
ABU DHABI – SSR2 Review Team Face-to-Face Meeting - Day 2
Friday, November 03, 2017 – 09:00 to 17:30 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: November 3rd, 2017, SSR2 Review Team Face-to-Face Meeting Day 2 in Capital Suite 1. Starting time is 9:00.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi. I'm Denise Michel. We'll go ahead and get started. I'd like the SSR2 members and staff to introduce yourselves, and then we'll go around to other participants. Can you start us off, please, Noorul?

NOORUL AMEEN: This is Noorul Ameen, SSR2.

ŽARKO KECIC: Žarko Kecic.

DENISE MICHEL: And Denise Michel.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric Osterweil.

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.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar.

GEOFF HUSTON: Geoff Huston.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Jennifer Bryce, ICANN staff.

STEVE CONTE: Steve Conte, ICANN staff.

JENNIFER BRYCE: And in the chat we have Matogoro, he says he's representing ALAC to SSR2, and he'll be participating remotely today.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you. So the agenda previously circulated has been blown up, so to speak, so we're creating a new one a bit on the fly. We have a letter from the SO and AC Chairs that's being displayed in the Adobe chat room that gives us official direction

for our meeting today, and our agenda will essentially flow from that.

Hang on just one second, [let me try.] Can you scroll down a little bit or give me scroll rights, please, Jennifer? There we go.

So we will address the selection, sort of skills to support the SO and ACs' consideration of selection and membership of the team, and also the scope that we have in terms of reference for the Review Team. Then we have reviewing the input and discussions from this week from our outreach meetings, and agreeing on some next steps that flow from that. So that's our proposed agenda for today, and as part of that, we also want to continue a discussion we had with the team a couple days ago in discussing some of the issues that have been surfaced around team dynamics, processes, objectives and things like that. So those are the core issues that we want to address today.

Does anyone have any comments or suggestions around that? Hearing none, we'll go forward with those objectives today.

I also wanted to note that there may be some SO and AC Chairs stopping by, I think in particular SSAC Chair wanted to come by, probably around 9:30 to talk more about the skillset issue, so I think that'll be a really useful stepping-off point for that part of our agenda. And with that, I think I'll turn it over to Eric to start

our first general discussion, and then we can spend that when Rod Rasmussen walks in to listen to his input on skillset.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thanks, Denise. Yes, and so just to kind of underscore that with some of the things that Denise said, in the chat room you all can see that the letter is there. Obviously, it might be a bit difficult to read right there, but hopefully everyone's seen it or is in possession of it at least, and actually before we start, I just want to – sorry, we skipped an administrative. Any updated Statements of Interest? Okay. Yes, sorry to have skipped that.

Yes, so like Denise said earlier this week, among other things we had a team meeting, and we discussed team members' perspectives. And I think we unfortunately ran a little short of time, and I feel like it's possible that we have more that we could say. So I think Denise and I wanted to hear from people in the team the extent to which you have other thoughts. More specifically, I think we wanted to sort of focus up sort of the general question of what everyone's perspective was, and if anybody has any thoughts on what they would like to see different.

Not so much – I think what we talked about was things that we thought we wanted to see that were different. I'm more asking, does anyone have any thoughts on how they would like to see

things done differently? And we don't have to dwell on this, it's not like everyone should feel compelled to say something. I think everyone on the team I felt like gave really good feedback before, so don't necessarily feel like you need to regurgitate it or feel like you have to say something. But I think Denise wanted to make sure the air was as clear as we could make it. So if you're all amenable to that, I'd like to start going around the room, and feel free to pass.

But Noorul Ameen, do you mind just kicking us off if you have any thoughts, anything that you see that we're doing that you'd rather see done differently, or something that you wish we'd do. I just want to make sure that you all have a chance to say something, you can say – you're good. Yes, I just want to make sure we finish because we ran out of time. So I just want to make sure as far as, do you have any thoughts? Okay. Žarko.

ŽARKO KECIC:

Yes. The past week was hard for everyone over here, and I would like just to give my thoughts about that. I think that the reaction from the Board and ACs and SOs was bigger than it should be. I don't see our work as a disaster, and Geoff, can you help me with that? You had one [phase] set to failure or something like that. I agree on most you said past this. I don't agree on that, because we did some small mistakes that led to this.

Specifically, I want to say that we didn't react on a couple of questions and requests from Board, and SSAC wasn't involved at that moment, but we got a request from the Board just before the Johannesburg meeting to review our scope, and we just neglected that.

I don't think that this is just straightforward. I said before in a previous meeting that we should have a scope defined before we've even started, because when you give somebody opportunity to develop scope, then you cannot judge on that. You should either give scope, or leave people to do what they think. Of course, there should be some guidance, there should be some help, and I really hope that we'll work this out, and from now on we'll work closer.

I don't blame anybody, and I blame everybody, including myself, not pushing to respond to that letter from Board in regard to the scope of our work. So I hope we'll work closer with SOs and ACs and Board in resolving this problem now, and predict and prevent any other problem in those issues.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. Thank you very much, Žarko. Denise, should we just pass, or do you want to go? It's up to you. You want to go? Denise, why don't you go? Hi, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So I think just kind of general reflections in no particular order.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Let the record reflect that Denise has been given ice for her injury.

DENISE MICHEL: And I did not hurt my foot by kicking anyone, on the team or off, and I will be using it for the Scotch.

