BRENDA BREWER:	Hello everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR2 Review Team Plenary Call #56, on January 10th, 2019 at 1500 UTC. Attending the call today is Ram, Alain, Kaveh, Russ, Naveed, Laurin, Denise, and Kerry-Ann. We have no observers. Attending from ICANN organization; Negar, Jennifer, and Brenda. Apologies from Norm, Eric, and Boban. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to state your name before speaking, and Russ, we'll turn the call over to you.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. So, the first thing is to deal with certain administrative things regarding travel, so I think Jennifer is going to handle that.
JENNIFER BRYCE:	Thanks, Russ. So the first item on the agenda, I know that we have been dealing offline with a number of our BT members regarding certain travel situations that need to be resolved, so thanks for your patience as we continue to resolve those. But we just wanted to take a moment on the call here for anybody to raise any issues regarding either their Los Angeles face-to-face meeting or Kobe meetings in terms of flights.
	With regards to the hotel for the LA face-to-face meeting, I understand that the confirmation e-mails haven't yet been sent, but they should be coming out shortly. As I said, I think before the holidays the hotel will be [inaudible]. And so, I'll pause there, and I see Kerry-Ann has her hand raised, and anybody else who's having any issues that we should be aware of, please let us know. Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi everybody, can you hear me? Can you hear me, hello? Okay, perfect. I just sent an e-mail, we had a last-minute change in our office, and I have to be in Geneva the week of L.A. I was to fly back in order -- I was coordinating with ICANN staff to be able to fly back from that trip and go straight to L.A., but we have a last-minute meeting that was confirmed with the [inaudible], but I have that changed with my boss, so I will be able to attend L.A., but I'll participate over the weekend remotely because I'll be home by the weekend. But I've gotten a passport and I'll be -- the staff [inaudible] my passport, I have to renew it over the holidays. I'll be confirming the Kobe trip.

I told my boss if I miss this face-to-face, I have to be at the next [inaudible], so I'll be confirming the Kobe trip this weekend, just to make sure I lock it in so he can't change his mind on anything. So, I just wanted to apologize to the team in advance and to assure you that I'll participate as much as possible on the weekend remotely, and I will make sure that I am in the next face-to-face meeting, regardless of what other changes may happen internally in the office.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks Kerry-Ann, and I see Alain has typed in the chat, "I will not attend Kobe and have informed the travel team." So, we have a hand raised so we'll take it, but everybody else's issues I think that was via e-mail, and I'll move on quickly to agenda item 1B; we've been working with the leadership team to pull together attendance data for the review team up to date. And we had promised that we would circulate

this to the list ahead of this call but unfortunately, we've had some staff absences this week and haven't been able to do that, so the update for you all is that we're working on pulling the statement together and expect it to be there, to go shortly. I don't know if Russ or anybody else wants to add more context to that one before I move on to item 2?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure, this is Russ. It was pointed out to the leadership team that some of the team members have not participated since the resume after the pause, and so we wanted to take a look at the actual data, who's been participating, who hasn't, so that we could bring it to the team and talk about what, if anything should be done at this point. I think that's it. So, the next thing is the Doodle poll, which is also Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Russ. So, the Doodle poll, if you all remember for those of you who attended the call before the holidays, the review team had discussed potentially meeting in May after Kobe, that would be a face-to-face meeting, and they're going to add that to the agenda for the face-to-face meeting in January for discussion to see whether or not the review team feels like our face-to-face meeting in May would be reasonable or needed. So, we're going to send a Doodle poll before the end of the week to just check if everybody is available to lend that time so that we can just get a step ahead in terms of planning, because as we all know, it takes a while in these meetings to be able to be planned, so please keep a look out on the Doodle poll. And it's just to emphasize the review team feels like things will be needed in May, which will be

EN

discussed in further detail at the January face-to-face meeting. With that, I'll pass it back to Russ unless there's any questions, thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is Russ, one follow-up on that, we don't know whether we'll need a meeting in May, but if we do, then we want to try and get it on everyone's calendar. If we don't, then we won't waste everyone's time going ahead and holding a meeting, we don't have an agenda for. So, it really depends whether we have a document out for comment by the community and what those comments are at the time where that meeting would come about. Anyway, that's the idea. I see a comment from Kerry-Ann; are we able to do individual outreach? Are you talking about dialing out to someone, or are you talking about during the Kobe meeting? I'm confused Kerry-Ann. Why don't you talk to us?

