates from the DNS abuse team. we had a lot of presentation, a lot of update for the DNS abuse because we were covering misuse and all of these things, so I think these things are very important and we need to decide, are we still going there or not? But in the past, we had a lot of update discussion with the ICANN staff working on the abuse, misuse, all of these things. I think your point is great, we have to put [inaudible] if we're going for the misuse and abuse, all of this, that means we need to go back and revisit all of this [inaudible] going on, etc.

---

And also, this also gave me an opportunity to raise one aspect of [inaudible] this team has discussed, stability. When we were discussing stability, if you remember, it took us to metrics, then we went back to the OCTO staff, how do we define, and then they brought us these health indicators, etc. So once again, also when we go to the stability, we also need to decide where we draw the [border.]

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. Naveed, and then Kerry Ann.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. To me, why the scope is important has many dimensions. First of all, it's the scope that leads us to all those sub-streams or chunks that we're going to revisit at the end. So I would like to have a discussion on the content of the scope, like what really is meant rather than the language that is in place, because the language can be revised. So what I look for, like a discussion on the real content of what the scope is rather than the technical language that you're using.

The second is why scope is important is, like it has been discussed many times since yesterday that we're stopping into somebody else's domain. So we need to revise this and review this scope, keeping that in mind, whether the scope is leading us into somebody else's domain or we are within the bylaws of the SSR, what is being made before. So these are the two points why I want to spend time on this focus.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. Kerry Ann, and then Laurin.

---

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I'd rather let Laurin and Russ go first, and then I'll jump in.

STEVE CONTE: And I'm sorry, I didn't see Russ' card go up. Did you go up after or –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Russ, okay. Russ, please.

RUSS HOUSLEY: In response to what was just said, can you tell us what you think is in here that is in someone else's domain that you'd like to see removed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's the question I'm asking, actually, because I keep listening to this, so that was one of the concerns that I'm told when this was paused, that we are stepping – so that's why I need a discussion on the content so that we can assess whether we are stepping into or stepping out of our domain or not. I'm not sure, I don't have answer to this question either.

STEVE CONTE: Laurin, and then [inaudible] and then Kerry Ann.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, I think we would start with – essentially, we do have what I'll call a mission here, right? And I don't think based on this document we can actually answer Naveed's question. Rather, I think we would have to start breaking things down and see what other things that we believe we have to look at, and then we can consider if we're stepping on people's [thumbs,] or as I would call it, if there are people we should liaise with to actually do what we're supposed to do. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann, Alain.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Hi. I think the reason, forgive me for always putting it up and putting it down, is that the comments come in, it makes me think a little bit more. For example, Norm's concern is valid, and I can tell you how I'm thinking about it, and the team can decide how we approach it when we start breaking it down. At the end of the day when we approach the issue, we have a very – it is a wide remit based on the bylaws. What is security? What is stability? What is resilience? But at the end, we're tasked to look within ICANN's remit as well as how can ICANN fix this. Because the recommendation is going to ICANN. And Kaveh can correct me if my terminology is wrong, but how I break it down is that the recommendations we're providing is to ICANN, ICANN board. So it has to be that the recommendations we give are relevant and specific enough, as Steve cautioned us so much yesterday, that "My role is really

---

to make sure that these things are actionable. If you give me a recommendation that's not actionable, it's pointless."

So if we go to Norm's concern about WHOIS, I think in the write-up, especially with the context and background, I think that's where it comes in, where we would say we recognize that SSR on a whole, the terms, [inaudible] the WHOIS does have a role to play in it because at the end of the day, it's the stability of the Internet that we're looking at and WHOIS actually affects that if we're not able to enforce, if we're not able to see behind. So I think – Norm, you can tell me if I'm wrong, but it does resonate with me, your concern, and I think it's necessary to narrow in when we get to the recommend – the review in terms of what we look at and the issues that pop up is one thing, but when we narrow that down and come into our specific recommendations, that is when I think we have to be very – more and more concrete.

I don't know if that helps, but that's one of the things we struggled with all this time. I think every time the discussion's come up for the "Oh, no, we're going too wide," but sometimes, we have to kind of look at the landscape and then you're painting your own portrait based on the landscape. And I think that's how I've been approaching it, and if I'm wrong [inaudible]. I think now is a good time as we are about to kick off that we all be on the same page. But that's how I've always been looking at it.

STEVE CONTE:

Okay. I have Alain, and then Norm, Laurin. Are you – okay.



---

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, I agree with Norm and Kerry Ann about how we should proceed, and I also agree that it's important in that terms of refence we define clearly that the ecosystem is big enough, but we may have to limit our work to the ICANN remit. So this is a guidebook for us, so when we'll be – and [inaudible] we should always relate that, this thing to this document.

But now back to what you said – and you said something to Kaveh, and Kaveh accurately said, "I think the recommendations are going to ICANN board," but the target is not the board or the org. The target of the recommendation are ICANN global. ICANN, that is the org, that is the community, etc. Right? Just to clarify. There is ICANN org, there is ICANN community. So our recommendation could target the community, not only the org, the organization.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you. So if you read the bylaws, it's clear, the recommendations go to the board and the board, after public comment, they have to act on them. If they decide not to, they have to explain why. But it should be something within remit of the board. ICANN board, for example, cannot go to ccNSO and say, "Hey, you have to change how your WHOIS works." We really have no remit there, correct? So it should be within

---

what ICANN board can basically effectuate. And if it's not, then basically, the recommendation is useless because the board will come back and say we cannot act on this. Simple. So it depends how you see the ICANN community. But you have to see the board has to have authority to be able to effectuate the recommendations.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, so I'm going to offer up an example, I guess, and maybe I can help me clarify it in my own brain. So let's take an IP space hijack. So [inaudible] take some IP space and take it over. That's obviously a security issue. However, that's done through changing, announcing things [over] routers, which has nothing to do with ICANN. So, maybe it's my lack of understanding the word "remit" and its actual meaning. I think of remit as a charge, what you're charged to do, but it's also what would be within ICANN's control to act upon. So maybe we're missing that other word, so it's remit and control, or whatever that correct word is.

STEVE CONTE:

Denise, KC, Kerry Ann.

DENISE MICHEL:

So, the bylaws indeed require us to submit our report to the board, and the bylaws require the board to take public comment on that report, and then act on that report. And every recommendation in that report within a certain timeframe. The bylaws do not require the review teams to only make recommendations that are the responsibility of the board.

---

In fact, it is our responsibility to address issues, policies, etc. that are in the purview of ICANN writ large. The staff, the board and the organization, which includes all the constituencies, advisory committees and stakeholder groups.

And sometimes, ICANN has a facilitator function. Sometimes, ICANN has as Collaboratory function. We can address those issues as well. And in fact, SSR1 did address, and some of its recommendations made recommendations to say the GNSO to undertake some information sharing and other SSR sort of related activities. That's perfectly acceptable and perfectly within our remit to do.

Now, whether or not we should do that, whether it's a smart recommendation, whether it can be measured, whether there's metrics, all of that is sort of another issue. But we have the ability, just as SSR1 did, to make a recommendation that in part suggests, recommends, advises that the community or an SO or an AC take a look at something, address something, have a discussion about something, try and improve SSR standards for something. All of that is feasible. Whether it's something they want to do, entirely different question.

STEVE CONTE:

Alright, I have the Ks, KC, Kerry Ann, Kaveh.

KC CLAFFY:

Okay. Thank you. I thought it would be good to know, to get a pulse of the room whether there's consensus or not, because I did run into that syntax issue when I read the charge. It says it reports to the board, and

---

it says ICANN. And I kind of don't know whether the word "ICANN" refers to the org. I know nowadays you see ICANN org as one word or whatever, but it's not clear to me what's the definition of that. Was this meant to be ICANN writ large? Or I think Kaveh thought it meant ICANN org. So maybe we need to – or do people get that, and I'm the only one who doesn't know the syntax?

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

I can tell you that one of the working process that we had done – and I had done it personally – was when you go to the bylaws as amended June 18, 2018, the bylaws which is mission one, it outlines the mission, and it says this is the bylaws for the ICANN, a nonprofit public benefit corporation. So I'm figuring I's the org. Right? And under that, under article 1.1, which A1, it says, "etc. coordinates the allocation for DNS, etc., for which [uniform or coordinated] resolution is reasonable and necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and stability of the DNS, including with [the limits to gTLD.]" And how's that entire language? When we got charged to do the review of SSR, I assume it linked back to the mission of ICANN org. And this is just [inaudible] the legal brain [inaudible] because at the end of the day, for me, the language may not be the best, but it's black and white in terms of how it reads.

KC CLAFFY:

[inaudible] black and white that ICANN refers to the org or [inaudible]

---

DENISE MICHEL:

No.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

No, it doesn't, but here, if the SSR, it's referring – when it speaks to the response of the mission of ICANN –

KC CLAFFY:

Yes, it refers to the org.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

It's org, it's not the community. And ICANN org is responsible for the uniform or coordinated resolution as reasonable and necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS, including with respect to gTLD registrars', registries' policies, and areas described in an annex attached to the bylaws as of mandate June 2018.

KC CLAFFY:

[inaudible]

STEVE CONTE:

I'm sorry, we need to stay on mics, we are on record.

KC CLAFFY:

Sorry. I'm not a lawyer, so even that language is confusing to me, because it sort of says with respect to its relationship with the registries.