So I think we got some good suggestions as a team for communication issues. I think we need some serious discussions and agreement on roles. There seems to be a lack of clarity on roles. What the role and responsibility is to be a member of the Review Team, what the role of staff is, what the role of co-Chairs are, what the role of the rapporteurs are, what the role of the Board and the Community is. So I think it would be worthwhile to spend some time discussing that.

I think it's also important to address some foundational issues. I heard a lot of discussion that goes to process, and a lack of process. Unfortunately, we were the first community review out of the gate on the post-IANA transition ICANN, and I think we've

done the second WHOIS review a great service in taking all the bullets, and they've certainly learned a lot from us. So it's been highlighted there are a number of questions and processes that are missing. Clearly, there's some consternation and happiness about how the SO and AC Chairs and how the appointment process was handled. Not our responsibility at all.

The operating procedures that are required by the Bylaws were not complete by the time our review started. Neither was the SSR1 review that we need to spend some of our time on. There is a lack of clarity on budget and reporting, a lack of clarity on communication expectations and responsibilities. So I think a good thing that came out of this week was at the surface some disagreements, some misinformation, and importantly, some issues that I think this team needs to address.

So I think there's also, as I mentioned, a resource issue in looking at the path this team is going to follow. I think it would be worthwhile to drill down on comments made by Geoff and some discussions that we had about what's the right sort of skillset and resources that this team needs going forward as we move, hopefully, into the sort of second phase of our report. And I think getting clarity on also members of this team and their responsibility, to echo Kerry-Ann's comments. I'm also disappointed that some members of the team raised questions and criticisms outside the team they didn't actually bring to the

team first and give the team a chance to address. I think we need clarity on what the Board-appointed members' role is in the team. Is it to issue directions from the team, or is it to be a working member? I think that flows into our skillset conversations as well, and how we want the team structured, leadership and other issues around that I think are important to address as well. And of course, what we need to do to help the SO and AC Chairs address the pause issue will be a chief objective today, and getting more clarity on terms of reference and our work plan. I'll stop there, and I see that the SSAC Chair is here as well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Thank you, Denise. And Jennifer, I see Mr. Matogoro's got comments. I don't know if you want to read it or you want me to read it.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

So Matogoro is online, and his comments are, "I would appreciate if SO/ACs can build on our initial work plan draft and come up with a final work plan that have community consensus and that will better guide the team. This will avoid the control that we have seen from the Board and SSAC. More resources are needed to be allocated to the Review Team such as specific staff making sure that pending questions are answered quickly. Also,

I'd be happy to see ICANN interpretation on 28 SSR1 recommendations are in place, and key KPI to be used to assess its success."

He continues, "We need to put communication strategy in place on how to keep the community updated, as well as our constituency that we are representing. And to me, the pause will give SSR2 Review Team a better start."

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Thank you very much. I was going to pass, but I'll just jump in real quick. I wish I had sort of said this earlier, but I want to level set. I think the team has done a really good job. I think you guys have all done a really good job. I think we've had areas where we've made a lot of progress and areas where we've made less progress. I just want to let the team know that Denise and I stand side by side in being still very committed, for whatever that's worth, to the efforts that you and we are putting forward. And that doesn't mean we don't think that there's room for course correction or that we don't want to hear feedback. Clearly, we do, but I just wanted to let you guys know that our perception is that you've done a great amount of work, and it's been really good. If nothing else, the fact-finding trip to L.A. was a huge surge forward. As these things do, they sort of go in fits

and starts, and so that was one of the moments where we really came forward.

So whatever else you've heard this week, whatever else you've taken home from this week, know that we think you guys have done a great job. We still have plenty of work to do, and Denise and I stand committed, for whatever that's worth. So I just wanted to be sure everyone heard that. I sort of feel like I'd rather be in listening mode. I don't have a huge amount that I want to say about change, except that I want to be sure that we try to find a nice balance with all the perspective. So I'm going to pass it to Norm.

NORM RITCHIE:

Okay. Thank you. Well, this has been fun. Obviously, this is a big learning exercise for everybody, and because of that, we should look at what lessons we've learned. Certainly, clearer communication is going to be key for us, including carefully choosing the choice of words when we do communicate publicly. Adjectives do matter. And I think given the diversity of the ICANN community, but I'll admit myself, I probably did underestimate the importance of that, because especially people where English is not their first language may interpret thing differently than others. People who come from, let's say – not picking on anyone or anything for any reason, but let's say

government has strict meaning behind different words, whereas the technical community may use them differently. So we have to be more aware of that, I think.

The ICANN community drama I think was unnecessary and embarrassing, and I think we can all learn from that one. I'd like to thank the Chairs, by the way, and I think we should just go forward and on with it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Norm. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I will pass at this point. I would like to hear [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Come on, man. Right.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I will give comments [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's totally cool, I'm just kidding. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Thanks, Eric. Thanks, Denise. Look, there's not a lot of self-determination available to the team at this precise point in time. To some extent – and I think it's a very real extent – the letter from the SO and AC Chairs effectively says, “The team can work on resolving the issues identified and discussed before and during ICANN60 related to scope and skills.” That's a very precise kind of definition of what is current business, and the other issues are left open. If I was going to offer advice to the SO and AC Chairs at this particular point in time about what it means to restart this effort, I think there are a number of considerations that it would be helpful for them to be mindful of.

The resourcing certainly requires attention, and it's pretty clear that the large scope of this work, the level of ability of voluntary effort within the numbers that we have and the active and engaged subset of that is, to my mind, inappropriate to the scope of work. We need more folk, and that's obvious to me. Hopefully, it's obvious to the SO and AC Chairs.

