JENNIFER BRYCE:	Yvette, are you still there? Did we lose you?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:	I think my connection temporarily went out. I'm sorry. Can you guys hear me now?

JENNIFER BRYCE:	We can hear you. We didn't hear the role call.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:	Okay. Let me try that again. Sorry about that, everyone. I'm having some audio issues this morning.

Welcome everybody the SSR2 call. This is plenary call #43, 13th of September at 14:00 UTC. Attending today's call, we have Alain, Eric, Kaveh, Ramkrishna, Boban, Denise, Laurin, Zarko, Russ, Scott, and I think I just saw Kerry-Ann join us as well, [inaudible]. We do not have currently any observers at the moment. From the ICANN Organization, we have Steve Conte, Jennifer Bryce, Negar Farzinnia; and myself, Yvette Guigneaux. We have apologies today from Norm Ritchie, Brenda Brewer, Alice Jansen, and Naveed. I think that's about it.

We'd like to remind you that today's call is being recorded, so please state your name before speaking. I think that about does it for me. Russ, I will turn the call back over to you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, the first thing on the agenda is an update about Barcelona. I think Jennifer is going to do that.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, everyone. Thanks, Russ. Actually, I think 1A was just CCT recommendation. Just to highlight to everybody that CCT report was sent to the board last week. Recommendation #16 is addressed to the SSR2 Review Team among other groups. We wanted just to [inaudible] to you. I believe a link was sent to the e-mail and a recommendation is on the screen. I know a lot of you are not in the Adobe Connect room. Would you like me to read the recommendation? Okay. I'll just read it out anyway quickly.

The recommendation reads that further study about relationship between specific registry operators, registrars, and DNS security abuse, commissioning ongoing data collection, including but not limited to the ICANN domain abuse activity reporting initiatives. For transparency purposes, this information should be regularly published, ideally quarterly and no less than annually, in order to enable identification of registries and registrars that require greater scrutiny, investigation, and other people enforcement action by the ICANN Organization. Upon identifying abuse phenomena, ICANN should put in place an action plan to respond to such studies, [inaudible] problems identified and define future ongoing data collection.

I'll stop there in case you want to have any kind of discussion about this. Just let me know when you want me to move on to the next agenda item. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My initial thoughts with this is that this is something we should take up when we do the DNS SSR portion of our work, so we'll just have to bookmark this as something to take a look at. Anyone else have thoughts on this?

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, Russ, this is Denise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: I would suggest for review team members to take advantage of one of the audio conference calls or webinars that the CCT Review Team has scheduled. They'll be walking through their full report. It's probably useful in setting more overall context for this recommendation and other [inaudible] in the report. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thanks. Negar, you have your hand up.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, Russ, thank you. I wanted provide a quick clarification on Denise's comment. The CCT Review Team actually does not have a website scheduled. [inaudible] the RDS Review Team does [inaudible] webinars

on their draft report. The CCT Review Team has submitted the following report to the board but has not scheduled any webinars or any engagement sessions at the ICANN 63 meeting. So, there won't be anything for the review team to attend, unfortunately.

DENISE MICHEL: I think we should take an action item then to arrange either a phone call or subteam meetings with members of the CCT Review Team to get more insight into this recommendation [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Why don't we invite them to a call and see if they're interested.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I just wanted to let you know that we've already been in touch with some members of the CCT Review Team leadership to ask them if they would be available to attend as part of their review team meetings in Barcelona. Nothing is confirmed at this time, but it seems likely that the Wednesday, the 24th, one or two of the members might be able to attend part of that meeting on that day to answer any questions or clarification.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great, thanks. Anything else on this topic?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I just suggested we consider actually following what Denise suggested and having them come to one of our plenary calls just because it's easier to adjust the timing if we want it before or after or actually focus on it with congruence with the work that we're doing. But, also, we can do a more focused Q&A if they're prepared to actually put the proper people for our Q&A on the phone with us as opposed to it's possible that the people that are available to meet with us during a busy ICANN meeting may not be able to answer all of our questions if we form them. So, we might actually want to circle amongst ourselves and then potentially ask them to join one of our plenary calls or arrange a special call with them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Jennifer, could you extend that invite and we'll see what they say?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Certainly, will do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Next agenda item, then, is Barcelona.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Alright. In terms of the logistics of the room, I don't have any more updates on what I previously gave you all. I do have a couple more items that have been added to people's calendars. Hopefully, you've seen the invites. On the 23rd, which is the Tuesday, we're hoping to