BRENDA BREWER: While she's trying to get her audio on TC, did the Doodle poll go out? I'm trying to find it in my e-mail, maybe I missed it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, it's going to come out between now and the end of the week.

BRENDA BREWER: Oh, okay, thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry-Ann, we're not hearing anything. My display shows she's not muted, but I'm not hearing anything, either.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Maybe send an e-mail to her, she may be unavailable, I know that she can hear, but it looks like she's muted, or not speaking, I'm not sure but it seems she's not speaking at the moment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so let's turn to the Google Doc. We have a couple of entries, but I must say that I'm quite disappointed at the amount that's still blank. I had hoped that the vast majority of these would be at a point where we could go through and sort it out, the final text, and be done with this by the end of today, but clearly that's not going to happen. We have no text yet for recommendations 1, 2, or 3. 4 we talked about before the holiday break. 5 is still empty, 6 we did before the holiday break, 7, 8 are still blanks, we have some early text from Laurin for number 9, but it's not in the same three buckets as the other recommendations. Laurin, can you tell us what you're thinking and what, "Early" means? Laurin, now that you want to talk, can you? I see muted on your little icon.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, this is Laurin, can you hear me now?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can hear you now, yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, I'm very sorry about this, but I'm constantly looping, so I'm connecting in, it looks fine, and then it throws us out. Essentially with the recommendation 9, I had a little stab at it yesterday while travelling between Europe and the US, so apologies for length and so on. But what I was thinking of, which I thought would be a good thing to raise on the call, in general is; what is our idea of the general length of the assessment?

Because I've wrote like a paragraph, well, two paragraphs, that essentially contain the general idea where it's a bit like the other one that I discussed before, which is essentially we can see that they have undertaken steps training staff. They have pursued organizational certification, but this whole clear road map idea, having it compared to [inaudible] providing an idea of why are we doing this, why are we pursuing that is not present. And essentially then should, if it's all relevant obviously, it is from my point of view, and then we have to say, well, in addition to doing these things, they have to follow a strategy, they have to integrate a variety of best practices in this sphere, what should be done and shouldn't be done and so on.

My question though is; how much detail do we generally want, knowing that we have very different recommendations. Sometimes we might need more text, sometimes we might neglect text, but what's our idea as a team in general? Like, half a page, page, what's the general gist of the length that we're going for? Kind of think about; well, if it's too long, people won't read it. If it's too short, there might be detail missing, so I'm just wondering what the general idea is?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I find it a little bit humorous that this is coming from you, since you wrote the first one, right? Which was recommendation 4, right? Which, was roughly two or three paragraphs, right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Exactly, but that one was very clear, it was just like, there should be a document where the stuff is located, and it should be complete, and so, the reasons why I think that one should have been a bit special because it was very straightforward, so that's why I'm wondering what our ideas are. To look at KC's for example, there is a lot of text, this is maybe because it's still in trail mode, KC might be able to say more about this, and it just might be needed. So, I'm just trying to get an idea what the team thinks of that.

KC CLAFFY: I'll tell you what I think, I think -- this is KC. I think it should be as long as it needs to be, or as short as it can be, rather. I think some recommendations are going to have more content than the others. Then we think, "Well this one wasn't even written right, or we don't even know how to evaluate this," and I hope we can be real short about those. And there's some degree of that in the two that I reviewed, but I also think that, and I don't mean to be self-centered about it, but I feel like the two that I reviewed are pretty central to the rest of what's going on when you evaluate SSR2 activities at ICANN, that is; what are the advisory committees doing that as that is supposed to be supporting, and what is ICANN doing?