---

It's not clear to me that that means it includes what the registries are doing [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

[I was telling you] in terms of how I've been processing – I could be completely wrong. How I've been processing is that if it is that – the reason why we aren't going to have to go deep into the nitty gritty – I don't know if you guys use that term, we use it, the nitty gritty – is because at the end of the day, there's an entity with responsibility and oversight of others and has this wide responsibility to ensure that the DNS is SSR. But at the end of the day, as a review team, we may not be able to go to the level as Norm gave an example [inaudible] an IP hijack. That's not really our role. What is in place to ensure that IP hijacks and all the other cybersecurity risks that are existing are being addressed? Is there an audit process in place? Is there a security team that when a request comes in – for me, I've been looking at the review team that we have to not only look at content but process as well because it's the process that would actually ensure security, stability and resilience, because if it is for example we might speak and say, "Alright, there's a lot of government-level domain names that are being used and abused," is it a matter that there is a contract in place with a registrar? Are those contracts being monitored? Should we be then giving recommendations to the Contractual Compliance team? Not necessarily going into details, but say, "Okay, how can we actually prevent these things from being hijacked? How can we get specific technical recommendations that when this happens, you do these things?" I don't think that's our role as a review team. Our role as a review team is that we identify issues, what is the source actually that can be implemented

---

to actually address those issues, and give recommendations based on that. We're not a cert or anything like that, our role is actually to review processes, review systems to ensure that the Internet at the end of the day is secure, stable and resilient, and if processes aren't in place, "Hey, ICANN, you have these gaps. You guys should do this."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] if I'm wrong in terms of how I've been thinking of [inaudible] because I said as we go forward, the idea is that the work streams would have to flow to say, "Okay, are we going high-level for some issues based on the work streams we identified, deeper for others?" For example, the work that Boban did which I think was really good, and I think Zarko was a part of that team as well. Really, that technical side is necessary, but the other issues, how can we ensure that we're not – for me, it's not crossing into other people's territory, it's more just outside of our remit.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No. It's not a matter – for me, I don't think about it as stepping on other toes. I think about it from the context, is it within our remit or not? That's how I've been looking at it. I'm not trying to not step on toes, I'm

---

trying to ensure that we are within our remit. If I'm within my remit and I stepped on somebody's toes, we have to figure out how we communicate. As Laurin says, maybe we need to consult, maybe we need to refer this issue from our review team to their review team. But at the end of the day, for me, it's not a matter of I'm trying to not encroach. I'm trying to stay within. And if within encroaches, then we have room to then say in our communication plan, let's communicate with this group, because we need to either consult, defer, transfer, recommend that another review be formed to address this issue. So if I'm wrong in that – but that's how I've been processing it. I'm not afraid to step on somebody's toes, what I'm afraid to do is to go outside of my remit.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Remit, yeah.

STEVE CONTE: Okay, I've got a big queue, and I swear I'll capture you all, so just be patient. I've got Kaveh next, and then followed by Laurin.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Thank you. So, the way I see it is it's the remit is basically how the authority of people who have [the Internet.] I disagree with Denise's reading that we can issue comments into recommendation for any constituency – for example, GNSO or ASO – because the board is the recipient of the recommendations. It's very clear in the bylaws. If you tell the board that, "Oh, ASO should take care of IP hijacks" for example,



---

the board will immediately dismiss that a we have no remit, we cannot tell ASO. And even if we tell ASO, we'll say it's not in our control. But the board even cannot tell ASO to do something or not. That's not how it works, correct?

So if there is no possibility, basically, to take any action, it will be useless. And that's exactly where it's – that I think this also shows why some of the concerns which lead to the pause, because the way the board sees this type of recommendation is, okay, they would have to dismiss all of them or many of them. So if we are going to receive 20 recommendations and the board is going to dismiss 15 of them because they don't have any authority over that, they will see that already as a basically failed effort. So this is exactly why people – the board will issue another pause if they see us going in that direction, because they want an actionable recommendation.

PHIL KHOURY:

Any kind of sort of independent review that I've been involved in before – and I do reviews of lots of public purpose multi-stakeholder kind of environments where an individual organization only has a piece of the puzzle, it doesn't have control of everything, it's a player. So there might be a regulator that can regulate conduct or a regulator that can only do prudential regulation, and everybody's got limits to what they can do. In that environment, you want to have a report that isn't stupid. You want a report that addresses the issues and doesn't pretend they aren't there but can make a recommendation to – so ICANN org advocates sometimes, from time to time, in its relationships with the rest of the world. That's an activity that ICANN org does, and the board – you can

---

make a recommendation to the board to say, "Advocate for X. We know you can't control it, but advocate for X." So in a sense, you don't want to get too tangled up in if the board doesn't completely control it, then you can't mention it. If it's an obvious feature of the current environment that goes to SS and Are, then the sensible thing to do is say, "We found this issue. We know it's not entirely in your control, but here's an advocacy piece you could do," or something like that. So I just wanted to kind of caution that, because I think you can lose a lot of energy on that, imagining what a dumb recommendation would look like when you're probably not going to do a dumb recommendation, I think.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Alright, continue the queue. I have Laurin and Denise.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [inaudible] a good question, because I'm trying to follow this. KC, you've mentioned something on like a report to the board that had to be looked at. Can you tell me where it is? I couldn't find it.

---

KC CLAFFY:

I think I was just – you mean the syntax question I had? Yeah, it was when I was reading – I think it was the bylaws that said what the review is. It said the report goes to the board about ICANN’s execution of its responsibility to do bla bla, to do security and stability stewardship or whatever. And ICANN – it was used just the word “ICANN,” and he thinks that means the community [inaudible] – the thinks that means ICANN writ large, and he thinks that means ICANN the organization. And now I’ll just jump my place in the queue and say that I think the resolution for this or a way to think about this – although I totally agree with what Kerry Ann and Denise said – is channeling the board’s pain and suffering when SSAC has written reports for 20 years with these fuzzy recommendations [that they don’t know what to do with] is back to our internal commitment to try to make these recommendations measurable.

So maybe it’s not about ICANN board telling ICANN what to do, but let’s make it so that SSR3 can tell whether it’s been done. And maybe that just means ICANN sets up a meeting so other people can talk about fixing GDPR problems or something, I don’t know, or we come out with a finding that says progress can’t be made on this until X, and it’s not just ICANN but here’s how they could facilitate or advocate or whatever. So I think Kaveh’s concern is – he goes back to the board and they say, “What the hell? You let them put a bunch of recommendations in here, we can’t even do them.” Let’s make sure that there’s a measurement facility that you can check a box and say it’s done for the benefit of SSR3 in case any of us are on it.

---

STEVE CONTE: Okay, I've got three more in queue. Phil, can I suggest that we close the queue after this three and maybe take a break and let everyone digest? This has been a pretty heavy conversation here.

PHIL KHOURY: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You ain't seen nothing yet.

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah. Thank you, Steve. [inaudible] Can I just – at the end of that round, I just want to throw in one more suggestion for people to reflect on while they take a break.

STEVE CONTE: Denise, and then Naveed, and then Kerry Ann, and then Phil.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. So, the bylaw language refers to ICANN, and it refers to ICANN writ large. The construct of ICANN org is a syntactical tool that was recently created by the current CEO, I believe, to distinguish ICANN [inaudible] ICANN staff. [inaudible] That's not formal. The same substantive language that guided and provided the mandate for the first security review that had a whole host of recommendations, some applied to, say, advice on what the GNSO should do, some provided it by somewhat staff should do, some provided it by somewhat different

---

things. This is the same language. This is exactly the same language. And so we absolutely should make smart recommendations that are smart and measurable. Absolutely agree with that. Ultimately, it will be up to the board after receiving community input whether or not to accept those recommendations, and there may be a recommendation that is a SMART recommendation and is a recommendation that's something that the registries or registrars should do or that the GNSO should consider launching a new policy development process to address X SSR issue. That's just hypothetical. We may not want to go there, but all of that would be within the language of the bylaws and our remit to address ICANN. Not ICANN staff, but ICANN.

STEVE CONTE:

Alright, I've got Naveed and then Kerry Ann.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

[inaudible] my affiliation with ICANN. ICANN is composed of the staff, the community and the board. So when we see ICANN, the word "ICANN," it means all three of them. To me, ICANN org, which is, as you said, just created, it's an implementer. It's just an actor. It just implements the policies that are made by the community. So whatever we recommend eventually affects the community, the board and the org, all three of them. So I don't think the recommendations are focusing only the board or the ICANN as an organization or as a community. Again, we cannot force communities like ccNSO or RIRs to make sure that they do it, but we can always educate them and push them to consider implementing whatever recommendations are being

---

made. So whenever I see the word “ICANN,” I assume that we’re dealing with all three parts, the board, the community, and the organization itself.

STEVE CONTE:

Kerry Ann, and I want to close the queue with Phil.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

I’d probably just ask the staff just to probably take a note that once we've assigned drafters, that we contextualize – make sure – I know it will have to go back to like today, but we actually contextualize how the recommendations are drafted then in terms of there may be some that we can't specify who should implement, but they may be general recommendations because ICANN’s organizations and rules and stuff may shift, and we don’t have to have stuff that says “board should be ICANN board” but it has been shifted to another entity. So probably, I don't know, whoever’s assigned to draft has that in context.

And I think the second thing is that we may need to – I looked at the template that was circulated, and I think when we look back at this language, probably clean it up a bit, just a little bit more structured so at least when we do develop the work streams, we can actually say part A, part B, part C based on the explanation we have after each section. Just to kind of tighten up how we approach the work streams, because I think the recommendations will flow from how to contextualize this. I think if we start clean, it will address a lot of the discussion points that we have right now.

PHIL KHOURY:

Great. So, look, this is a useful conversation, because these are the sort of debates that have got to be kind of wrestled to the ground. I just wanted to, while everyone's going to stop and take a break, anchor this back to the output from the discussion. So we started with looking up terms of reference as a strawman, if you like, a thing to focus on and look at the content of it.

One of the things about that document is that the focus and scope is originally drafted for a team that hasn't started yet. So you guys have started. There's a whole lot of experience now and a whole stack of work that's been done, so in many ways, that needs to be tidied up. I completely appreciate it, but it's probably not the most important thing. I think the audience is going to be looking at the workplan, what are you going to do?

And that goes to Naveed's point around having a concrete conversation about what are we actually tackling, and that might give you more tangible examples, like Norm was sort of reaching for, to have the discussion around, which is actually what you think is on the table right now. So just maybe when we come back, we'll try and do that, continue the conversation but in that sort of vein, thinking about that. Okay, everyone. Two minutes. Alright, so 2:55, [inaudible] 15 minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

[inaudible] coffee coming in, or not?

---

PHIL KHOURY: We're out of time, I think. We've –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Use the kitchen one, yeah. So 3:00. 20 minutes. [inaudible] Pause the recording.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Suspend the recording, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] be done at 5:20, by the way.

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah. I don't think anyone has tolerance for much more than that.