[inaudible] the review team. We put in a request for an engagement session, and as I said, that's just to give an update to the community on the progress of your work and answer questions.

Secondly, also on Tuesday, the 23rd, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group has invited the review team to attend their meeting. They're interested in also hearing an update from you also.

Again, Yvette has kindly sent calendar invites. If you don't have them, let us know and we'll make sure that you receive them.

We also wanted to let you know that constituency travel have the request for you all to attend. I note Laurin said on the list that he has not yet had any communications on them. So, I just wondered how everyone else was doing, if that was consistent or if people have everything they need yet from the travel team.

DENISE MICHEL: I haven't heard from them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I have not heard from them.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I've not heard from them.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. So, it sounds like the review team has not heard. I do understand that Joseph was on PTO, one of our travel team colleagues. I believe he's back. I know that he has actually been in touch with members of our team regarding it. So, they're certainly aware of it. We'll continue to work with them and make sure that that comes out soon.

Then, in terms of if anybody needs a visa letter or anything like that, that is also [inaudible]. Please drop us a note on the list and we'll do what we can to help get those expedited.

In terms of updates, I don't have anything else on Barcelona.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are there any questions?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, Russ. Hi, team. I just wanted to give an update. Unfortunately, I won't be able to attend Barcelona in March. We have some changes of activities in the office and my boss needs me to come … I don't know if everyone knows I'm on maternity leave. I'm required to come to office that week and [inaudible] be in office. But, I indicated to him that I was happy to participate in the meetings [inaudible]. So, I'll be able to participate [inaudible], but I won't be able to leave to come to Barcelona.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, we'll miss you, but we understand. Anything else about Barcelona? The next thing on the agenda is the coms outreach plan.

Denise sent around a version. I hope everybody had a chance to look at it. Denise, is there anything you want to highlight?

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Russ. This [inaudible] with our previous discussion and with the broad schedule that we outlined in the terms of reference.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anybody have any questions or concerns? I suggest we adopt this, then, as our working document and only revisit it if there's any concerns that arise as we move on.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I have raised my hand. I don't know if you saw it in the chat.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't see any hands on the Adobe Connect, but go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] had sent an e-mail about anyone [inaudible] on the phone trying to participate. I don't know if he's on the call. Are you on the call? If he's not on the call, what I understood from his e-mail is that there was a misunderstanding in terms of how we communicate [inaudible] make a note that it's adopted. We just need to clarify from [inaudible] the next time he's on the call. I'll respond to his e-mail. [inaudible] high-level concern and it's not [inaudible] to document the discussions we're

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Kerry-Ann. I just got that e-mail.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Good. Anything else someone wants to raise? Then let's move on. This past week ICANN sent out I guess I would call it a communique telling people things they need to do to prepare for the KSK, the DNSSEC root signing key rollover. Eric agreed to introduce this topic.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks. I'll go through high level of the KSK rollover situation and I'll keep an eye on the chatroom, so if I'm being to [inaudible] or I'm going too fast, please drop a note. For the most part, right now there's an ongoing discussion in that timeline in place to rollover the roots, the DNS roots KSK, the key signing key, the root of all DNSSEC trust in the Internet.

There's been a bunch of people with different opinions on it on both sides. There's a lot of people who want to roll it. There's some people that provided some data and I think we saw some commentary on the list about whether we should bring this up as a discussion topic. And also, I think there are some people on the call, on the team, that have published some perspectives on it and it seemed like if this is something that we decide is an SSR issue, we probably should have a discussion about whether we think it is or it isn't now, before there's any

substantive action. If there isn't something that we think is a priority, then that's fine. But I think it was raised on the list that we should talk about this. So, inasmuch as I think we were planning to go to the SSR1 review [redo], this issue seemed like it was worth clarifying.