So, I did feel like I wanted to be as comprehensive as I could be, but I'm happy to have other people say, "We don't need all this text, cut it down into two sentences that are needed." I don't think anybody has said anything about my text. Like, nobody said anything about the previous text that I wrote that I want a discussion of. So, sorry there's a little bit of frustration in my voice that I guess I share with Russ, that, I'll just say it; I don't think this team is functional right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I see a plus one from Denise in the chat. Since I suspect most of you are staring at the Google Doc., anyone else want to offer comments on the size? I think we need to be flexible and adjust to the content that's needed on the recommendation, shooting for a page-ish on the ones where we need to, and of course, we have different font sizes which make that even harder. That I'm sure we could get staff cleaned up at the end. Anyone else? I see hands from Laurin and Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Laurin, do you mind if I go first, I'm kind of just sat in between meetings; I just stepped out to just say something quickly.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Kerry-Ann, please go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Go ahead?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry-Ann, go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: KC, I feel your frustration as well. One of the things I was thinking about this week is, I don't mind sitting with somebody, probably next week, because my work load doesn't kick in fully in gear until that next week from now when I'm going to be on the road again. I don't mind sitting with someone to just undertake the clean entire text and just to clean the entire text and just prepare something on SSR1. I think it is taking up too much of our time so far, and we still have our own review to do. We've spent a lot of time on trying to finalize SSR1 review of that review, and I think it's time to just clean the text and then just undertake to send back to everyone for final review of a full document.

I don't mind speaking with someone, as I said, anyone who is close to me, or we can try to take a bus to each other, and just sit that day and just write and look at the text that persons have already inputted, the research that was done, and just conclude on some paragraphs that can be critiqued by the entire team, or tear it apart, but I think we've spent enough time on SSR1, and I think we need the chairs, co-chairs to kind of close off on SSR1 now and move onto our own review.

I too have been lapsed in getting in, but just like KC, 27 I've had put a comment previously and even a discussion that I don't think we need a full review of 25/26, because we recognize that 25, 26, 27 are related and the work that Boban would have done before related to that, the findings are in the text, so I had done a draft to reflect the findings.

But as I said, the offer is here for next week, we're going to have to sit with anyone who is just willing to do the work and get it done, and then the members that have not been as active, to probably do individual outreach to them from the chairs and co-chairs to kind of get them to review the document, finalize on SSR1 and move onto the other topics we have heard. We've slowed down significantly, not just because of the holidays I think, but I think because persons are probably not as energized as they should be for whatever reason. But, just to say that, that's my recommendation in terms of how we can just get this done. So, the offer is there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you for that offer. Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, this is Laurin. Thanks for kind of confirming what I was thinking about [inaudible]; second, with the recommendations, so I will essentially until next week provide a draft for all the ones that I'm on, and e-mail people that are with me on that, hoping that they will contribute as well. I'm sorry for not having them as much as I wanted to, but huge travel this week, it was just not doable.

And I think like the most important point is essentially what Kerry-Ann raised, which is that we need to think about how we can kind of finish this up. I have the same feeling; the longer we dwell on the SSR1 issue, the more problematic it will get, because I think everyone is fed up, and the longer we take, the more people will kind of drop out, shut off, etcetera, etcetera.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: Kerry-Ann phrased it like; let's finish this week and get onto our own review. My understanding is that this is a required part of our own review. We're not just making up extra work for ourselves, is that right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is right.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, I just want to- so, the people who decided this isn't worth their time, they're deciding that SSR2 is not work their time, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin and Denise, I see hands? I don't know whether Laurin is an old one? Yep, okay, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: I took Kerry-Ann's comment to mean that we spent a huge amount, substantial amount of our time on SSR1 implementation, which is a core part of our job, but we have two other major work areas that the group has defined for ourselves, and in terms of our work plan and timeline, I agree with Kerry-Ann that we should, and think we need to make a push this month to wrap up our first draft as the SSR1 implementation