Secondly, I think however you put it, this week has been a hiatus in terms of the inputs coming through, and although he is not here at this point, Boban did say on Wednesday afternoon – and I think that's reasonable – all team members should be given the opportunity during this pause to sign off from the team without rancor, without bitterness, without regret, without anything. If

they wish to leave at this point, they have made a fine contribution and that's great. And I echo Boban's [settlement].

I think there are words about staffing, and certainly as I said earlier in the week in other contexts, the level of support we get in particularly the group I'm most active in, the SSAC, is markedly different from the style of support that we get here. And I'm not criticizing the staff in this aspect, I am, I suppose, criticizing more the overall directives and what is your role inside this group. Certainly, SSAC receives considerable more support in terms of what one would call project management and development of work items that is not evident here, and I would encourage the SO and AC Chairs to look at that.

Last but not least, I think when you regroup and add more folk, naturally, the issue of leadership comes up, and I think it would be appropriate in my mind across this pause arrangement for one of the SO and AC Chairs to actually take on the interim leadership while it goes through that process of reforming and regrouping. I think then it would allow a clean slate when the group is actually back under its own steam to work from that point forward without an implicit judgment on the contributions of Eric and Denise to date. So it would make that a clearer picture.

I think that's about – oh, sorry, focus. I think however it reforms, there is a need to understand a clearer focus on what security and stability actually mean. We've discussed in general terms the differences between audit and review, the difference between assessing the capability of this, the ICANN Organization and the broader community, versus particular responses. Is this a case-by-case analysis, or is this a more broader review in terms of its scope about the capability of the organization to respond without necessarily picking up on individual items? I think any reformed team – and I assume that it is going to reform and regroup, because it's important and necessary – would take that on initially as a question about style of review. And I think if the group is able to level set on that, I think the various subject matter experts would be in a much better position to understand their inputs. What style of fact-finding is appropriate?

I support the idea of a skills audit. I think it's unclear exactly what skills are in this team and unclear what skills are required, and I certainly think that would help us all a lot to understand the particular areas that we contribute. A couple of logistic comments as well while I'm at it, because I noticed the SO and AC Chairs and Board members are here, so please take notes. The grouping into subgroups did not offer us the power of focus that we had hoped, and it necessarily divided the effort to the

extent that we're struggling to get people on the subgroup calls. I think even with a larger group, that approach was perhaps in retrospect not the most effective way of dealing with it, unbeknownst when we made the decision.

I think it's good to have folk responsible for work items, absolutely. It's not the Chairs' requirement to do all of this. But I think the idea of sort of separate groups moving forward has not been successful. I also think that many of the team members have a sense of commitment to the entirety of the work and would like to follow it, even if they can't contribute in [inaudible]. I have learned something about phone calls: make them the same time every week, that's just obvious now in retrospect. It seemed like a good idea to rotate, I was all for it, I was completely wrong. Varying phone calls in your diary, in your work plan is just incredibly difficult to track, and in retrospect, no surprise at the resultant difficulty in making a regular diary entry.

I understand you said a lot about getting face-to-face in L.A., Eric, and I think that's kind of good. But on the other hand, we have to recognize that in any large, global team, that's an awfully [begin] position again and again. Review members are already on three trips a year to ICANN meetings. Even if you schedule two more a year, in anyone's workload that starts to get an enormous amount of travel [up.] I think no matter how

this works, we have to make better use of the regular calls to substantially progress work, because relying on intermittent face-to-face with intermittent attendance, and all the issues of jetlag and everything else I think simply makes it a tough job all the tougher, despite the fact that as I said, you did have a positive feedback from one of the face-to-faces. But I don't think in general, that's the best way a diverse group like this can make progress, and we shouldn't really upon it.

I've spoken probably enough. I think that's actually a pretty clean brain dump anyway, so thank you. And as I said, I hope the Board members and SO and AC Chairs were listening, because primarily, I think as I said at the start, the ball is in a different court than with us at this point – to use a tennis analogy – and I certainly am committed personally to see this reform and regroup and progress, and I will assist in that. But I don't necessarily think we have the sole carriage of that process. As I said, we can make inputs and comments from our experience, but the court – the ball is elsewhere. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thanks, Geoff. I don't know, Steve, do you want to say anything, or is that okay?

STEVE CONTE: Yes, actually. Thanks for the opportunity on that. In the aspect that I'm both staff and involved, I'd like to speak as myself, as the staff who is involved, but not speaking for the organization. The only thing I can really add to the comments that were made here is actually to reach out and address the SO/AC Chairs and the Board, and reflect that there's been – since the L.A. meeting, the face-to-face meeting for ICANN SSR and the meeting last Friday, there's a significant amount of momentum, and a significant amount of energy. And I personally would – recognizing that a pause will certainly – some of that momentum and energy will deplete, but I feel that the team was in a really energetic mode, and I'd like to see if we can get this resolved quickly and not lose that momentum, that energy and that dedication that this Review Team has, and that we can get back on track and so utilize the expertise that we have on this Review Team. That's really all I have. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks a lot, Steve. Noorul, [inaudible].