---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

PHIL KHOURY: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it is hot in here. Usually, I'm cold. And I'm not, so that means it's hot in here.

PHIL KHOURY: Are we all ready to start? Everybody here?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Oh, okay.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Jennifer, would you please resume the recording?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, everyone, welcome back. This is the post-afternoon break session of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting on the 23rd of August. I think the recording is running, and I'll hand it back to you, Phil. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY:

Thank you, everyone. Just further to the conversation we were having before the break, I'm going to suggest a bit of a change of approach just to see if we can tackle this in a bit of a different way. I've just e-mailed Jennifer just some text. We started at the terms of reference, and it gets into the sort of area of scope, but that's written in a way that is imagining you haven't started yet. So there's a lot of information that you have around that now, you could get a lot more practical about it, and I think it would get to Naveed's interest in understanding what are we actually talking about here, what are the potatoes that we're sort of working on.

So it seems to me that as that currently is written at the moment, it's essentially – well, the terms of reference document is essentially – there's nothing in that that is recent discussion, there's nothing in it that's massively revolutionary or going to change. And the advantage that it has is it's already been approved by the board.

So it may be – and you guys might disagree with this, but this is a proposition in terms of focusing your energies on the right bits, is that you might want to say to the board – to the world after this – “We've revisited the terms of reference, we've tried to make minor changes to clarify it, to address areas where there was obviously some confusion out there about what we were doing or not doing, but essentially, it's as approved by the board two years ago or whatever the date is, and we've sort of worked from there and put our energies into the workplan and the scope of the sub-streams of work and so on.”

---

Kind of draw everyone's attention to that rather than on this, because I don't actually think this is an incredibly important piece, provided you make sure that the scope within it is nice and clear and works for the work that you want to do. But beyond that, it's probably not important, really, to spend a lot of time on it, so long as it's working for the work you actually want to do.

So I was going to suggest what you might want to do is go to the work you want to do and talk about that for a little bit, and then come back, do a loop back to the document and say, "What of this do we have to change given what we think we're trying to tackle here?" And just get the conversation into something a bit more concrete rather than philosophy. Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Except for the timeline, I think that's okay.

PHIL KHOURY: Agreed. I wouldn't suggest just abandoning it, I would just come back to it and tidy it up with a view to doing what has to be done to make it okay rather than trying to perfect it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And the [inaudible] process, [we decided on for that?] What are we doing for that?

---

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

PHIL KHOURY: Laurin's been picking up those edits.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY: We'll come back again to this and say, "Alright, as a result of our concrete conversation about Work Stream 3, we want to change something else, bring it up to date and make sure it's okay. Does that work alright for people, suggested way to do it? So then the trickier part about that proposition is what's a good way, Denise or anyone, Kerry Ann, people who've been around it and familiar with all the sort of strings at work, what's a good way to come to that so that everyone in the room has a good sense of the pieces of work that were considered to be in scope at that concrete level? And how can, say, somebody like Naveed go through that and kind of validate for himself that that's reasonable and challenge the things he wants to challenge and so on? So, the original workplan, is that a good document to look at in terms of saying when the team started, this is the stuff they wanted to actually work on? I'm not quite sure about what you think is the right –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. That's – well, if I understand you correctly, you want to get into the substance of the work that was being done, and the details on a lot of the substance –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Subjects.

DENISE MICHEL: Subjects, thank you. The subjects aren't addressed in detail in the workplan which is more operational, I think. Do you feel like the material – did you circulate it for each subgroup? Is it an appropriate stepping off point to discuss each one?

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry, Denise, I'm just not competent to judge that, alright? So not content competent, so I'm not sure that that actually gives people who aren't familiar with it enough to start with. That's all. So it's kind of looking for some help in terms of what would be a good place to start with getting that understanding. We have Alain, Kerry Ann, and then Naveed.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah. [So any of that,] I don't see any issue showing the workplan. Okay? Then we start [inaudible] because my concern is going to the subgroup directly, I don't think this is a good idea, because the

---

subgroups, items and composition came from the bigger document which is the activity plan or the action plan, whatever. So then we should look at it, maybe we'll not decide how we – well, at least it will give a team a sense of where we start from, and as you said, give chance to newcomers to look at it. But if we go direct to the subteam, I think like we're trying to corrupt people directly.

STEVE CONTE:

Kerry Ann, and then Naveed.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

Naveed's mic is on. I just wanted to make sure. I think if we do go to the workplan, what would be good for all the members is to have the sections of the [inaudible] that gave us the remit. So for context, how we ended up with the workplan and the areas that we had narrowed in, we had a whole session that ICANN staff had helped us with where we had all the different bylaws that was relevant to us, and then we all threw words up there that we thought were within that. And then from that, we had narrowed it down to the work, to the areas that we're going to focus on. But everything came directly from the [inaudible] on one side kind of, "Okay, what is this [inaudible]?" And everybody was throwing up sticky notes. It was like a whole colorful process. And then we took off the ones that we thought weren't relevant ,and we agreed based on that.

So I think we may not be able to do that exercise again, but I think it's good if we look at the workplan, have those sections in front of us, all of us, so that when we look at the workplan, say, "Hey, this is not relevant

---

anymore.” “This is what I think is missing from this section, let’s include it here or not include it here.” And I think that would be useful for us. Not necessarily the [inaudible] just the sections instead of the explanatory parts in-between. [That way, we’ll] have context so they can put it on their own machine.

STEVE CONTE: Naveed, and then KC.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, what I would like to see is I actually miss the scope of each of these streams that we have. Maybe they're there, but not in as much detail as I want. Like we need to have scope of each of those sub-streams, and then map those scopes to the scope that we have here to identify, “Okay, this sub-stream will match to this scope that we have in this document,” and then we will be able to identify how much work each of those sub-streams require and what point we are missing. So I would want to have a metric that maps to those individual sub-stream scopes or activity plan or workplan to the main scope that we have. That would be a good point.

The second thing is maybe it’s a good idea to reverse map now since the work has already gone ahead to some extent. So maybe we need to reverse map those and update the scope for the parts that are missing. We can include that as one of the focus areas that we want.

STEVE CONTE: KC?

KC CLAFFY: Yes. I totally agree with everything. I love this idea that Kerry came up with. I want us to think as we go through this though what we're going to need – this may sound off-topic, and maybe it is, but I just want to carry this thought as we're going through this process, what we're going to need from ICANN staff.

So for example, all the briefings that got given to folks in the first round. Was that sufficient? What are the gaps? Because maybe that helps us shape this, what workgroups have to happen.

PHIL KHOURY: Anyone else, new people, requests about how we tackle getting into this level of detail? Russ, anything?

STEVE CONTE: Kerry, Eric.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I was just mentioning to Laurin, the reverse mapping, I think, would be good. I don't know how many of you are familiar with using like a logic framework. A logic framework would start, would stem from the bylaws, then going down to the subtopics we have, and then into the works, the different areas under the subtopics. So I think, as you said, what staff could do additionally, in terms of the – I think we may have the notes still. I don't know. You had done some really good slides back then.



---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: They're all in the Wiki.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: They're all in the Wiki. [inaudible] I don't know how much we can actually digest and get it done quickly. Maybe in order to –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: A year ago maybe. I won't promise I do. [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, so I'm not clear that we have a document, sounds like the workplan isn't quite what would get us to what Naveed is asking for. Can anyone else – sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have a document that's a subteam, a Google document, I think, is maybe what you're talking about. If it would be helpful, I can display that at this point.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Great. Can we put that up and just see if that's going to get us to where we can have that conversation? While she's doing that, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you. The workplan document is essentially a very high-level project plan. It has timelines, it has subgroup names, but it doesn't have details of topics and discussions included under each subgroup or the major scope items. So I think looking at the workplan by itself will not give the review team perhaps the view they want of the topics under consideration and discussion at the time this work was happening in the past.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

Just to follow up, I think a slight agreement – disagreement with what you said. It's not very detailed, but what it has is that under each topic, it cited the relevant bylaw that informed the subgroup that we selected. So [inaudible] suggest, and simultaneously, if we do have the text in front of us, we could look at this and say, "Okay, under this bylaw, yes, you guys identified at that time this," but either [inaudible] reconsider [inaudible] older members and the new members, which I'm hoping we eventually can stop using this terminology and just say "the team," but the team revisits it and looks at the text of that bylaw which informed the work stream. We could say, "Okay, this is not relevant anymore, we need a new sub-stream based on this." But I think I disagree with you, [inaudible] only because it does reference it each time, so it wasn't like out of context, and that would probably help Naveed to kind of see what informed that work stream, and then...

STEVE CONTE:

KC?

---

---

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible] Phil sent out this slide. I missed this call, but there was this work summary subteam slide. I wonder if we could use that as the right-hand side of what you're talking about and map it to the – no. Okay.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, it wouldn't help, only because the slides are so [summary].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So summary. It wouldn't necessarily help in terms of the substantive work. We want to kind of [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, so could we get that blown up a little bit? Great, that's better.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I'm just emailing the link. This is actually a Google document, this is .PDF format at the moment, but I will e-mail a link to the Google document to the list.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just wanted to suggest to the team as well that while we have the bylaws up, if we could reconsider if that line still says, "as needed." We

---

had done that only because of us trying to have divided and created the work streams. But maybe we need to either come up with – it already has a subtopic title [inaudible] challenges, to reconsider if we need that line or not. I don't know, I can't remember why we had it. That line still says – why we had it in the first place. I cant recall why.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Which one do you mean?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: The third line in the table. I'm just going back to what KC had said, that maybe you may have something that you're really good at but you can't because of the timeline. So I'm just wondering if we put that in, it may –

NEGAR FARZINNIA: If I recall correctly, it was to allow the review team to decide who needs to be as part of what subgroup based on their areas of expertise and experience.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay, and I think based on KC's request earlier that we probably eliminate that based on time availability, time zones, you may not be able to work. It was a good suggestion.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] is that a requirement?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: It's not a requirement, but that's how we had kind of filtered the group to be able to work.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that's fine. I would keep it there.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: You think we should? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think – well –

DENISE MICHEL: KC, don't take it out on my account, because I don't think it's a rule, so it might be helpful to guide me or others.