assessment, and turn our attention to the other work stream that the team wants to tackle. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY: Okay then, I do think that given that folks have had a couple months here that the leadership has -- I'm sorry to throw this on the leadership, and this is more or less what Kerry-Ann said, you guys just assume that everything that's in the rough draft document is final, and just go edit it and let's publish it or whatever, let's just stay clear. I think at this point, we're not going to get anything more out of the rest of the team; they have spoken.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, that's an interesting approach. There is still two that are blank in there from Scott, in the data mining collection document. Scott, are you able to tell us the status on that?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Hello?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I heard a whisper.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Can you guys hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can now.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Okay, there we go. So, I updated one of them yesterday, because it was about the vulnerability disclosure. That has been a very slow-rolling process within ICANN staff. So, that one was updated yesterday. I can take a look at the other one, was it two still left or one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, you had two that we were waiting for, mid-October-ish as I remember.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I must have missed one, because I thought I went through the document and everything is good, but I'll take a look at it again today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right, if you could get those pounded out by the end of the week, or early next, that would be great.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does anyone think that the approach that KC just suggested is not the right one? Denise, is that an old hand?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I think that I need to digest that and think about what it means in terms of workload for the leadership team. I would like to, on this call, go through other parts of contributions and see if there's any point where there's some disagreement? So, Laurin, we were talking about recommendation 9, do you think you got the information you need to flush that out?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin speaking. I wrote this up as a basic starting yesterday. I'll reach out to Scott and Boban right after this call just to see what they would like to see added, or if they think it's all right. But, in addition, obviously everyone who thinks I forgot something important right now, please just go in and add it.

But again, I think in general, it is quite clear that as I mentioned before, we do have some evidence of some stuff having happened in the direction of that recommendation; it has not been completed in the way that the recommendation text kind of wanted to be completed, and there is very little question about it in my eyes, so please everybody, if you disagree, if you think something else should be written, let me know.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I would like to turn to recommendation 15 for a moment. The way I read the one sentence that was put here was that people think we should just point to that one document and say, "Did it have the intended effect? Yes. And, is it still relevant? Yes." But no further work is needed. Is that correct? I think all three people who were working on this are on the call, could one of you speak? Go ahead.

NOORUL AMEEN: This is Noorul Ameen, I just added the genetic document for [inaudible] reporting for genetic one. I don't know the current status of any of the disclosure reporting [inaudible] available with ICANN for [inaudible]. We could add some text regarding that, and if we can [inaudible] that information, it would be useful. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, that was my reaction to the URL that was given; it's one from 2013, I would think that if it had the intended effect that was it, and nothing has happened in five years, that would seem like more is needed. Okay, anything else to be captured here? Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin speaking. I think it always makes sense to have a little bit of text at least, and I think it would make sense, especially what Noorul just said, maybe again, write a paragraph describing, okay, this is what's happened, this is the outcome, so that someone who is reading this document, that if I was to read that, I would want just a line, "Yeah, it happened," to make that point at that level, just like a two, three

sentence one so you can see, this is the recommendation, this is what has been done, this is the evidence I can provide, we're happy with this. Done. I think that would, in general, all of those where the answer is very clear, we should have, from my point of view, like two or three sentences.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But I think there's more to say than that, since it hasn't been touched since 2013.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, absolutely, so I would personally kind of say, well, if it hasn't been touched since 2013, we definitely have to think about it a lot more, but I'm not holding pen and I have not researched that one, so I'm not going to infringe on that territory, because I simply don't see myself having enough knowledge to comment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The next one I want to talk about is 23. KC, we talked about this a little bit right before the holiday break, but there's still some places where you say, @@not clear status. Are those places where you need the input from the team?

KC CLAFFY: Well, really, I did some digging around with SSAC, I got SSAC and ICANN staff to go find some other not well documented URL's about this DSSA thing. It's a weird history. There is a couple of reports that we didn't

get provided by ICANN about DSSA, but it has some sort of mysterious [inaudible] associated with it, where there's a "final report" that talks about a bunch of future work that will be done, the next phase, and then there's nothing after that, there's no history after that.