NOORUL AMEEN: I would like to congratulate and thank Steve for his remarkable comments, because I also have the same experience and comments. As I expressed two days back, I felt like that the team was in a good momentum after the L.A. meeting, and last Friday

the meeting – I followed the reports, and the pause has created a kind of problem in the positive forwarding of team efforts. That is [the only comment] I have.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks a lot. Yes, Denise, please go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I would echo your remarks, Noorul, and also thank the staff that has been in the trenches with us the last many months. Each community Review Team is very different. We have vastly different objectives and subject matter to address, and in particular this one being the first one post-transition and having a huge amount of work to review from the first review, it has been challenging to find the right sort of skillset and processes and ways forward. But I definitely want to acknowledge the support and hard work of the staff that's been with us, and also to echo your comments of substantial progress has been made, clearly not communicated in the right way to all of the community, but we definitely had a very strong sense of a path forward in that really important topic area that we addressed in L.A., and definitely pushed off track by the Board letter, which was quite surprising. As I've said, I would have expected some discussion from SSAC as a team before they sent that letter to the Board. I would have expected more Board conversation with

the team before the Board sent that letter. At the very least, I would have expected the Board to say, “Okay, SSAC. You’ve articulated some general problems with the SSR2 Team. You should talk to the SSR2 Team and see what you can surface in particular, and what you can work through as teams. That would have been, in my mind, an appropriate response.

Another appropriate response would have been, “SSR2, we’ve been alerted to some issues. You have X days to assess them, address them, and respond back to the Board with a report.” I can think of many ways to do a course correction, raise concerns, ask us and the community to deal with them rather than a Board letter suspending the first independent community review. But I’m all about moving forward, and I think we should give Matogoro and some other team members an opportunity to make some remarks and then perhaps move on to SO/AC Chair contributions.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yes. I just want to do a quick check. So I have Kaveh, and I think Mr. Matogoro has comments, but I kind of lost track of where they start at. Maybe Jennifer can help me out with that. But Kaveh, and then I’m in queue after that.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. First of all, I think I agree with most of the comments that we learned a lot from this whole process, all of us. To address directly what Denise brought up, the modality of – yes, obviously, there were multiple possible courses of action. But again, there is this diversity as well, and diversity at work means that there are multiple different opinions. Within the Board, we went through different scenarios, and we think – and I think we still think – we selected best course of action to be able to mitigate all different range of issues.

I'm not going to argue for that. I agree with Denise, let's not go back. I will definitely make sure these comments also get back to the Board for future action, and as highlighted in SO/AC Chairs' letter, they're also concerned about limits of what, where the Board can intervene or how they can make that happen. Board also has their own understanding, maybe Bylaws are not clear. That's definitely a good discussion to have, to explore more and set precedents for the future.

But yes, that was the modality of the action that was selected by the Board as the best way to move forward and resolve this issue. And now we are sitting here, all aiming to resolve. I'm very proud of the situation, the endpoint where we are now, and I have high hopes. I think we will get out of this successfully.

In general, I'm not going to comment on the specifics because from Board's point of view – and we have discussed this internally and this has been our message also this whole time – we really want success of this team, and we really don't want to steal or intervene, except if we see it's getting into line of our fiduciary responsibility. So it's going so far from the mission that we think – again, that's why we put the ball back in the court of SO and AC leaders to review our understanding of the scope. And maybe we are wrong. If they tell us, “No, you're wrong, this is completely remit of this review,” we will accept that. But this is not what we thought, this is not what SSAC thought, and that's why we gave it back to the SO and AC leaders to check.

So as long as the team adheres to the core principles of this community – and I don't think I need to repeat like openness, transparency obviously when possible, not when working with secret documents or things like that, and inclusiveness, in general and also respecting the multi-stakeholder, bottom-up model, we really don't have any other issue, again, until we think it's going to touch our fiduciary responsibility of running an effective organization or effective operation. Correct? So within that box is completely the teams and SO/ACs to control where this goes, and have a successful review. I really don't think Board wants or should intervene further than that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thank you very much, Kaveh. Jennifer, do we have anything in the chat room? I apologize, I'm not keeping completely up with that.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. Thanks for checking. Matogoro in the chat says SO/AC Chairs should react on Board reaction towards specific review and independent review. This will give a feeling that this specific review are for the community and give accountability.”

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Matogoro, and Jennifer for channeling. I just wanted to sort of touch a couple of points. I think that's a lot of great feedback from all of you. And Geoff, as usual, very insightful comments. Thank you. I think it sort of calls into question or brings up a sort of good topic in general – a couple of them.

One is I think now is a good time for us to just basically see how team members feel about continuing their level of commitment. I think that's part and parcel with looking at the staffing of the team, is how many people – I'm not saying do a straw poll right now, but I'm saying across the team, I think we should basically get an idea of what people are – where their heads are as far as [inaudible] are. Now is a good time for us to sort of see what

we're actually facing there, because to your comment, Geoff, you feel like there are maybe people who aren't on every call or they're having trouble making the face-to-faces. So that doesn't mean they don't want to be on the team. On the other hand, there are some people who may not. But I will point out that when we did do our perception audit, people on balance seem to think that the face-to-face meetings were too scarce. So I'm not judging, just looking at the data. So I just sort of represent that as just a point. And the subgroup thing, you're right, I think the team a couple weeks or a month ago, at some point recently we sort of all came to that moment as well. Was it a week ago? I think it was longer –

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, it was as closing comment from a week ago.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You probably weren't on the call, there were a couple of calls where we've been talking about –

GEOFF HUSTON: I've been on the last three calls, and we rounded it up a week ago. I've got my notes here from the meeting.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I'm quite certain – so this has been in the air for a while, Geoff, but that's fine. I just want to point out that I think we're there, or at least we were there. There's something else. Oh, yes, so just I guess I have my back to the audience. I apologize. I don't mean to be rude, I didn't realize who was there. But yes, I think one of the ideas that I heard floating was that staffing, if the team is going to be sort of reupped with new membership, one of the things that might be useful is young blood. I think in an SSR context, Geoff has sort of brought up a couple of times that he thinks we should reexamine the definitions of certain core words like security and stability. And I'm a big fan of people who come with diverse perspectives. The teams I've run before, that's usually been really good lifeblood to bring people in who don't necessarily think inside the box, and I see a lot of young blood coming to the microphone in the open sessions.