ZARKO KECIC: I would keep it, and especially because this is pretty broad, and I believe that we should jump into narrow skills from there.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Anyone else on that? So the intention here then is – so this is the sub-string, this is the chunking that was originally done. So, can we get someone who was involved in it just to sort of walk us through it in

---

terms of... Can you just roll that up, Jennifer, as far as how far – I'm trying to think about the structure of how we do this.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible]. Okay.

PHIL KHOURY: Back up a little bit. Yeah, okay, I see.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: What would be most useful for people to hear about this?

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: In one sentence, fairly straight-forward, there's 28 recommendations from SSR1, we are bylaw-mandated to assess the implementation of them, we spent six, seven, eight months getting information on implementation, there are still some outstanding questions that those briefings – issues being surfaced that we need to get additional information on. Right, the decision point for the team as to how we want to take the next step, I think. Do we want to have a neutral consultant do an analysis and come back to us, or do we want to divide

---

up the recommendations among appropriate team members, have team members do the assessment and analysis and provide initial recommendations on the quality and etc. of the actual implementation and any resulting additional recommendations therein?

STEVE CONTE: Russ.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, I see you, Russ.

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry, I asked for this in June, but I never found it. I was looking for a single document that ICANN itself wrote that said, "Here's what we did with one, here's what we did with two," all the way up to 28. I understand that doesn't exist, but –

JENNIFER BRYCE: There's something that ICANN calls the implementation report.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: I'll send you –

---

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: Pretty high-level, because we have completed the implementation of this, it has like a paragraph, includes sometimes some links, and that's what they consider the implementation report.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. And based on that is when you asked for various briefings that were not covered by that high-level document?

KC CLAFFY: Correct.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

STEVE CONTE: Russ. And then Zarko, did you have a point too?

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Okay.



---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Turning to the question about getting an expert consultant to do that analysis, if we're going to get done, my understanding is the hiring process is pretty lengthy. Is that not true?

DENISE MICHEL: I don't know. The hiring process for a consultant that ICANN staff wants has been expedited at different times. So I think that's an open question. But I would support if there's other interest around the team to do so. I would support us taking on the task of assessing the information we've got on implementation and providing our own assessment coming back to the full team.

RUSS HOUSLEY: In addition, I think there's some bucketing we can do about is it still relevant, is it [inaudible]? Is it just an unmeasurable thing and move on? And if we can do some of that bucketing, then that'll trim the list that we actually have to investigate.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

STEVE CONTE: Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I just wanted to elaborate a little bit on the implementation that you had asked a question on, KC. There are quarterly executive

reports as they were termed before. The executive summary reports included up to date information on the result of the implementation, so they include a lot of hyperlinks to resulting documentation, reports, etc. And the implementation briefings were meant to supplement that with explanations and details as to what steps we're taking to implement and kind of point to various other information that are available.

One of the things that we are implementing within our team to improve implementation is that we're going to have much better documentation going forward. We're actually incorporating templates at the moment, so hopefully with the new reviews coming to conclusion like CCT and RDS who are going to be the first ones to be done, I would imagine, we're going to implement a new implementation plan and documentation that is much more detailed and comprehensive. You're going to have a single page hopefully on ICANN.org. Hopefully, that's going to have information for implementation and resulting documentation.

Also, the new bylaws are asking for a report called annual implementation report. The title doesn't do it justice, because it is not just about implementation of the recommendations from the specific reviews, it also covers the conduct of the reviews, but it covers the implementation of the report – reviews as well on an annual basis.

So there's going to be a lot of substantive changes in the way we're handling implementation going forward to provide much better details to the community and the review teams and offer better information.

---

DENISE MICHEL: Great. So, where are we now on SSR1 in terms of our discussion here? What would you like the next steps to be?

PHIL KHOURY: I guess, are there documents up there – I'm asking the people who are new to the team. Are there documents up there that look like a helpful way for you to get in to understand what has been taken on and how to get your hands on, whether you think that's right, wrong, complete or otherwise?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm just [inaudible] because I can't find it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The document?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, the implementation document that you just [inaudible] the high-level thing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I sent you a link.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, you sent me a link. Okay, fine. I'll go check. Thank you.

---

PHIL KHOURY: So – yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: This one? Is this linked from –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] is this the one that you wanted up here?

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Both.

ZARKO KECIC: This is not workplan. We just produced in the beginning after Madrid meeting, just framework for elaborating and reviewing SSR1 team. So, I put what should be then that's also high-level, and we never discussed deeper this stuff. And right-hand side is skills required. And I forgot what [inaudible] is probably [inaudible] and policies, T is technical, and IS is information security. I believe at the end of document –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] explanation of this.

---

ZARKO KECIC: At the bottom? No? Okay. I have somewhere. But I believe policy and legal and technical, information security, and BP is business process skills. So it is broken up into – I've read some 2-300 pages just to produce this. But that's something that evaluation team should do that and evaluate the outcome of implementation. And we can just jump into one of these. And I broke that up how it is broken up while we were having explanation how it is done [based on] briefings, yeah.

ALAIN AINA: So, I still feel a little bit uncomfortable, like we are not addressing – what is the name again?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Naveed.

ALAIN AINA: Naveed's things. I think – and as you said, the procedure should be that we're trying to explain a little bit from the bylaw. This is all the "must," this is all the "may," and based on this, okay, we decide that we do this and this, brought us to this subgroup. Although I look like – as I said, the new people, we're not helping them to catch up. I don't think so. Yeah, I don't think so. So [inaudible] the bylaw said this is a "shall do," this is a "may do," and we did some brainstorming, okay? And we decided that this is, okay, how we're going to approach the work, and then we decided to go for the subteam or the subgroup, and this is how we – also, if you look at a subteam – subgroup, we have some questions there. How do we measure do this? How do we do this? How do we do

---

these metrics? Etc. So that means it's not fully completed, even the subgroup workplan. So then to have people – we still have work to do, so I think it's good if Denise or Kerry Ann could do these kind of exercising on the [inaudible] to help them, otherwise, look like, I don't know, we're jumping to the destination and we are missing some steps. So this is –

STEVE CONTE:

Kerry Ann, did you have –

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

Alain, [inaudible] because what I was about to explain is how the bylaws are written. It started off with the “mays” first. So while we had avoided doing let's put in the “may” at the first work stream, because it started off with “mays” which didn't make any sense. But then it went from the “mays” which is two, bylaws 4.62, it went into three, and three was something that was substantive. So what we didn't do was put three first, because three requires more work.

So we started off with four, which says the SSR2 team shall assess the extent to which prior SSR recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect. Which is why Zarko had approached it that way, by breaking it down into what was intended, and then we now have to see whether or not it met the intention. Not necessarily that the box was ticked, but did it actually – so put contracts in place. Contracts are in place, but contracts were in place to ensure that there was

---

accountability. Has accountability been met? Not necessarily the tick box that contracts are in place. Just using that as a broad example.

We had also looked at – when you go back to three, three is when we had kind of started to break it down into the other sub-streams, because it had several things caught up in it, and three says the SSR2 review team shall also assess – and that’s a “shall” – the extent to which ICANN successfully implemented its security efforts, the effectiveness of it, actual potential challenges – [inaudible] we came up with the future challenges.

One, the DNS security – which will address some of the concerns that we've been discussing – and the extent to which security efforts are sufficiently robust to meet future challenges, threats to the SSR, and consistent with ICANN’s mission. So that’s when we came up with the other work streams based on this broad area.

So I think the SSR1 thing, I think we could probably take broad topics where we tick the box that says, yes, there is a work stream, but it is a work stream for a previous SSR review recommendation. So that’s a tick. The content will take more time, I think. I think we’re all tired to go through content. I'm tired to go through content now.

I think the next step will probably be to look at the subsection three, which speaks of the other areas, just to see if we identified the other sub-streams correctly. And if we agree that those topics are still relevant, like future challenges, yes, no, the other, the DNS one, yes, no. Are those still relevant? Do we have others that we want to include? Then we put a space gap for those.

---

And then for domains, we go through domains and then see, “Okay, are they [inaudible] any of the existing ones? Do we need new ones to capture domains?” But I think trying to go through substance now may not be as productive [as it was.] But if we've identified the correct areas, and then we could go from there.

PHIL KHOURY:

So I'm struggling a little because I'm not sure what the content means, but having somebody walk through it, I had sort of thought a document would be sort of an easy thing to have up on a wall for people to kind of step through and start to understand it all. It seems like one of the knowledgeable people out of the team walking people through it is going to work better than just having a kind of document up on the wall. We just don't seem to have the right kind of summary document that's going to show the hierarchy at the moment. Seems like. Is there one?

And it certainly won't be consistent across all subgroups of activity anyway, because some are much more advanced than other ones. So, is that too much to ask of existing team members to do that sort of walkthrough with the whiteboard and maybe point people to occasional links or something to kind of show that sequencing of how they arrived at the chunks of work that sit underneath? Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah, actually, maybe because I'm academic, so I go for a structured approach always, and this is what I expect. So, what I'm missing – and I'm feeling we're jumping between too many things and that we are not focusing on much and then start discussing about something else.



---

What I was expecting during at least the first two days of this meeting is that each of the subteams that we have – and I keep calling it a subteam, I'm sorry – or chunks or whatever, one of the members who knew about that would present to the team what was the objective, it's like a small presentation that I was expecting. I'm not sure if I'm expecting too much, but like a small presentation telling the group this is why it was created, this is the objective, this is the scope, and here we are, and this is what still needs to be done. Right?

In a more structured way so that that would allow us to understand what content needs to be covered and whether we need more sub-streams or not. So rather than discussing and jumping these or going through the document, it will be more like structured approach to have like a formal presentation kind of thing, maybe 15 minutes, 10 minutes or whatever, going through what is being done and what is missing so that we know which area we need to focus more. Kind of that. So this is what my expectation looked like. If we can do it before tomorrow, we finish the meeting, it would be really helpful, especially for us, the newcomers.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, to me, listening to Kerry Ann talk it through makes a heap more sense. I think talking about it makes more sense, much faster than trying to figure it out from those documents.