I wound it all the way down to [inaudible] at ICANN staff who said he believes, he said, "It's my understanding that these things were folded into ICANN org operations," whatever that means; it was all about risk management. And then, I never got a follow up from that. Now, this sort of goes to my -- I had asked the leadership team if we should set up a time to talk to SSAC about their view of whether enough resources were provided for them to do their job, and whether they think -- you know, anyway, their view of that recommendation's assessment, and I'm still kind of waiting.

I thought maybe we could talk about it on this call, whether that's something that we think a large or significant number of people on the SSR2 review team would like to participate in such a call, or they want me to do it as a member of SSAC and come back and report back, or they don't think that's appropriate to do it at all? I'm happy any way.

Well, I think we should do it in some way, I think I would be unhappy if we decided it wasn't appropriate to talk to SSAC or RSSAC at all, but I don't really need to be doing this on my own, if anybody else wants to help. So, that was my thought, but other than that in terms of the DSSA thing, I can just remove the @ signs and call it done, because it's not really at all clear what to say, and there's only so much time we can spend on this, so open it up for comment.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, thanks. I would suggest KC that we get a couple of volunteers, a few volunteers from the new team and reach out to the prospective chairs of SSAC and RSSAC, tell them we'd like to have a conversation about this recommendation and bring the results of that back for the team and incorporate the piece. To me, I'm happy to help you with these conversations.

KC CLAFFY: That's great. And it could be that we decided we should wait until Kobe, but I'd just as soon have that conversation earlier, set up a separate phone call for that, and I already talked to the chair of SSAC and he's happy to try and help coordinate that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is there anyone else who wants to join that call? I'm hearing Denise, and KC will do it. And Laurin has his hand up.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, this is Laurin, I wrote in the chat, people haven't seen, that I'm happy to join in as well, [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay, so Laurin, Denise and KC, have their hands up for that, is there anyone else? Alain says he would like to join as well. And Scott, okay good. All right, so that's certainly plenty to ask them whether they're getting enough budget and understand what their needs are that are not being met, if that's the case. Okay, so KC you put a lot of work into 24 since after the holidays I guess, can you walk us through that?
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah. Sorry, I was needed. This one I also find a little harder for [inaudible] security office, so I'm just kind of mentally substituting OCTO for that, because that's what they clearly decided. And the public org. chart of OCTO is a little weird, because there is a security team under OCTO that seems to have two people on it, John [inaudible] and then there's two people I've never heard of, and one seems to be an outreach person, so all that stuff is in there.

There's another thing that might be worth talking to SSAC about this recommendation in particular, because I know there's been some tension because I was part of it this year about what role each of these bodies and other bodies who play with the spoken evaluation of [inaudible] KSK roll, and it's still ongoing with the whole new gTLD thing and of course that has been ongoing for years, in terms of risk assessment and risk management, and really the search and data analysis.

So, I sort of wrote about what I could find publicly available, but I think there is an open question that will come in our next phase of; what do we think the role of that organization is inside of ICANN? I think we'll

probably expand beyond CSO to OCTO in general, which I think is what SSR1 would have written about, had it existed at the time. And like, who picks their tasking, and who evaluates their tasking? Because my assumption at the moment at this phase was ICANN board, or the board technical committee or something like this, and it's not obvious to me that that's working, let's put it that way. Or, that that's even the right thing to begin with. That's all I've got.

Oh sorry, that's not; there's one more thing, which is the -- and on this point, I talked to somebody who used to work for ICANN based in [inaudible] who spent a lot of time in OCTO trying to build data analysis platforms and sort of bring more transparency to the space of DNS abuse. And while I talked to him it sort of occurred to me, and also in previous conversations with, or reading all the material that was presented to SSR2, there seems to be a lot that OCTO has done, most notably this DAAR stuff that's presented a few times and there's some third-party recommendations, but their position is that they, because of the way they negotiated all these contracts with the data feeds, and all of that data is proprietary, and they can't really share it with community or with SSAC, because I know SSAC has been interested also.