Is everyone in receipt of the e-mails that went out on the list in this regard? Is anyone not in receipt of that and would not know what I'm talking about?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I've seen them. I want to point staff to the chatroom. It looks like two of our members are not hearing this conversation.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Ah. So, I was going to watch the chatroom and I totally missed that. I was indeed watching that text was being written. I guess I should probably pay more attention. We should totally fix that. Naveed and KC I suspect might have some perspective on this, so making sure they're involved in this is important.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I'm sure KC has a lot about this and she can't hear it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. KC is actually one of the SSAC … She's listed as an objector to the SSAC com, so she should at least have a perspective on it. I'm not sure if we should … I think we really need to make sure that the people that

are on the call can hear what we're talking about. I'm not sure it makes sense to move forward. We're sacrificing air time.

DENISE MICHEL: I just wanted to make sure that the staff has seen a couple of review team members have posted on the list that they need dial-in information for the call. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. One person is KC. She's in the chatroom, but she's saying that she can't hear anything. She said she has something to say on the KSK rollover.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can someone dial to KC? That sounds great. Is Naveed able to hear us now or do we need to do the same thing for Naveed?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Naveed just joined the room. I think he was in listen-only mode originally. I want to verify that's still the case.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. Thank you for that.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I'm working on that. My apologies, everyone, for the audio issues. What has happened is we've had to disable the audio mics in the room, otherwise it shuts down our [inaudible] to the entire room randomly. That's what's going on. If folks aren't able to find that microphone like they're used to, that's what I'm working with. My apologies for the inconvenience here, everyone.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: For those that are not in the chatroom, there's some back and forth about whether we should just have this discussion on the list. I'm just informing people in the chatroom that we've paused the discussion while we try and resolve the audio issues.

Maybe I'll cull the dead air a little bit with more background on KSK in case people find this wrought. Some of the consternation that's been published about the KSK rollover is included whether or not there are [inaudible] parties or validating resolvers that are going to have trouble being able to validate DNS queries or responses to DNS queries because of a KSK rollover. Some measurements suggest that there are difficulties that some non-trivial portion of Internet users are having rolling over to the new key.

I think some people are more concerned about this than others and I think it sparked some debate in the community which is what led I believe some of the people to post some of the commentary to our list and that commentary I think is why we're having this discussion at this juncture.

I see Naveed is connected. KC, are you on?

KC CLAFFY: I am. Do you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: I'm now having data issues, so I'm going to try to call in right now, but I discovered the call-in number and she—

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We hear you fine.

KC CLAFFY: I guess the high-level bit is that I'm one of the names listed on the SSAC 102 document in [inaudible]. Scott mentioned Verisign, but there's four people on that [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hello?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can hear you, Eric.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Hi, Eric. This is [inaudible] KC to get reconnected. Her perspective I think will help us. Is it the intent of the SSR2 team commenting on the rollover at this stage, it won't be able to be included in our report except for public future rollovers. [inaudible] community expects us to post like a blog on our commentary on the issue as a mid-term review or mid-review comment, or is it that we are going to take note of it and then see how we can incorporate that for future recommendations in terms of how the rollover [inaudible] in the future? I'm just trying to see the content because if we're not publishing our report now, it is just public comment that the community would expect from us.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Okay. I think you're asking me, which is fair, except I'm about to deflect. My two cents is I think it matters what the team thinks, so I definitely defer to the team. But I think the setting for this conversation that [inaudible] is just how much do we think this … Is this within our purview to consider as an SSR issue or not? I think, operationally, if we decide it is, then we go down [inaudible] what's next. But I think [inaudible] bounds. Does that make sense?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Yeah, it does.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Okay. I see KC has her hand up, so by all means, KC. KC, if you are speaking we can't hear you. Okay. So, Denise, why don't you go and maybe KC … Maybe Yvette or someone on staff can help KC.