ZARKO KECIC:

If you look at this document, we can go to it, and there are more documents supporting some stuff, the documents about SSR1 that, as

---

far as I know, there is not much done. And looking at subtopic two, there's a lot of work done in L.A. and before L.A., and we can elaborate on that. And Eric is not here. I know something, but not much, because I missed a couple of meetings for subtopic three team. And subtopic four, Kerry Ann is here, and I hope Denise can update us what James and Cathy did with – no, not much.

DENISE MICHEL: I think Eric maybe, but I can look at our files and try to think.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. We'll check with those two. Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: We didn't get a lot of information.

ZARKO KECIC: So I believe going through this document and other documents, we can have a clear picture.

STEVE CONTE: Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. We can always go through the document as you suggested, but when somebody is explaining, it's always better than reading the document, and saves a lot of time so that we can ask questions right

---

away, what are the clarifications required or the confusions or the terminology that we are just understanding, because different people take different understanding while reading. But when somebody tells you something, you can right away ask and get clarified so that everybody's on the same page. So, as I said, I'm not sure if I'm asking for too much, but it would be better if we can go through by explaining whatever is required. That's what I meant, actually.

STEVE CONTE: KC, and then Kerry Ann, did you –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah.

STEVE CONTE: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: I'm just getting nervous hearing us go deep into all these subgroups, and I wonder, although this might be covered kind of organically, if we could focus on the “must” recommendation – like if I had a grad student right now – I guess that's going to be me tonight – I would say go to SSR1 report and taxonomize all those recommendations into categories. Maybe the exact categories of the subgroups. Maybe there is a pretty much 1:1 mapping, and whatever recommendations don't fit into one of these subteams, it's either not relevant because you can't measure it, or it falls under a new thing.

---

And so I wonder if it's – and maybe we can just say that we're doing this and then maybe feel better even if it doesn't look that way, if we can have one team right now for a month that is just doing the "must," the review of SSR1, and have, in a month, subteams fall out of that when we see gaps. But I want to make sure we get that "must" thing done as a team as much as possible, and to the extent that we have subgroups, they're all structured around this one "must." Maybe try [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: Well, okay, you know, these two "musts," we should talk about that, because they feel one-ish to me. But okay, let's do the second one, I think the SSR1 recommendations, and that will lead into what we've left out, what they left out.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I would probably address what I want to say first. [And I] wanted to respond to KC if that's okay. What I had wanted to address before is I think Naveed is – I'll agree with you, probably, we could take – Phil, I don't know what the agenda looks like tomorrow. Each of us could give an overview, but I would add a caveat that we don't get caught in thinking that that is it in terms of our review and starting point. Because

---

that's a trap I don't want – I'm very excited that we have new minds on the team, so we may have missed something, and we have persons who left who had different perspectives. It would be nice to always have fresh perspective. And if we've missed something, to capture that and not get caught at, "These are the only four, this is what we're working with and we're trying to spend time editing those four." So that's a caveat I would have. So I don't mind, I think, us doing a presentation, but with that caveat.

To KC's point, one of the discussions that we did have – and I would caution us again – is that we didn't want to get caught doing another SSR1 review, because if we spend a lot of time focused on just SSR1 recommendations and what had happened, we had discussed as a team then that we didn't want that entire SSR2 review would have been an SSR1 review of the review. So what we had done was created a separate work stream that there was a group focused on just ticking those boxes off and then identifying new issues that are now facing ICANN, and solve the "must" and address the "mays," because we thought the "mays" were important too.

So that's why we had kind of separated the SSR1, because SSR1, based on what the ICANN staff had presented, from their perspective, most of it was ticked. So we didn't want to spend another two years doing that. So that's why it was separate, it has context. But I don't know what – as I said, tomorrow, I don't mind presenting on the future challenges and whatever else. We could explain the logic. I think even if we weren't part of the team, we could explain the logic behind it because I think all of us understood the logic, or most of us did. Like Alain.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'm really open to how the team would like to attack the SSR1 recommendations and implementation. Having said that, I think I'm a little concerned about exclusively just focusing on that for a significant period of time because that's I think only one part of what this team should do. And that report was written ... Is almost a snapshot in time. It was written a little over eight years ago. There was no new gTLD program. The world was a different place. ICANN was a different thing. DNS was so, so different.

So, I think we should respect it for what it was and absolutely get that job done, but I also want to be mindful of the timeline that's been suggested and make sure that we talk about how we can do some parallel efforts when it's appropriate. Thanks.

STEVE CONTE Phil?

PHIL KHOURY: So, just to go to the session plan, it's completely flexible from here. We've identified the leadership issue as a must-do before we go. That's not a big time sapper. To enable the new members of the team to contribute, we have to go through these kind of steps of getting them to speed and I think if we can have volunteers who are prepared to make that 15-minute presentation and then sort of work from there, I think what will happen out of a 15-minute presentation is people start to get a grasp of what it all is, start to ask questions and that's going to lead us

---

to where we need to be in those discussions. I have no other fancier ways in my mind about how to get to that sort of outcome in terms of all that and I think people who do have that in their heads, I think the presentation thing is probably the most promising thing I can think of in terms of how to simultaneously lay open those issues and get people to talk about but also to bring everybody up to speed who is still not 100% sure about where it is.

So, it might be unfair now to do this on the spot. It's now 3:45. We're scheduled to do to, I don't know, 4:30 or 5:00 kind of thing. Is anyone in a position to feel comfortable enough to do a whiteboard dance and talk to the documents and go through one, so we've at least passed through one now? If we're going to go on with it in the morning, that gives whoever else is going to do it a bit of learning in terms of how they'd want to do their presentation and what they want to refer to.

I have nothing else on here that's more important than that because I think the big issues that follow, this step is the precursor to it, so I think we need to do it and we need to do it now. If everyone isn't completely dead yet, my suggestion is we start with one, if someone is happy to whiteboard or talk through the document on one of the bits of work. We can bring that back up to the cross the project thing, but it starts somewhere there that's concrete. Does that work okay as a proposition? And who wants to put their hand up to commence?

STEVE CONTE:

Kerry Ann put her hand up for a comment, probably not to ...

---

PHIL KHOURY: No, I'm pretty sure she committed to a 45-minute presentation. That was ...

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah. Just so you guys ... I'm [inaudible] because I will have to run out just after 4:15 to get my son. But, with that said, I had two comments and then I think I can volunteer to do the future challenges, just in case I'm late tomorrow morning. So, I volunteer to do the future challenges. I don't think that will be too long. But, I would probably charge everyone as homework tonight whenever we do – and that's for tomorrow, to read the bylaws, look at the Word document still pending, the other presentations, and just see what we've missed. I think at least if we come prepared to discuss the tomorrow and to sit to wait to hear, it will help the dialogue because once we finish presenting, then we'd want to hear feedback as to whether or not that's rubbish or it's not rubbish, it's good, and we need to add other work streams.

So, that would be my charge. I don't mind presenting on the future challenges. I think it's the easiest one-ish. The good thing is that we do have a lot of academics, sincerely. We do have a lot of academics now, so some of the future challenges, they may be researching it and actually seeing it, so it would actually inform what should be considered for this one, so I don't mind presenting it and then probably leave for comments for tomorrow, so persons can digest the logic. I don't mind taking it if you want me to.



---

PHIL KHOURY: I think that will be correct, Kerry Ann. And I think Zarko is going to do one of the chunks. Denise, will you do another one? Are you happy that this is the right piece?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure, but Alain was the rapporteur. Do you want to do it? No? You would? I'm sorry, Kerry Ann. I think you should do. I'm happy to ...

MODERATOR: Okay. So, what would be helpful, just to pick up on Kerry Ann's point is whoever is going to do the 15-minute presentation, whether it's this afternoon or tomorrow, that you identify what the reading homework is that's going to help for that. So, pick two documents, whatever it is that you want to say to people. To understand what I'm saying tomorrow, please make sure you read these two documents or whatever. So, if there's any document, if you say there is some reading homework people should have done, then [inaudible].

We have a comment from Alain. Zarko is going to send 300 pages. So, if people are okay with that as an approach for now, and if you can, please identify for people what they should be reading, scanning overnight. Alain has a comment. Alain?

ALAIN AINA: To follow up on what Kerry Ann said, we should read the bylaws, read the SSR framework, read the strategic plan, ICANN strategic plan 2016,

---

2020 and give ideas. And once again, I'm going to suggest that we should not push too much energy of to explain what the subgroup has been doing. I want us to look at what are we supposed to do first and see how we approach and see what is already there. Okay. We already have subteam one, two, three. So, do we need them or how do we [inaudible] we go direct subteam. As I said, it looks like we are just trying to just police the existing. It may not be the solution.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay. So, this is an exercise in making all of this accessible, not committing you to following the same path or accepting what's there. A lot of people saying the focus is around the subject matter, one of the things that people decided was important to be looking at. What's the focus and why? Rather than going through all the activity.

ALAIN AINA:

We have new blood and I expect them to also contribute. Then, from the designing, then we look at what we have as tools. These groups, are we comfortable with them? How do we adjust, etc., etc.? So, when we get to the point to look at the existing, then we could present the existing.

PHIL KHOURY:

So, Kerry Ann, does that give you enough guidance? So, do you want a whiteboard or do you want a document up on the wall?

---

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

I don't think it's necessary, no, because I don't think we're brainstorming right now. I think, at some point ... I don't know, Phil. When would we start documenting the recommendations and change it for the subgroups? I don't know who would be taking notes as to what we want to change and if there would be a session dedicated just for those changes tomorrow. So, everyone just listens now and then [send] later.

Alright. So, for the future challenges, I'll just jump right in. It would have been based on bylaw sub C3. So, it has in it several things, one of which was we're supposed to assess the extent to which we successfully implemented its security efforts, but that's not what this addresses because it's future challenges. But it goes on to say the effectiveness of the security efforts to deal with actual and potential. So, it starts off with the "and potential" so it captures ... The future challenges would have picked up "and potential" threats to the security, stability of the DNS. It doesn't say resilience there, so just keep in mind security and stability. And the extent to which the security efforts are sufficient to meet the future challenges and threats to SSR.