So one of the things I hope anybody who's listening considers at least is that people on the SSR team could be people who are young PhD candidates, cybersecurity, up-and-comings. They don't have to be part of sort of the known crew. And so that's just my perspective. It's not decided with the Chair hat on, but I just think that an SSR review with people who are sort of not inside the same walks is going to be very much enriched, and those people are going to be enriched by working with people

like Geoff and other people who have been around and know the territory really well.

DENISE MICHEL: If there are no further comments on these topics – and of course, we’re going to revisit them as well. I don’t know what the time constraints are of the SO/AC community members who are here. Do let us know if you’re tight on time. We have another comment from Kaveh and also from Steve, and then we’ll go to the community leaders.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So a very quick comment because we are – I think it’s good to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I’m sorry, who are you?

KAVEH RANJBAR: A very quick comment because we are looking into stuff and things come up, I think it’s good to retrospectively look into the things that I think for example that would raise attention of the Board. For example, you referred to the survey or poll which was done recently, and I really welcome that move, but again from my point of view, that doesn’t represent openness. It was done by the Chairs, it was never reported back, and with all due

respect and all the trust – it’s not about the trust, it’s about the whole process which should be visible to the outside.

When the Chairs poll basically the team over e-mail, there is no observer to that, correct? So we need transparency, and there are good reasons for this stuff. It’s not about personal trust or personal issues, it’s about the whole process. So when an outsider looks into the process, they can trust and they can see, “Okay, this has been done with due process and we can look into these results.” When you do such a thing and refer to the results, an outsider has every right to ask, “Oh, but how can I use this as reliable information?”

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Kaveh, thank you for your comment. And this is a point that I think we need to discuss more in detail, because I can tell you my perspective, you can tell me your perspective, but I think it’s important to kind of come up with a sort of metric for the team. I’ll sort of point at like democratic elections. The ballots are not open, but the calculation is. This was not even a ballot election, this was just a perception audit. It was used simply to be directional, and no serious decisions were made based off it. It was basically just a way to try and summarize the team without people having to say something in public that they may be uncomfortable with. And I understand your point. I’m not saying

it's perfect, I'm not saying we should do it again necessarily or not. I'm saying this is a point for us to decide as a team where we want our heads to be.

So you've raised this point kind of on a separate matter before about transparency, and you raised it again in your comments now, and I think it's really good. I appreciate you bringing it up. I think Denise and I both do. I do, I'll speak for myself. And I think we as a team just need to sort of get onboard with what our sort of operating procedures are around that so that we understand it going forward. But that's just my perspective.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

If I may come back to that, first of all, yes. I fully support getting that feedback, and I would actually love to see that more. So that's a very good move. But my point on transparency, this is one of the principles. I don't think this is up for discussion or for decision for the team. Especially operating procedures, they should be open and transparent. This is not the team decides, "Oh, we'll close it down." And I know for some other instances as well. Because in the word of ICANN – and as you two know and most of you here – even if you're not documented, [draw] on some usual practices. For example, leadership calls normally are attended by staff, and even sometimes there are other observers. I heard that staff were completely excluded from

leadership calls of this team, which is a strange one. It's a new – except if you have a very good reason, which should be then documented and pointed out, you shouldn't do that. This, and the team shouldn't accept that. Openness and transparency, especially in the procedures, is very important and it will stop many of these issues or many of the criticism that the team has received, because that's bulletproof evidence that, no, things have been done properly. For example, I expect in my constituency all of the leadership calls are attended by staff, and actually one other observer from the team, not from the leadership. And they're all minuted, and minutes are all submitted openly to the list.

So I'm not saying this exact process, but there should be a kind of bulletproof, open and transparent model. It's not about the leadership, that call. That was an example, correct? But I think this is something, these are principles that the leaders of this team should adhere to, and there should be no tradeoff for no reason.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Kaveh. Just a follow-up note, you're welcome to jump in. So the perception audit, again, was discussed in our open plenary call, so the results of that. We'll also put it online to make sure everyone has the questions, and again the questions

and the results. So we'll just put that on our open e-mail list. And we'll discuss going forward how to continue to get the pulse of the team, to make sure everyone feels comfortable in their own cultural ways of providing open input. The Chairs have a staff coordination call every single week, pretty much, and we can talk about the best way to do that. Those are focused on operational matters, and if the team wants those to be minuted, transcribed, recorded and published, we can talk about spending some of our time and money doing that as well. So nothing is done on this team that isn't done on the full e-mail list and transparently.

Steve is in the – I think – Eric, do you want to close out this topic? Of course, which will be revisited, and then we'll go to Steve.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Steve, do you mind? Or if you want to go first, I can wait.