EN

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, her little telephone just disappeared.

DENISE MICHEL: If I get dropped off, it's because I'm winding my way through the [inaudible] Mountains. To answer your question directly, Eric, I believe that the KSK rollover is absolutely within the purview of this group. And given all of the issues involved, I think that's something that we should absolutely address and it's also within, I'd say, ICANN SSR but also [inaudible] for the larger Internet, sort of DNS, SSR work as well. I can share with the list a lengthy comment submitted by the Business Constituency back when ICANN had a public comment on this that lays out the more detailed concern that all the businesses involved in ICANN have regarding this rollover. Unfortunately, I really did not get a response from ICANN. Apparently, the ICANN board is addressing the KSK rollover issue next week.

So, I would suggest that if there is broad agreement that this falls within the remit of the review team and people are interested in addressing this, that we should also let the board know that this is an issue that we're delving into. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thank you, Denise. KC, are you on?

KC CLAFFY: Can people hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Go, KC. Sorry, we jumped over you while we were … Sorry about that.

KC CLAFFY: No problem. It's my fault, probably my fault. I've never had so much trouble with a conference call. Is my audio clear?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, crystal.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I'll try to [inaudible]. My comment to Scott's [inaudible] message was it wasn't clear to me how SSR2 dovetails with this particular issue, given that our charter and our timeline. I wasn't sure if he was imagining that we should do something before the [inaudible] or before the board meeting that ICANN is having this week, I think, to vote on this.

But, I guess my view or my understanding that SSR2 started to do more of a broad reflective review that review was currently burning fires, which I guess I would consider this to be somewhat.

I think it would be well within SSR2 scope to consider the whole trajectory of how the board found itself in a situation where it was asking SSAC to provide advice on whether a decision had already been made and announced was okay to follow through with.

My view is that when the roll was postponed last year, what should have happened is that there should have been a process to create a checklist of what was measurably needed to be done before the system qualified for launch and that when all these boxes were checked in a way that a reasonable person could determine that they were checked, then [OCTO] should have gone to the board and said, "We're ready to go, but since this involved board-level risk, we want you to do whatever you need to do with due diligence to approve it before we announce it."

And at that point, it would have been appropriate for the board to ask SSAC for advice if they wanted advice from SSAC or RSSAC or RZERC or whatever, which actually happened months after the [inaudible] and well after the public comment period.

So, long and short of it, the fact that SSAC 102 document exists at all, never mind the quality of that document, to me is evidence that a risk management mistake occurred somewhere in the process and I think and I have said to people, including to SSAC, that that needs to be debugged and let's make sure that doesn't happen again because, really, regardless of what happens with this role, if it goes or if it gets [inaudible] someone, there's going to be blowback. It's not going to be good for ICANN because I believe more could have been done. It seems to me that's something that could be within SSR2's purview but doesn't have to be this week or probably shouldn't be this week or this month. So, that's my view.

But, I don't consider myself representative of the community or this committee, so I'll just say my piece. I've said it elsewhere. I'll say it other

places. You guys can just take it for what it's worth and I'll continue the discussion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, I'd like to respond to a couple of things you said. I think that there's two flavors of recommendations that may result from us watching what happens with this KSK roll. One is the one you've addressed about process and that kind of dovetails with what Denise said about the ICANN SSR part of our review, and basically having a procedure for something that's going to happen over and over and over again seems completely reasonable.

The second is to look at a post-mortem what happens after the thing rolls, assuming it does, while this team is still working and that seems to fit into the DNS SSR piece of our work. If there's any technical aspects, if there's any lessons learned that need to be passed on to the IETF to update 5011 or whatever RFC it is and so on.