So, the future challenges, the perspective was to see, okay, what's happening in the globe right now concerning the Internet. What is ICANN doing to actually prepare for those challenges, whether they be through future threats analysis or whatever it might be. But, the idea was we identified that we would have needed some core areas to be able to do this work stream, the [inaudible] threat intel which would give the future threat analysis aspect of it. Policy, because it would be what ICANN has in place to actually address this, cybersecurity because

---

of the threats out there, and really the IETF, what's going on in that stream or that world to be able to address these threats.

We had tried to describe it, so the description is not sufficient [as something we could address]. The subteam was responsible for looking at the long-term strategy of ICANN, to plan and mitigate potential threats to the security and resilient operations. So, there's a distinction where here it says security and stability. Here we have security and resilience, so we have to kind of address that as well, to see if we correctly captured it. But, it should be the security, stability, and resilience of the operation of the unique identifiers it coordinates.

We had broken it down into the work stream was challenging because we had to kind of decide. We had questions and that's what those questions were. The questions were kind of brainstorming what are we really going to be addressing, what should be considered biased? So, the questions were how do we actually assess it? So, these were just provocative stuff for the team to consider.

What are the forecasts and researches? What is the research that is now available? And it speaks for itself. Can this actually impact the DNS? How effective are the efforts now? Which is pretty wide, as it's stated here. What emerging technologies? At the time, these were the things that were coming up that we were aware of, but there are new issues that are evolving now that we may have to consider.

Then, we thought the need to actually have definitions because we started to look what would be the source of information that we needed to have. We needed to be very specific as to what we were

---

looking at. What is at risk? Assets are at risk. Assets meaning what does ICANN rely on that could be the infrastructure? Is it just the people, staff? What is needed to ensure that the future threats can be addressed? Should we go as far as to look at the staffing structure of [inaudible]? Because that came up as part of the discussion in terms of the future challenges that are coming up. Has ICANN prepared itself, as Alain pointed, in a strategic plan, staff itself enough to meet these challenges? Is the physical infrastructural lined up? At the time, we were talking about the new ... I think the key that was supposed to come up, we're supposed to have a new key. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The KSK roll.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah. That was a huge discussion. Oh, the key handover was delayed and what's going to happen? So, we had all those issues as to who is actually inside it? Who actually keeps the key? We had all of those discussions as well because that's the future of each time of ICANN.

So, we had some discussions as to what is assets. Assets include domain names. Assets include IP addresses. So, we can widen that. I don't remember where we got this definition from. It's a part of one of the meetings. I wasn't there, but I had followed it.

We had vulnerabilities, as a definition threat risk. Risk was there because if you're discussing future challenges, you need to think about

---

from a risk perspective. Do we do a deep risk analysis? Which is why some of the other topics in red and stuff came up.

So, we then started to say, okay, based on those questions we had, what are the areas we needed to look at. We thought that looking at the top identifier system attacks were important because there was something that was happening based on the fact that I think at this time we had the new TLDs coming out, if I recall. We had something happening at the time where we had put this as an issue and then we had ... I think we were considering expansion of the IP address. It's a lot of stuff that was happening at the time that we got this in.

We had the DNS zone file [inaudible] a question mark because we were trying to figure how deep do we go because there was a very specific ... As we know it right now, the attacks could change and that was one of the discussions we had, that attack methodology and what the targets are may change for ICANN. How does it adapt to these changes, so that if we can switch the topic from being very specific to the task to more the adaptability and flexibility of ICANN to be able to address any challenge, not just the specific ones we know?

Then we had new dependencies threat. Intelligence blind spots was deleted because I don't think ... I can't remember why we deleted that, to be honest, but these were comments from one of the members that we had deleted as a result of ... Let me try and remember. I think because of how specific it was as well and it got wider to just new users for DNS instead, [inaudible]. So, that's why I think it got replaced with that comment. It was too specific, so we brought it higher and broader.

---

The one in red, we inserted and that's why we were seeking comments from all the members for because we had recognized that we did not address some of these specific issues, and I think KC had asked about it yesterday. How are we addressing contracting? But we have brought it more in the sense of how do we look at vendor services that are being offered and how we actually manage vendors.

We did not intend to go deep into looking at all the contracts that ICANN had. That was never the intent, nor the intent as to how they manage those contracts. But as to whether or not the legal team had a [inaudible] on what are they considering. For example, when the TORs go out, are they considering security measures in those TORs instead? So not necessarily specific contract details which is confidential. Third parties like us should not really be ... I think it's not our business. But it's more the fact that is there a process in place to ensure the TORs are very specific, the TORs take into account security, the TORs take into account auditing, accountability, etc.?

KC CLAFFY: TORs?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Terms of Reference. If there is a contract, a bid going on for a contract, for example.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

No, vendors. Yeah, vendors. This is vendor-specific. For intelligence, we thought that there had to be a need ... The language was a bit rough here, but we thought that there was a need to ensure that we take into account how is ICANN getting its threat intelligence. How is it using it? Does the information come in and streamline into its work, so it actually improves what it's actually doing?

Then, lastly, we had two notes. One was ... Let me see if I can remember what this last [inaudible]. Yeah. Those were just notes for us to consider. It wasn't anything specific to the workplan.

But, in essence, the logic to the future threats, which it's not ... I don't think it's conclusive and I think it needed a lot of refinement. But we're looking to the membership to see what areas are not covered, what areas should not be covered based on what's listed here. But the logic was we have a lot of certs coming up based on how the Internet is evolving. We have cybersecurity threats, cybersecurity threats, but it's more how is the security, stability of the DNS is the bottom line.

I think that's a short overview. I don't know if I've missed anything.

PHIL KHOURY:

In the queue right now is KC and Naveed, so if anyone else wants to go in the queue, please put your cards up.



---

KC CLAFFY: That was super helpful, although I drank from a firehose a bit there. But I want to just make sure I understand. While you were talking, I went to the subgroup page and it lists. Actually, it says subgroup conference calls and it lists three conference calls for this subgroup, two of which did not happen. Was there just one conference call for this subgroup?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: There was [inaudible]. There was another that we tried, but I think not enough persons showed up so we canceled [inaudible]. There was one that was held. I couldn't attend it so someone had chaired it for me. There were others that were scheduled, but we didn't feel that there were sufficient persons on the call to have a call, so we had cancelled it at that point.

KC CLAFFY: That's fine. I'm just trying to figure out if the Wiki is a complete representation of what happened in all of the subgroups.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I'm trying to remember. I can't recall [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: There were also instances where at face-to-face meetings the team broke up into subgroups and advanced their discussions and worked through that. That was not officially recorded I don't think for some of the subgroup efforts. I think in Abu Dhabi is where a lot of this was developed as well.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: South Africa.

DENISE MICHEL: South Africa. I wasn't there, but a lot of it happened not just through the teleconferences.

KC CLAFFY: Then the second related question maybe for ICANN staff is I see there's also a link to the mailing list that was for that subgroup. Each subgroup had a mailing list, but I can't see the archives I guess unless I'm a member of it maybe because it's Mailman and I have this problem, too. In the interest of not asking questions that I could just go search in the archives, I wonder if the members could get access to the subteam mailing list archives in the most expedient way possible.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. Sure. Sorry. You should be able to see it, so we'll correct that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Thank you very much. One of the things ... It seems by looking at this document and the website that the subgroup was able to identify a set of questions that need to be answered, but there is no work yet on what are the answers to those questions. Some of the ... The key things that I see maybe, like I'm not sure are missing, is what is the impact of having these IPv6 more in use with respect to the security and stability

---

of the Internet, and especially the IDNs and new gTLDs. These questions can be answered implicitly with the questions that are there already, but I'm not sure if we need to have them specifically mentioned as part of ... For example, the IOTs are mentioned. IOTs are generally expected to be working on IPv6 or something. But do we need to have those specifically mentioned is what I was wondering. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY:

Kerry Ann?

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

You're correct, Naveed. We have not started to answer the questions because there was kind of – and team can correct me – there was a decision that this would be kind of the last subteam because we had to do the work of the others that may inform the subteam. So, there may be ... If that would have been addressed or areas identified as future challenges that this team would have to consider. So, the others were supposed to kind of complete what they were doing and feed it into this subteam, and then this subteam would then push forward with the recommendations based on the future challenges identified because all the other sub-streams would feed things that are happening that, based on this trend, would have impacted that specific one. So, it was deliberate that this one was not advanced as the others, but we were just trying to ensure that we started to capture, just based on common sense and experience what needed to be addressed while we penhold it, waiting for the results of the other sub-streams.

---

PHIL KHOURY: Kerry Ann, just in the developing of the thinking through getting to the questions, were you at the point of having a debate in the team about whether something was getting too far into the weeds or back where you were adjusting that? No, not yet, yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No, because we hadn't had those kind of substantive discussions until we had agreed on the workplan. So, we need to agree on the workplan before we started to delve into the discussions. So, the idea that ... All those areas in red were not adopted yet and the areas in yellow were recommended for deletion. They were just notes for persons to consider. So, because it was not adopted, we didn't get into the process of discussing. As I said, we were waiting on some of the results of the other work streams.

PHIL KHOURY: [inaudible] for the other people who are doing it. I'm kind of interested in what did you find useful to help you guide that kind of discussion? Or you didn't get to it. Fair enough. But, I'd be interested in any of the others. Did you find the bylaws helpful or were you able to go back to the scope document to help you settle the debates when you were having them?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: The only other [inaudible].

---

DENISE MICHEL: So, I'm listed, I believe, in every subgroup simply as a co-chair just in case, just to help us keep broad tabs on how the work was flowing and what the subgroups need, but not as a substantive contributor, although I believe Eric did provide substantive contribution here. And I did when I had time.

PHIL KHOURY: Just to answer that question, the makeup of the subgroup was Kerry Ann as the rapporteur. As Denise just mentioned, Denise and Eric as co-chairs following all the groups. Mr. Matogoro, Mohamad Hasbini, and Noorul were on the subteam. I agree with Denise. I seem to remember that Eric was interested in this topic as well.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And Eric [inaudible]. Eric was the one who actually did the calls for me when I wasn't able to attend, so ...

PHIL KHOURY: Can I just quick check on if people found that helpful, the narrative that came with the ... Excellent. Alain?