But it's not clear to me what's the public impact of that data, or all of the data-oriented projects included the metrics project, the internet health report, and that health indicator of things. If all of that data is inside ICANN, and maybe that's fine, maybe that's appropriate, but there seems to be a gap between building all these platforms and having something that is having some impact on the community, and maybe it's just that we don't know, but even that is a problem, so that's the latter part of my comment in there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, that question would lead to one of two things; either a recommendation about something being publicly produced, or it would lead to a place where we want to dig deeper, and I'm not sure what you're asking.

KC CLAFFY: Open for discussion. I don't know. I mean, obviously as they said, the current -- I don't' know, we should take each project specifically, but I think that I remember during SSR1 there was a lot of angst over assigning or expanding ICANN's mission to include more research, and I wonder what the current view is of that, because it sounds like at the same time they get preferences for the work they do for SSR activities, so I just feel like I don't have a good handle, and I couldn't find anybody else who felt they had a good handle on what is on this very recommendation, what are the roles and responsibilities of OCTO, and how does the community know that they're being met?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, it sounds like you're calling for a recommendation for greater transparency, and Laurin has its hand up.

KC CLAFFY: That would be fair. Maybe incomplete, but fair.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin speaking. This is like a real kind of topic point more than a writing point. It appears to me that with a lot of recommendations, we see the following: here is the recommendation, ICANN org has done some things, but has not truly addressed the recommendation. However, we do see that they would put OCTO, we know they're doing, like, really interesting, really good stuff, etcetera, etcetera. So, and I'm just wondering how we would address that, and I think Russ, you already kind of said we should probably have a simple recommendation on that, and I would agree with that kind of thing.

What you need to do is to establish some form of strategic plan, or something like that and these things have to relate to each other, because right now it seems to be that like, different parts of the organizations do something, which sometimes is good, but the overall kind of mission here or strategy is kind of the same thing I saw when I looked at the certification stuff yesterday. Like saying you're happy, yes, but there's no clear plan. It's not clear how it works with the organization, so I think we should probably make a note to impress that in the future. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think what you're saying Laurin, is we need to say, "Some good things have happened, those should continue, but it didn't fully meet the intent, there's more good things need to happen."

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes Russ, this is Laurin, and I think that for me, at least from my perspective, the main point is that what is really missing is that there is

a central and functional way this is being communicated and integrated. So, when we look at things like management framework and stuff like that, there is usually a kind of starting point. You integrate all the stuff you do into that, you say how it applies, who is in charge, all these kinds of things, and that is effectively not happening. Which doesn't mean that nothing is being done for security, and think this is what I would say is really necessary so that it is trackable.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, does my thought, and maybe others have a contrary opinion that that overview coordination is going to be something we're going to want to draw out as part of the ICANN SSR recommendations that we're going to write of our own. Not to say that we don't play the feed about that here, but I don't think that it's a follow on SSR1 recommendation to call for that, because you're talking at actually something that falls across several of the SSR1 recommendations.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, exactly, that is my intentions. To kind of say, "You will see this in a lot of these recommendations, and that's why we are writing one of our own." I just wanted to kind of make that point, because it applies here, and make sure we're coming back to this later on, that's all.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's a couple of places where we've done that and said instead of putting a recommendation in the SSR1 section, we put a forward pointer to this, and made recommendations about this in the

subsequent section. KC, did you get what you wanted here, I'm not sure?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I'm pretty much declared done on these two, and I can go over what I said and stuff, but I think the rest of it can be covered in the next phases of what we…Laurin and I can talk to the side, he sent an e-mail asking for clarification, but we can move on.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Kerry-Ann, is there anything that you want to talk about, about the recommendation 27?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, I can hear you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. Questions about recommendation 27, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, she put some comments in the document off to the side, and I was wondering if you wanted to talk about them?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Well I have wanted to suggest to the review team was that recommendation 25, 26, when we had the last meeting to discuss them, we recognized that they all were related to risk management. I know we had some, I guess, counter reviews in terms of whether or not they could be addressed as one review and just have comments on a risk management framework and whether or not it was in existence, whether or not it exists, what was meant by comprehensive, non-comprehensive.