So, that I think is the way the review team ought to look at it. That's just my perspective. Maybe others have thoughts. The only hand I see is KC's at this point.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, my hand is up? I'll figure that out.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, it's KC2, so it could be a different KC. Okay. So, since Russ is watching hands, I'll put my hand up. I think this is a really good

discussion. I think I'm trying to manage reading what I think people are saying and encouraging anyone else with any perspective to wade in, of course, but it sounds like there's perspective that there's a reason to consider where this goes into our SSR evaluation, overall the SSR2. We talked about ICANN SSR, DNS SSR. We talked about process concerns, whether we called them [mismanagement, mistakes] or whatever, the process of how this was followed through. But then we've also talked about the potential impact that it may have to DNS and how it might later be reflected in outreach to IETF and reflection in businesses and RFCs and stuff like that.

It sounds to me like we don't have a clear idea of exactly what we think, how it muxes into our SSR evaluation. It sounds like to me we've just crossed two different subteams' worth of work into this one ongoing issue. I mean, on the one hand, it sounds like we're not sure where it fits. On the other hand, it sounds like we think it's pretty important if it's muxing in with two of our separate subteams. I mean, I'm certainly looking at the room for hands in case someone wants to attenuate my signal or shut it down or something like that. But it sounds to me like we're not 100% clear on where we think it fits, but it sounds like there's a lot of discussion we think maybe the team wants to have about KSK and how it relates to our charter. Is that a fair assessment?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Eric, I don't know [inaudible] putting my hand up in the chat. I'm going to [inaudible] on the phone, but it's not [inaudible].

EN

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're not sure yet, Kerry, and I'm sorry. Please [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Eric, I think what KC said and what Russ said more aligned in terms of it may not be something that we can comment on immediately. I don't agree with you that we don't [inaudible] review. I think Russ's summary and KC's comment pretty much says that it's something that is of interest of this and the impact it may have, as you said, on our two subgroups, DNS and ICANN security. So, it's not something we can comment on probably now as it's happening, but it's something to consider as an overall risk management portfolio for ICANN in terms of how do they address this from a policy level and operational level going forward and recommendations we can make even from the impact that the rollover may have now because that will give us a perspective as to the potential harm it could do for the stability and security.

So, I think it's more a combination of Russ's and KC's comments that, for me, it sounds a bit something that does fall within our purview but not something that we can comment on immediately but more for the report in terms of future recommendations.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Kerry, I know I'm supposed to be [inaudible], but I think that's really helpful. Thank you. And I think actually that, at least for me, highlights a point that I'm not sure if I really grasped before, but you're right. Certainly, you're right. Hopefully, nobody was expecting us to come together and write, draft an interim report. I think that should be clarified. I don't think we're expecting to see that. But, at the same

time, I think a comment about impact. You're right. I think given enough time, we would probably have assessed how important the operational mechanisms and the affects of the KSK rollover are to the stability, security, and resiliency of the global identifier system.

So, I think, yeah, eventually this will show up in our report, probably, it sounds like. It sounds like there's broad agreement that we'll be talking about things like this and it may very well be specifically KSK. I guess if the roll happens and things go sideways, it will be real easy for revisionist history to say, "Oh, yeah, if we had just got there in time." But, I think you're right. I think we're probably going to be evaluating the impact of the KSK roll on the stability.

I know it's not exactly what you said, but is that a reasonably [faithful] observation from your comments?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. Is anyone trying to raise a hand?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] concern and Russ's comment that maybe we could think about the technical, what needs to be done technically after the roll. My [ask] over this was there was a piece of it that was about the technical analysis that could have been done before, but my bigger concern was about the risk management, transparency and accountability part. So,

it's actually quite similar to my [ask] when I try to go through these SSR1 recommendations and figure out has this been implemented, to what extent, [inaudible] impact, how do I know that it's been implemented, where is it documented?

That is the piece that I really think was not done sufficiently by ICANN. In order for me to be able to answer the technical piece, was there enough outreach? What was the affect of the outreach? How many people are going to be affected? What are the different operating systems and blah-blah-blah? All of that. They've done a lot. ICANN has done a lot. I'm not saying this is a travesty or anything. Well, maybe I've said that at some point, but it's a delicate situation and what you want to be, and this is not unique to KSK.