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible] to ask it's okay with because [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I already responded.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. Now to address—

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: No, no. I know, I know. Naveed was mentioning the IPv6 IOT, etc., and then this ... Once again, this, let's go back to the bylaw. One thing I want to point out, if you look at the tree, the tree specifically focus on DNS. So, sometimes when we're supposed to be looking at the unique identifier, we should include the numbers. But, when you go down, it says DNS. So, that's [inaudible]. Because ICANN has more role in the DNS than the numbers. So, that's why I say we should all look at it again. And remember that in Copenhagen, we had this long discussion on what DNS means, etc. So, what is DNS? So the numbers may not be in our main focus.

DENISE MICHEL: You could parse that sentence in the way that DNS applies in the second clause, not the first, and we've got unique identifiers elsewhere. I don't know that that phrasing should constrain us, but I take your point that obviously, names get a lot more oxygen around here than numbers, for good reason.

---

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Sorry, Laurin, did I ...? No. So, that was really useful. What's the next best logical group to do? You've to bolt in a minute. So, for the people who know this stuff, what's the next most useful one to do? It might be too much to ask to do it now. Is there a 15-minute one that can be done now usefully by sort of 4:30 and save some time for tomorrow? Out of the chunks that [I have.]

STEVE CONTE: I'll just read through them. We have the SSR1 Review. We have ICANN SSR. We have the DNS SSR. And we have IANA transition. And a reminder that most of the group members from IANA transition and many of the group members from the DNS SSR are either not in this room or not in this review team anymore, so those three are going to prove challenging, I believe.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I think the only one that could be covered right now is IANA transition because I know I was reading that it's done already. It's finished. And it impacted minimal on – the IANA transition on the DNS security. I don't know what that means, but this is what was concluded already. So, it seems two are done.

PHIL KHOURY: A few people put forward the view on that one that it was a project for the times and kind of interest in it lapsed a bit. I'm not sure that we have sufficient depth of knowledge to really say what James said in the slides, in the room. It might be some knowledge there, [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: I don't know if I'd agree with depth and knowledge to address it. I think the question more is whether there's still an interest and people feel there's a compelling need. The two team members that felt strongly this should be addressed are long gone. So, I think the real question is ... Again, it was a point in time where a number of transparency, accountability, oversight, and mechanisms had not yet been created after the IANA transition and they now are created. So, I think personally the most compelling question for this area, given that the two people who were most interested in this have left and a number of activities have occurred now that weren't in place previously, should this still be a subgroup? Should this still be an area?

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, I have Russ, Naveed, and Kerry Ann.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Having been heavily involved in the IANA transition, I kind of watched it. It's one of those things where we say, okay, it was a huge amount of work. It happened. And everything just continued to work. So, I don't think there is anything to highlight here. There's no recommendation other than, "Yeah, it worked." And that's not a recommendation. That's an observation.

PHIL KHOURY: Naveed?



NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just going to say that this IANA transition [inaudible], it was created as like a sub-stream, but I didn't find this map to the scope of this review team, neither I found this in the bylaws. So, I'm not sure how we are going to map this eventually to the scope of the work that we had to do. So, it didn't fall into what we are mandated to do. Anyway, I don't think that would work. Even [inaudible], the IANA work, the transition does not apply anywhere in what I could learn. Yeah.

PHIL KHOURY: I have Kerry Ann and then Alain.

ALAIN AINA: Kerry Ann is busy, so –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No, I was doing institutional memory. I'm guessing – oh, that was [inaudible] Alain. I think it was [inaudible]. I don't know.

I was just trying to remember, if we do scratch the IANA transition thing, there was a discussion – and I'm only throwing it out just in case it comes up and we finally have to pen the recommendation. There was an issue trying to decide, because IANA's functions were transferred, if something does come up that affects anything to do with SSR, if we had the remit to do it or not ... So, just in case. I don't know if someone remembers how that was concluded. I know we did conclude it, but I'm just raising it because I don't want it to come up later. I'd rather it come

---

up now since we're scratching IANA. Since we're scratching IANA, I just wanted to make sure ... If we decide to scratch IANA, correction. If we decide to scratch it, that we put that to bed as well, so it doesn't come up again.

PHIL KHOURY: I do have an answer or I believe I have an answer to that, but Alain?

ALAIN AINA: Just to be trying to answer what Naveed said, I think this IANA transition thing came from the fact that we all know that IANA functions are so critical, and then we [perceive] that transition may affect in a certain way stability, etc., etc. So, I think that was the idea.

PHIL KHOURY: The question I was raising around that depth of knowledge is because we lost the team members from it. I'm sort of not clear about what you're going to say in the report, given that people know you started the work on it. You just say, "Well, a couple left, so we abandoned it." Or we formed a view, however sort of small and unqualified that is, and then what's the evidence that you've got there that you formed the view or analyzed it? So, I'm not quite sure where we've got to in terms of how you abandoned it, but Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Words matter. I wouldn't use the word "abandon." I think what we're discussing here is the fact that events overtook the initial exploration of

---

whether there were IANA SSR issues that should be addressed by this team. I would invite team members to look at the brief summary that was sent by former team members, and if there's anything that resonated as something that the team should continue to explore, definitely raise it. I think if that's not the case, then I think a simple, in my mind, and straightforward explanation is that initially there was some interest, there was exploration and analysis, and now that all the structures that are in place post-transition, a year later, we find that this is appropriately handled by the oversight committees that are now in place or something like that. I do not intend to ... Or my intent is not to preclude or shut down any further discussion on this, but that's just an option if we feel that's the direction we want to go.

STEVE CONTE:

To hopefully address Kerry Ann's question on that. I don't remember if it was an official request, so I don't remember if it was on the request log, but I do remember having a conversation with Legal at ICANN Org. Legal felt that, because of the relationship between PTI to ICANN that it was fully reasonable for SSR Review Team to look at that regardless of what the monitor says. And I believe that the IANA subteam took that to heart when they went in and discussed with IANA. Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, given that PTI is a wholly owned subsidiary, that seems straightforward that they're part of the whole, right? But, I think there will be lots of things that we investigate where it just turns out at the

---

end of the investigation there is no recommendation comes from that search. This can be one of those.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And these are my parting words. Just to – I think how Russ had put it initially when he [inaudible] agree with Denise, it's a matter that at the end of the day, we've kind of addressed that it's not something that we needed to write a substantive recommendation on, and I [inaudible] remove it as a substantive work stream, but if there's room based on Denise's charge to review it again and [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah. You guys are talking too much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are you still watching Netflix?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, but just to conclude this, I think I agree, that's the best way to do it. I'd just like to excuse myself, and I'll see you guys tomorrow morning.

STEVE CONTE: I believe I have everyone in queue that's spoken, so please review your cards and reset if necessary. Phil, you didn't reset, so it's all yours.

---

PHIL KHOURY: Look, okay, so process question. For me, that was kind of a useful step through – in my sense, doing that in the morning would be great use of the first hour, would be to kind of step through the rest and have that sort of dialog.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Approximately. Whenever I say a time, it means -ish.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah. Sometimes [inaudible]. And look, the intent, just to sort of come back to that in terms of process, the kind of nomination exercise in the first pass shouldn't take us very long to get the sort of nominees up. If it's a no-contest thing, then job's done. If there's a contest, then our proposition is we're just going to put the candidates out, send an e-mail to people with the candidates and ask if they want to e-mail in their vote to someone who'll be the returning officer and that'll get results sort of four hours later. [And that shouldn't mean they're up to our] morning session too much, I don't think, at the point of nomination.

---

STEVE CONTE: I was hoping for a hunger games, but I guess that's not going to happen. Russ, and then Alain.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I'd like to bring some experience from the IANA transition to this part of the discussion. We found that it turned out to be easier having a single chair and two vice chairs. So there are still three people organizing the work, but that it made – people who were looking at what was going on from the outside more comfortable to see a chair. And even if major parts of the meeting were delegated to one of the vice chairs to run, it just made it easier for dealing with that whole circumstance. And given the extra political stuff that has happened with the stuff, I'm wondering if that may help here too.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: My point is that maybe tomorrow, okay, I hope that it will be easy to select the chairs, but if we have a [contention] maybe, it should be a chance for us to try out the consensus model and use the voting as a last resort, trying to see if people could step down at that discussion instead of going for the first options.

PHIL KHOURY: I'll just respond, if I may. It's a little tricky to try and include the people who are not here, so I'm not sure whether that's fair or not fair. Probably seems to me if we do have to have a vote, they should have a chance to vote. So I would add one more thing to Russ's comment, and that is I would endorse that. so the work that we do around boards –

---

and it's not entirely analogous, but it's sort of in the ballpark – you can make co-chairs work, but a chair and deputies is a more efficient structure. That's one thing that seems to come out of the research and the evidence around governance. Certainly, you guys are under time pressure. I think that's less arm wrestling, checking, all that kind of stuff. So I think that does actually work more efficiently if you're there to get some stuff done and [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Kaveh and then Denise.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I'm going to echo basically what Russ said. I wanted to say that from just a practical point of view, in RSSAC, we have co-chairs, and exactly for the same reason as we are now proposing and discussing to change that to a chair and vice chair, because efficiency, basically, and communication issues. The chairs are very good [inaudible] their relationship, they even live in the same city, same time zone. But still, it's hard to communicate, and so we are proposing to change that.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'm amenable to whatever structure people feel most comfortable with. I think part of that discussion, there needs to be proposals, ideas about what the responsibilities would be, how we would split up chair and co-chairs. And then as one of the three co-chairs for the first year of this team's life, I'm happy to give people input on how much time it's

---

been taking and the type of support that we may want to think about adding.

STEVE CONTE: I have Norm in the queue, and then if you want to, then we can do that. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I like that idea as well, but for a different – as far as having a chair and vice chairs. More for the idea that the chair needs to remain neutral during discussions. If we have a bunch of co-chairs, we're all being neutral, it's not contributing to the discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah, Denise, you want to talk a little bit about the trials?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. So, I'm feeling the absence of Eric here, and Emily before him. It was easily at least sort of six to 12 hours a week for the work. I think that's probably a good [inaudible]. A lot more leading into meetings or if we were running different requests. I think that can – also part of this conducted discussion is what type of support, either on staff or consultant might be needed if we want to also think about what can we



---

augment. If a volunteer wants to tackle this – and may not have that much time.