So, my suggestion was, instead of trying to do similar comments for 25, 26 and 27, was to have a paragraph or two or three that addresses 25, 26, 27 as a whole. And, if everything is okay with that, I could add additional text to what I included last night inside recommendation 27.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Why don't we put a small little bit of text in 25 and 26 that says, "25, 26 and 27 overlap, so we put all of our findings and recommendations in 27?"

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'm okay with that if the team is okay with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not seeing any hands. I'm not seeing any chat. Does that mean people are fine with that? I'm not hearing anyone say otherwise, so let's go that way, Kerry-Ann. And, you have another comment about source for quotes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: There was just a reference that we did not need to be in it.   Risk management in terms of support and working group that was convened I think in 2011, or 2013, and I was wondering if anyone remembered why we didn't reference that?   I know Boban is not on the call, I don't know if anyone else remembered why we never made any reference to that report in terms of the risk management framework.

I've put a link to the report, which has that final comment from the public, etcetera.   But I couldn't recall us ever discussing it, so I don't know if I missed a call that could have raised it and if we should refer to it in that paragraph as one of the things that ICANN org. has done in relation to a risk management framework.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It seems to me that referencing it is the right thing to do, but again, it hasn't been updated for five years.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, in terms of it existing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And having been stated as work.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct. I'm not seeing anybody --

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'll update the text accordingly then.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not seeing anybody suggest otherwise, so, makes sense. Okay, there's a little bit of text that I don't understand in recommendation 28, I'm not sure who put it in. But, two of the three people on that one are on the call. Noorul or Scott, did you put this text in? Noorul, go ahead?

NOORUL AMEEN: This is Noorul Ameen for the record. I think recommendation 24 and 28 are somewhat related, and [inaudible] information, because the office of the CPO is responsible for coordinating incident information and containment process with appropriates agencies and instant response process, instant management issues. These are somewhat related, and that's why I've added the same text in 24, so thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Perhaps then you should take the approach that Kerry-Ann is going to take and put, say, these two overlap, and that you're only going to write the three-part in one place, does that make sense? I see Noorul is typing. Well, I'm not hearing anyone object to that approach, so why don't we go with that direction. Kerry-Ann says that's fine with her.

Okay, Noorul, the next couple of days could you put text in the document then? Okay, he says he'll do that.

Okay, I want to turn to the next agenda topic, we only have a couple of minutes left, but the leadership team on Monday will be talking about the agenda for the meeting in LA. It seems to me that we need to talk about the other two big slugs of work that we need to get done, and I was wondering if people had any suggestions for the leadership team about organizing that work. Noorul, you have a hand up?

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands. And he said that hand was for recommendation 28. All right, I guess you're leaving it to the leadership team to organize the work then, that's how I'm taking it. They have no thoughts that you want to share at this time. If you have any over the weekend, please drop me a note, we'll be having that call Monday morning.

Okay, is there any other business someone wants to raise in the last two minutes? Okay, Jennifer, do you want to take us through the action items and so on?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Russ. Sure, I have a number of action items associating two members to complete a Doodle poll for the potential face-to-face meeting in May once the poll has been circulated through the list. Scott's taken the action item to input text for SSR recommendations 17 and 18. KC and Scott will have a discussion with RSSAC regarding recommendation 23. Team members to volunteer if they want to participate, and KC will talk to [CROSSTALK].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Excuse me, Jennifer, I think it's SSAC and RSSAC.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, thank you. Next action item, Kerry-Ann to input text [inaudible] text for recommendations 25 and 26 is contained within the text of recommendation 27, and Noorul will do the same regarding recommendations 24 and 28, and then the leadership will develop a draft agenda for the face-to-face meeting and team members to e-mail any suggestions over the weekend to [inaudible] or the leadership. And any other edits or anything I missed, please let me know, thanks!

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I think that's it then. Thank you and we have to find a way to energize this team and get the work done. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]