So, I don't think we need to do a deep dive into this and take a whole other work party, as Eric might be a little worried about. But, I think it's a theme of when we embark on a risky move, we need to demonstrate that we have as deep an understanding of the impact that [inaudible] we can get, that we have documented everything we know, that we've subjected it to peer review, blah-blah-blah. So, I don't know if that helps or hurt, but I just want to clarify, it's not purely a technical analysis and it's very similar to what we're going to have to do with SSR2 to figure out how do we know that reasonable precaution were taken.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you. Yeah. That is actually very helpful. At least I thought it was. And yeah, I think just to pile on, because in case it sounded like I was not in agreement with that before, my comments were meant basically

that same kind of spirit. I think we're in violent agreement, for what it's worth.

I think I really liked a bunch of stuff that you said. In particular, what I took from it, and just reflecting this out for the team, is that there needs to be [inaudible]. At some point, there needs to be a process put in place so that things that could have complex, systemic, technical implications have the chance to be evaluated, whether they're for risk management assessment or whether they are literally like network systems, systemic dependencies before they're [inaudible]. I think part of the remit, in my opinion, for SSR2 in general is not – and as you said, KC, not necessarily speaking just about KSK, whether it's a good example or not, is that SSR2 should be saying, hey, the [inaudible] of the Internet or of the global identifier system needs this sort of conscientious process put in place. So, this one, I think you're right. I think this might just be an example of why we sort of need that and how we sort of put it, but it could be a canonical example.

It sounds to me like – Russ, I'm sort of getting ready to dovetail this back to you. It sounds to me like the discussion on the team is that this is an [in bounds] consideration, whether [inaudible] post mortem or anything else. We could do a straw poll if you think it's helpful, but it sounds to me like people are in agreement.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not hearing any dissent. I'm not seeing anyone type in the chat dissent. So, if someone thinks this is not something we should look at, speak now, please. Well, I think it's unanimous that this is something

we're going to end up looking at, but not this week. Thank you for guiding that discussion, Eric.

The next thing on the agenda is the SSR1 recommendations. We had a discussion on the mail list where a table was sent out that is the example of the kind of information we need to gather to determine what to say in our report about each of the recommendations. I hope this answers the discussion from last week where Naveed and Eric were basically calling for a table and two tables. Anyway, I thought if we had something as a straw man to poke at, maybe we could get past the discussing what we're going to do and start getting to the doing it.

So, let's start with does this table meet the needs of everyone? If not, what did we miss? I'm not seeing any hands. Does that mean everyone's happy with it or that their app isn't working?

KC CLAFFY:
I kind of made my comments on the list and maybe there was not sufficient support for them. It's not that I don't have anything to say. I just don't want to beat a dead horse here.

RUSS HOUSLEY:
You did make some things on the list, but you also cast it in terms you could live with this, but you have some … There was some shades of color you kind of questioned is how I took them. Did I misinterpret that?

KC CLAFFY: No, I think that's fair. I kind of want to move forward. I've also done some of this kind of research before where I end up thinking [inaudible] question. Maybe if we could have a checkpoint after we do five recommendations and make sure that we don't see a pattern forming that would make another question useful, I think I would rather just move forward here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'd love to do that. That sounds … Let's get some running code and then modify when we have some [experience]. I'm sorry, I'm using IETF terminology.

KC CLAFFY: [From that], I'm ready to go. I think we should go.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I see Eric agreeing with that. I'm sorry, Alain, you said you sent a comment/suggestion. I missed it. Can you share now?

                        So, I found your comment, Alain. Opening the attachment now. I understand your idea, but I think it's just providing background and maybe it would go before the table. Is that right? In terms of how we're using it. Are you not able to speak? Oh, he got disconnected.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It looks like he can't hear you from the chatroom, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I couldn't see that because I was looking at his attachment. Okay. I guess after the call I'll send a response to him. Okay. Is there anyone else who would like to raise a comment? Then I suggest we follow KC's suggestion and try this table with a couple of the recommendations and then reassess whether there's other things we ought to add to it. Does anyone object to that way forward? I'm not seeing any hands. I'm not seeing any typing. I'm not hearing anything. So, we're going to do that.