STEVE CONTE: If you want to close this part out, I was going to respond to your comment about young blood, so however you want to [run it.] Okay. So recognizing that, and without comment on the skill evaluation that the Review Team might be doing, if there is an opportunity for young blood or fresh participants from the ICANN community, at the risk of having David and John yell at

me, I'm willing to offer OCTO resources, Office of the CTO resources as requested to help get them up to speed in the ecosystem, and the concept of the ICANN community, so in the spirit of energy and momentum to get them up to a place where they can contribute in a valuable way to the Review Team.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I think that's fantastic. Thank you very much. So Jennifer – I'll just jump in real quick, because I don't know if Mr. Matogoro is going to talk about this or not, but in the event he's going to go off – Kaveh, thank you very much for those comments, and I think the spirit of the team is right there with you, and my spirit is, and I think Denise's spirit. We're all right there with you, and I think what we're facing is just operationally – I mean like literally our lives are not literally all available, and if you got a transcript of anything I ever said, you'd never be able to search it all. So it's not to push back on that, we've just got to find the right mechanism. I think we recognize that what we've done is subpar, and we'll do better. [inaudible] anticipation is.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

For the record, I fully understand and agree and respect that it's the intention of everyone. I never questioned it, it's just the process and the execution.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you. Thanks. Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi. I wanted to just clarify that the staff is not excluded from leadership calls. I think Denise mentioned we have calls each week, but the records of the calls are not public at this point. And then also if I may read Mr. Matogoro's comment here, he says, "I think co-Chairs should accept Kaveh's comment and move forward. It's easy to hide names and share the findings to the mailing list.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thank you very much. So Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, and thank you all for your fulsome comments. They're very useful, and we'll definitely come back to many of the themes that were raised today. We'd like to move to – we have some SO/AC I think Chairs, representatives with us today. I'd invite them to come up to the table and provide any additional input, comments, guidance that you think would be useful for the team, and of course, first, introduce yourselves. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. I'm Chair of SSAC, Patrik Fältström, one of the SO and AC Chairs. Let me say that we are now in listening mode as [you] saw in our note. It is completely up to the team, the SSR2 Team to work out whatever issues have been raised in the various letters, and also statements and discussions before and also during ICANN60. We have asked you to at this meeting specifically focus on skillsets and topics to resolve these issues in such a way that the community as a whole agree that this is something that can move forward, and so that we as soon as possible can unpause the work and make sure that you can restart.

We SO/AC Chairs can immediately – if I haven't done my math wrongly, it has been an intense week for all of us, I might have counted wrong, but as far as we understand, we can appoint at least six new people, because I think you're 15 people at the moment. 14, okay. That's one more, so that's seven. So I didn't do my math correctly. So anyways, ultimately, you can be 21 people. I want though to – I hear that there is a discussion about what kind of appointing people here and there, just want to take to the record that formally, it's the SO and AC Chairs that actually appoint the people. Just to make that clear.

We are prepared to do so. We have among ourselves been talking about doing a skill survey. That was what we talked about a week ago, but now we see that you have started to discuss an internal skill survey, both regarding what kind of skills you have within the group, and we also understand that together with the discussion of the actual topic and topics and scoping of your work, I also understand that you initiated a discussion on what kind of skills will be needed, both within the group and also in the form of Secretariat help to actually be able to deliver on those topics.

Given that you have taken on that task, and I also understand it's easy for me to say as an SSAC Chair, but this is also why it's actually good to have incoming SSAC Chair here, Rod, who has from an SSAC perspective took the initiative of trying to help the group from SSAC perspective. Anyway, we SO and AC Chairs do see that you have stated to do that gap analysis and internal skill survey internally, and given that the group has been doing so, we believe that is excellent and we don't feel that we then from the outside should guess what you need and what skills you have. But we see that as a positive thing, and something that is absolutely necessary to do for us to even initiate a review of what new members of the group you might need. We don't even want to conclude that you do need new members, but if that is the case, I think that should be backed by, from the

group, a very clear view on what you need, and also what you believe that you already have. Some kind of self-assessment.

So what else should I say on these kind of things? I do think that some people might think that this meeting this morning that we asked would be on topics or skills have been discussing other things as well. Let me just say that personally as one of the SO and AC Chairs, I think it's perfectly alright to do retrospect and have that kind of discussion, so I want to sort of immediately, even before there are any rumors, that I'm disappointed with doing too much retrospective discussions. Let me just say that that is perfectly alright. But that said, I think it would be really good for the group at this meeting to demonstrate that you can work together, that at least you can work on a plan, work out a plan on how you're going to achieve as a result at one point in time a completed skill survey, a completed scope for the group and how you are going to come up with some kind of gap analysis.

I see there is an agreement that just like I can say from an SSAC perspective, that there's a need for different Secretariat support than what you get today – and I intentionally use the word “different” – there needs to be an agreement also there, a negotiation and discussion between staff, ICANN Org and you as the team what you actually need, and we need to ensure, and we SO/AC Chairs will help do everything we can to ensure that

you get what you want. But to be able to help, you also need to be clear on what you really want and be able to communicate with us. We are in listening mode, and everything is good [with] that.

So I think it is really important that you, as soon as possible, as soon as you individuals feel comfortable and feel ready that you're actually moving into much more structured discussion today on how you are going to move forward, sure, it might not be today that you can move forward, but that is okay. But you must, I think, try to move things on. We'll leave to Rod to comment as well if you have anything to say. Let me just comment on the admin calls as the Chair of SSAC, to explain how we are handling our admin calls.