I think it'd also be good, if you're following sort of a vice chair type of model, to think about the big buckets of responsibilities you'd want to parse out, what makes sense. Do you want one vice chair that handles operations and staff, one that handles communication, one that handles research, analysis? Whatever. I think there are a lot of different ways you can slice and dice it, but that's something to consider.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you. Yeah, just from staff's perspective, I think it's also a lot easier to have a single chair and maybe vice chairs in place, because when it comes time to go to leadership for decision-making, passing around documentation, next steps, all of that, it always seems to be a little unclear how the approval is provided, who's moving it forward, who's leading the next call and meeting.

And division of work is also strongly productive and efficient in my view. We are doing that with, for example, having one person be responsible for reviewing factsheets even though the information is provided to the entire leadership team, leaders and vice chairs, etc. And it just helps distribute the workload, know who the go-to person is for decision-making. And if the chair decides to have discussions with the vice chairs to make a decision on a consensus basis amongst them, that obviously will be their call, but we know who to work with more effectively.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think there's a lot of wisdom in what Denise shared about dividing the big buckets, but I also think we ought to know who the chair and vice chair are and then let them get together in the corner and figure out where to draw the buckets based on the skills of those individuals as opposed to trying to do it now without having a face to any of these roles.

DENISE MICHEL: Also, just another thing I forgot to mention. It was useful to have a bit of distance in geography because this is such a distributed team and the team had decided to rotate between a few call times. It was useful to have a couple of different continents represented so we could trade off on chairing calls, that type of thing.

PHIL KHOURY: Denise, one of the things that sort of struck me when I tried to kind of understand how everything works is that some of the work that the co-chairs do really needs to be team member, because it's a bit of judgment, it's kind of who has authority to be speaking, and it's sort of stuff that then therefore staff, MSSl stuff really can't be doing. So they can do a whole bunch of things and there's probably a lot of reorganizing you could do around that.

But in the sort of supporting the chairs bit, I'm kind of interested in your take as to whether a hired resource in that space could be usefully used, if you had somebody with project management, some content competence, somebody who could write, all that kind of thing, who

---

could act as a fact totem or whatever for the chairs. Was your experience that that would have helped, having someone like that?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. In a word, yes. And I think many members who have been around ICANN in these types of arenas for a while recognized the incredible value of a support consultant or staff type of person who bridges that gap between substance operations and keeping the trains running on time. I think it's obvious just from what we're trying to wade through here, having a substantive consultant that actually tracked the discussions and the work and could have provided what's [up with] a good synthesis of, you know, "Here's why this subgroup was created, here's the work that they did, here are the outstanding issues, here are the next two work items that are left," and provided both the substance and the working elements of this. But again, it depends on what the members around the table want to do. Particularly with our new members, if we feel that we've got the time and wherewithal to fulfill some of those duties, then it's really our call.

PHIL KHOURY:

And I guess it's also, as Russ says, whoever ends up in the chair, kind of how they like to work and what availability they have also drive what solutions you put in place, that type of stuff.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

And just to interrupt, but that'll change week to week, for all of us, right? So this is why you need vice chairs.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay. I think we've sort of reached the point. We're half an hour early, but I think energy levels and where the conversation has ended is probably okay to stop here. Everyone okay with that? 9:00 tomorrow, we're going to start with presentations of the other subgroups' work, sort of walkthroughs of what we've got, asking questions. We'll stop for a bit after that to get leadership underway, and then we'll come back to, again, kind of a stock take about what's the best way to use the remaining part of the day in order to meet the expectations from outside about what the face-to-face is going to do and what's most valuable for you in terms of the face-to-face time.

I'm happy to be told otherwise, you'd really rather stay on and work until 9:00 tonight. I'm leaving the floor open for people. Scott's one vote for that. Anyone else? Comments? Any sort of observations over, you know, reflections on the day, frustrations, anxieties about tomorrow? Actually –

KC CLAFFY:

It's probably good to just go around the room and say what do you want to make sure happens before we leave tomorrow. Is there anything concrete you can think of?

DENISE MICHEL:

I'll bite. So, I would like to get our leadership structure nailed down and agree to the scope in terms of reference, if that's possible. If it's not, be really clear on the next steps and timeline to get that wrapped up. And

---

then have some really clear sort of next steps and deliverables in terms of how we plan on tackling the SSR1 outstanding items implementation and how we want to move our discussions forward in assessing the other subgroups and whether they should continue and how we might want to change them to the outlines about roadmap. [And then] do the next couple months.

STEVE CONTE:

Since Laurin put his hand up, let's go this direction.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

OKAY, so I think I would agree with what Denise said. I think one thing I would really want to see, I agree with the idea that we really need to work out the leadership question, and we really need to work out how we will approach organization, get things done, keep track of stuff. And I think we need to have a short, concise discussion on how this could look like, and then obviously, whoever becomes part of the group that need to deal with this, they will have to find a way to do it. But I think we need to kind of speak to expectations as a group and [inaudible] as a group, because I think organizing this properly will be very important going forward if we want to keep that timetable that I think Russ proposed.

STEVE CONTE:

And a great segue. Russ? Kaveh, anything you want to [walk away with?] Zarko, anything you'd like to say that you'd like to get out of – by the end of tomorrow?

---

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. I always have something to say. So, what I'd like to see is the leadership being – and yeah, that's been said already, but beyond that, I would want to have a clear identification of the work streams that we want to focus, and to review whether we need the current work streams or we need more. And the amount of work that is required in each work stream that we have so that we can ask for volunteers who would want to join each of that.

If by the end of tomorrow, we have members being affiliated with one or more of those work streams, that would be great. And the final thing, I think, that we should have definitely is what we need to achieve by Barcelona. So that should be the first step. So, taking one step at a time, we should definitely fix our deliverable by Barcelona. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Denise, did you want the room to keep going before we went [inaudible] or did you want to make a comment now?

DENISE MICHEL: I could just clarify.

STEVE CONTE: Please.

DENISE MICHEL: I think it's worth pointing out explicitly that I think we should also agree, if not here then the next day or two, to sort of a communique from the team. We had our first face-to-face meeting, here's what we did, here's what we decided, here's the next couple of things coming up for the team. Some type of statement like that should be forthcoming very quickly after we meet here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Plus one.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Plus one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Plus too.

STEVE CONTE: Alright. Laurin? We're going back to people who already spoke.

---

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think I heard agreeing murmurs, but I think the communicating outward is something really important. We really need to do that. The ALAC guys were already talking about it. So we really need to do this.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Alain.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. I think tomorrow, if we could agree on the leadership, agree on decision making, and have a common understanding of what are we supposed to do, the scope or the remit, I'll be very happy. The rest, we can do all – we can keep working. Because what has happened in the past, we have a meeting, and we all leave the room with a different understanding of [inaudible]. So I think tomorrow is the day, leadership, decision-making, and can we agree on what are we going to do to all this we discussed here? And we have a common understanding of what are we going to do. And if we have time, then we can look at the methodology.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just agree with everything that Denise had in her list. A big plus one for the communique. I think that should be a regular feature we do whenever we have a get together that we send one out. Not quite sure who we send it to though. I assume the SO/AC chairs, and the board.

DENISE MICHEL: And the constituencies. And the public.



RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, let's do a press release. [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Ramkrishna.

RAMKRISHNA PARIYAR: Okay. I also agree with Alain, and apart from that, from tomorrow, we'll go in deeper [inaudible]. Might be this review team will not be paused again. Hopefully, from Barcelona, it will come to some conclusion.

STEVE CONTE: KC?

KC CLAFFY: Reading Phil's – what do you call this?

PHIL KHOURY: What did I call it? Oh, [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: His assessment, sort of result of all the therapy sessions he had with us. And I've been reading it every couple of hours during this meeting and thinking, "Did we cover that? Is that one fixed? Is that going to haunt us again?" And I just don't know on some of these, because I don't feel like, "Oh, this is how we resolved that one." Right? So, what I hope for

---

by the end of tomorrow is that somebody [like me] goes through that list, maybe Phil too, but somebody else on the team and says, "I feel that this is not going to come back and haunt us again," like to your point that there's no danger of us running into that issue again. God help us.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] besides me, because I'm neurotic.

STEVE CONTE: Scott, any hopes and dreams for tomorrow?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I think really the leadership thing needs to be ironed out. I think that's imperative that we do that this meeting.

PHIL KHOURY: Excellent. Alright, I'll call the meeting to a close. Do we know, just to check, is everyone comfortable that we're proceeding with all of this in the public realm, so recorded and all that kind of thing? We're satisfied with that? So if you want it to be otherwise, you have to ask for it. Do we have online guests for tomorrow? Do we know?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I think we can expect Boban and Matogoro unless we hear otherwise from them.

PHIL KHOURY: Right. So I think that's it. Look forward to an energetic day tomorrow. [Just] one more question. The invitation said 3:30 finish for tomorrow. Is that a solid thing, good reason for that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Even earlier today, people were starting to leave. 2:00-ish for planes, right?

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So.

PHIL KHOURY: Summer.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Summer.

DENISE MICHEL: I changed my mind. I'll leave at the end.

PHIL KHOURY: Leaving –

---

DENISE MICHEL: My flight is 5:30 now, so I'm fine.

PHIL KHOURY: Oh, okay.

DENISE MICHEL: And it's 3:30?

PHIL KHOURY: It's scheduled for 3:30, yeah. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I've got [inaudible] because I know about the [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY: I have a 6:30 flight out of here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] with Russ.

PHIL KHOURY: I'm not going to –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, you're not.

---

PHIL KHOURY: I just want to know, do we have until 3:30, or have we got –

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I think we do.

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah? Okay. So it's a shorter day tomorrow, so we need to –

DENISE MICHEL: Hustle.

PHIL KHOURY: Hustle when we get into those things tomorrow. So anyway, have a great night, everyone, and we'll see you all back here 9:00 AM.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. So I just want to officially close, stop the recording and end the meeting. Thanks, everyone.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Thanks.

---

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**