Okay. At this point, is staff able to tell us where we are in the getting dates for each of the questions we have outstanding? The reason I'm asking this now as opposed to somewhere else is we have outstanding questions relating to SSR recommendation one, so I'm trying to figure out whether we should start with one or start with two.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I do have an update. Unfortunately, I don't have definite dates that I can give you, but I can give you an update in terms of … So, we populated a table on the Wiki. I shared the link there in the chat. We've created a Google Document where I list all of the questions and answers there, given up on the Wiki. It's not an intuitive tool for creating tables, so hopefully everybody can get into that. [inaudible] share it there.

So, we've populated this table with some answers snice our previous call based on discussions that have happened in the past. There was [inaudible] information and populate the answer instead of just putting the transcript and the link. So, we've done that. So, if the team is able to review the table and can [inaudible] to see which, as you suggested, recommendations already have the complete answers to. There is a call

on the right-hand side for the delivery date which we will just populate this table as we get those back from the SME, so we won't bog down the e-mail list. We'll just fill this table out and populate the answers as we get them. So, I hope that this will be a more helpful tool for everybody and of course happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Jennifer, right now the expected delivery date is empty and you're going to be gathering that from the SMEs throughout the organization going forward. Is that right?

JENNIFER BRYCE: That's correct. So, yeah, the process is that we can answer these questions with the SMEs that's appropriate. [inaudible] needs to take a minute to just look at the questions and be able to give us a reasonable date that's not just a random date. We want them to think through the questions and provide a date where they think that they'll be able to get us the answer. So, that's the process that we're in the middle of at the moment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. So, there's two questions here related to recommendation one that don't yet have answers. But, it looks like the questions we had related to recommendation two do have answers, so maybe it would be better for us to start with recommendation two. Does that make sense to the group?

DENISE MICHEL: Hi, Russ. This is Denise. I'd like to be in the queue. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. So, in order for team members to review not only the implementation information that the SSAC provided, but also the questions that team members have had over the last year regarding the recommendations that also staff answered, they need to be in one table. But, as we discussed at the last meeting, we also need the staff to use the original table they created for this. That is I restated it again in my September 5th e-mail to the list. We have the date of the request, the action item, the owners, and [inaudible] hasn't been completed, any progress notes that are relevant, and the actual answer of when the answer was provided.

Because of the [inaudible] on some of these questions, on some of these issues, context matters. So, we need to understand the point in time when the question was asked and when the question was answered as well as the answers.

You could also indicate in this table to the best of your ability whether it's relevant to one of the recommendations or not. Some of the questions – again, all of the questions [inaudible] questions that are asked on one table. Some of the questions were asked in different meetings at different times, but they have relevancy for SSR1 recommendations. That's the [inaudible] that's been on the table, so if