On our admin calls, we always have staff support. We have staff support for the calls themselves as well. The calls are minuted in the form of action points, and sometimes even more detail than that. All members of SSAC are welcome to be part of the admin calls if they so wish, and both the agenda and the minutes from the calls is posed to all of SSAC.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Patrik.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Did you have a question for Patrik?

DENISE MICHEL: No, I just thanked him. Go ahead.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Hi. Rod Rasmussen if there's transcription here. I'm not sure.

DENISE MICHEL: Everything we do is recorded, and a transcript is issued.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Right, okay. I didn't have a whole lot to add to Patrik's comment, and he is the official Chair still, but I will be taking over that role. There was an e-mail earlier, I don't remember who sent it, asking if I was joining the group here. I'm not, just to be clear. As much as I'd love to, I'm going to be one of the Chairs. I don't know that that would even be allowed from that perspective. So I just figured I'd take care of that one right here.

And I just want to add a couple of thoughts on what we talked about or what Patrik was just going over on being able to add people. There has already been some discussion amongst the

various SOs and ACs about potential candidates for that already, so that is being proactively looked at. Obviously, [we] want to get the skill survey, so obviously internal skills survey, [needed] skill survey, etc. done to be able to do that, but we're proactively looking, and maybe arm twisting a little bit some candidates out there. Although I would say that we've had a couple of people within SSAC at least say, "I'm really interested in going and helping." So I think that's a positive development. My feeling that I'm hearing is that people in the community want to jump in and help make sure this is successful. So that's just a positive thing from the outside of the Review Team here.

With regard to the work for today, I think it's really important to do some of those things. We did have a little ad-hoc discussion the other day, which I think has been disseminated. The information from that has hopefully been fully disseminated at this point, and we fully disseminated what we had within SSAC as well. That ad hoc little get together was not intended to be an official meeting of any sort, but really just a, "How can we help get a few people get some ideas on the table to help make this thing work?"

From that, one of the things– and I think it's been distributed on the list – is some of the skills that SSAC had identified from our own skill survey and from polling of some of the members of SSAC as to what are some of the things you should look at. Take

that as input, that's just community input from that perspective, and you need to come up with your own. Obviously, we're just trying to help you with some advice from the outside, and that's yours to take and use as you want, obviously. But it should be pretty good advice on that front.

So I think that's something that hopefully is a pretty straightforward task and one that can be knocked out pretty quickly, and I think that's something to concentrate on. And then the other is a scoping issue, and that's a little tougher. And we had some discussion, and it was circulated around what some of those things are, but categorizing things I think is really important for moving the ball forward here, to really just concentrate on those things. Because those are the things in the Board directive, the SSAC letter and all the things that have been brought up, and really, those are the things that the SO/AC Chairs are focused on. So it really is within that scope. So our suggestion is to really concentrate on doing that today. Patrik, you look like you have something to add.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Yes, just adding on to that, let me be very specific: as one of the SO and AC Chairs, I will of course not stay at this whole meeting. This is your meeting. You're the ones who run the meeting today. But let me suggest that at the end of today, I think it

would be realistic that you actually have hammered out your solution to how to solve, for example, the skillset thing internally, that you might even have sort of something like we in SSAC propose a matrix, but you can do whatever you want so you actually have that ready, you have a plan for how to populate that table, how you're going to do the gap analysis between what you need, what you think you need and what you have.

As Rod is saying, it is much harder to do the scoping issue, but maybe you at least can have some ideas on how you're going to do that. And if it is the case, I would be really happy as one of the SO and AC Chairs if you could summarize that one to yourselves or just send me a link to that at the end of the day so you have some goal for the meeting today, so you as individuals in the group have the ability to declare that, "Success, we have actually managed to do something today." You report that to me and I'll be able to report that to other SO and AC Chairs, and that will in turn be a positive communication as a follow-up to the letter that we as an SO and AC Chair sent yesterday that I also clarified yesterday what I was thinking of doing.

So I think the first thing you should do know after I left the table is to agree on what you think is achievable today, set that as a goal, have this meeting, declare success, travel home. And given that you then send that – Rod whispering [in my ear], "What

about the response from the SO and AC Chairs?” Yes, I’m pretty sure that the more clear message is sent, the more clear message you will get back. But on the other hand, it’s really important that you’re realistic. Not all SSR2 members are here. If it is the case that you [after a] face-to-face meeting here with lots of people now the time zones that you claim some kind of consensus in the group given what you have today, I think that is something that of course by itself would be questionable. So start by talking about what you think the goal of the meeting today is and move forward. And of course, we will respond to whatever you say to us.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you very much, Patrik and Rod. I’m happy to take a queue for questions and discussion. Before you go, I actually have a couple of questions. Moving back to the scope issue, unfortunately, a lot of our outreach means meetings with stakeholder groups and constituencies and ACs and SOs. This week, there’s a lot of focus on what happened, the suspension and all of that, rather than the substance of what we do. We did get some comments, but those comments are – then we got questions. Very few specific suggestions that relate to scope, and those suggestions were not, of course, “Our stakeholder group has considered this and voted, and here’s our specific input.”

So here's my question: given that we have one specific requested change from the Board on scope, in my mind we don't have specific, "Here's where we think your scope is wrong, here's what it needs to contain, or here's what you need to delete." We don't have that granular level of input from SSAC, or I'm not sure we have actionable input from SSAC on scope.