you could incorporate that into the Google Doc and then populate it with all of the questions substantively that have been asked and give us a sense of the ETA for the ones that have been unanswered, that I think would be really helpful. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Denise, I see a bunch of questions that have answers, so they're not … If I'm understanding the table that Jennifer has put the link to, this is all of the questions, not just the outstanding questions.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. So, it will be added to I assume as more questions arise. As the review team progresses, [inaudible]. But what we also need is the original table that the [inaudible] original table that staff created. That is the date of the request and the [facts] table included in my September 5th e-mail, but I think it's [inaudible] on the Wiki as well. This goes to I think maybe raises the question as well on last week's call is, for context, we need also the date of when the question was answered, when the question was asked, when it was answered and additional context [inaudible]. It would also help us if staff can include notes on their ETA on when they expect the unanswered ones to be answered. I think that will help us manage our workflow as well. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I see Denise's hand, which I assume she just finished and next is Negar, then Eric.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:	Thank you, Russ. I think [inaudible] what I wanted to say. The table is actually inclusive of all of the questions pertaining to SSR1 implementation, whether they were asked during the briefing, whether they were asked on the list, or if they were e-mailed in. However they were sent to us, all the questions are included in here.
	As you noted, the [set] of questions have already been answered. The answers have been extracted. It's not a problem for us to add dates requested and who requested the question as well as they answered. We can add those three columns in to make it more comprehensive.
	With that, I think I can lower my hand and give the floor back to you, Russ.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Eric?
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Yeah. I'll try to be brief as to the time. Thank you very much. I guess the one comment I have, just being the data file, is I think in the event that it's possible and reasonable and doable, it would be really useful to know, for example, if there are some things that got in the way of getting an answer to us, like staff attrition or rollover, stuff that was mentioned earlier. Being able to note that in a kind of archival way is useful because it might then inform some of our recommendations, like in the event of attrition there needs to be continuity management or something like that. So, any context around delays if possible or background complications could potentially be really useful to us when

we try to formulate general findings around this. I think we talked about that before. So, that's just my two cents.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. According to my clock, we've run out of time. Hopefully, next week, we can begin the meat of this and maybe we can figure out how to start it on the mail list. I'd like to find out if there's any AOB that we need to deal with today. Other than that, I'd like to confirm the action items.

Okay. I'm not seeing any hands or any typing, so I guess we have no AOB. Jennifer, can you walk us through the action items?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. Thank you. First, I'll go through the decisions reached and please make any edits. One, team adopted the high-level coms plan and there's also an action item as to the [inaudible] for Denise and Kerry-Ann to clarify via e-mail with [Matt Chicora] about the comps is intended to be high level.

Second, decision reached as [inaudible] include DNS root KSK roll process in relation to organizational mismanagement processes, ICANN SSR and post mortem of the KSK roll (DNS SSR).

Decision reached three, team agreed to use the proposed table to assess recommendations and reassess the table after five recommendations [inaudible].

So, I'll move on to the action items. Staff to invite the CCT Review Team to join the plenary meeting, answers questions. The review team to confirm the best time for this to happen. I already covered the second one regarding the communications plan.

The third, staff to add columns to the table to capture the date of the ask, who asked the question, and when it was answered for context. And that's the SSR1 questions table. I'll stop there. I see that Denise and Eric both have their hands raised.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. Just want to note that [inaudible] communicated with [Matt Tigoro] that action item completed, [Matt Tigoro] will be providing a draft template [inaudible] input for the review team's consideration.

Also note that the table should include the elements that we've discussed in the past and that's on the list, so that is also the date of the answer, the owner of the answer, the estimated completion date if it's not, if it hasn't been answered and additional notes to provide context for any delay. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric?

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry, I forgot one thing, really quickly. Scott, could you please ask the travel staff to expedite their reservation? Could you also ask them to keep you apprised of their contact with the review team members? I think that will give us all insight into whether this is moving forward in a timely fashion or whether we have a problem on our hands. The longer of course we wait to make reservations, the [inaudible] review team. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I'll go real quick. I was going to hit that one, too. I think we need to have an action item for staff to [inaudible] since we're [inaudible]. But also, with the KSK roll, I don't think the wording expresses it quite right. [inaudible] phone for me to wordsmith, so I may follow that up or we may want to follow that up on the list. I think what we're saying is that the KSK is an issue and there are process concerns and there are operational concerns that we haven't had a chance to address yet and I think the comments about post mortem is that we may not have a choice, but I think the general concern was we have a consensus that there is a process concern that we have and that we would like to figure out if there's a technical concern, but we need to think through the process first.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Hey, this is Scott real quick. Just FTI, council travel was just sent out yesterday, so I assume we should be following shortly behind that.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Cool. Okay. With that, I think we're done. Thank you, all. Hopefully, the next one we'll have no technical issues, so we can focus on the work.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, Russ. Thanks, staff.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]