So one thing that comes to my mind is – and it's a long way of getting to a question. In order to resolve the scope issue, what do you think about – and again, this is just me, top of the head, so we haven't discussed it at all. But it occurs to me that it might be useful for the SSR2 Team to post the scope and terms of reference that we agreed to and submitted back in early May, post it for a short public comment period, officially give the community – particularly the SOs and ACs an opportunity to consider it, and offer a public comment, hopefully that represents their whole constituency or their whole stakeholder group, and then in a more formal way, that would provide the team with additional input to consider on the scope and terms of reference. Do we have the authority, ability to do that? And I would also welcome any informal reactions you have to that. Thanks.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: I think you have the ability to use many different kinds of tools, whatever tools you find effective to be able to specify the scope of what you're going to do so it's understandable both for individual members of SSR2 Team that interact with other parts of the community, and also for other portions of the community, including ICANN Board, that pointed out some requests for clarity regarding certain words with the start of the e-mail in June last year. From an SSAC perspective, like I said at the meeting that we had between SSR2 and SSAC, one of the largest problems that we have in SSAC was the disagreement on various things in the scope.

Just by reading the mailing list, we saw disagreement also between individuals and the SSR2 Team that concerned us, so I think yes, having a discussion on these kinds scopes in the group and also more broadly I guess could help, of course. But I think that must be done in a structured manner.

In various discussions this week, there have also been detected other kind of taxonomies used that have increased the confusion, for example the difference between the words "audit" and "review" and such things which is one example that just needs more clarity.

We also talk about issues like for example the difference between doing a review according to the SSR2 specifications

and the Bylaws, and the gap analysis or specific investigation of the SSR1 recommendations which are very specific. If it is the case that the two of them are referring to review of different things, how is the group to explain that in such a way so everyone involved will accept that instead of as a default reaction say, “You’re doing the wrong thing?” I think the responsibility is on the group to communicate and express whatever you’re doing in such a way so the reaction is turned from, “You’re doing the wrong thing,” to, “Oh, hurray, you’re looking at these kind of things,” and in a more positive way. So how to do that? I really don’t know. You just have to try different ways and maybe try different communications and see what the reaction is. Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I would add to that, I’ve been picking up on a threat that Geoff Huston was talking about in his retrospective comments on the – I don’t remember the exact wording you used, Geoff, but the type of review, the level, the flavor of the review. I’m using a synonym for whatever he said before, but that is I think fundamental towards understanding, towards the scope itself. And I think that might be where there’s been the biggest point of disagreement potentially, when you’re thinking about how far to dig into an issue or how far to dig into the ICANN Organization versus other parts of the ecosystem. And having that defined

well up front, and really a sense that this is what we're going to do as an approach, is fundamental to even doing the rest of the scoping work. So I would concentrate on that first, and I would say that obviously, you're not going to do all the scoping today. That's not possible. But the main thing is to get your approach to how to get that done as feedback back to the SO/AC Chairs.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Rod and Patrik, and everyone would like to comment, which is wonderful. Žarko, what's wrong with you? So I apologize, I was listening to the speakers and not looking at the order of the queue. Does anyone know who had their flag up first?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Alright, so we have in the queue Geoff, Jennifer, Kaveh, Norm, and Noorul.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm much more confused now than when you started, unfortunately. I had a clear picture in my mind that we were in the process of being paused, and there was a small amount of

outstanding work to clear up, and then the ball was in your court, SO and AC Chairs, of which you are one or two depending on how you count, but it was really over to you at that point and we would, as team members, receive some further instruction at some point from you as to members and how to resume. But now what I hear – and what I’ve heard from Denise, actually – is this is kind of open ended. “Well, it’s going to be business as usual, we’re going to do this,” and the future tense is being used quite liberally, and it seems to stretch on and on, well past today.

And what I’m sensing in those two things is sort of a contradiction with my own expectations of what the verb “to pause” actually meant. And so in some ways, if you’re expecting the scope to be completed after it’s taken us more than nine months to wallow around in it, I think you’re just on a planet where the drugs are so good I want some too. It’s not going to happen. And realistically, I think the SO and AC Chairs need to have a certain reality check that we are where we are. And I kind of like Denise’s offer of we’ll publish what we have, but then it’s over to you.

It’s not up to us to then do a community review of the publication. It’s kind of at this point where it’s your call because we are paused. And that’s why I’m sort of searching desperately hard for clarity. Today, time available, skillset, probably make

some progress, circulate it on the list, get it done by the middle of next week even with everyone and time zones and travel. Much more than that, no. Accept what we've done, see it as what we've done, don't ask us to do in one day or seven hours what we haven't done in nine months, because it just isn't going to happen. Or if we try, Denise and Eric are right, this will go on and on, as will I. Sorry. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Geoff.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: I'm trying to comment on that, please.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, we have people who want to follow up. Patrik and Eric.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Because hopefully, my response will sort of resolve the issue, and hopefully some people won't have to say so much. So remember what I suggested that you should do today, and that is to do the skill survey to make sure that it is resolved, because I find that is doable, and then you can come up with your ideas on what are the issues with the actual scoping issue. And that to be reported back to the SO and AC Chairs, and then the ball is back

on our court. What I understood, Denise’s question was, “Oh, can we do, etc. whatever kind of thing?” That was what I’m – I’m sorry, I just tried to – it’s Friday after a very long week.

So anyways, I interpret that as something that could be discussed here after you’ve done the skillset survey. That could be one of the ideas back to us, SO and AC Chairs, on how the scoping should be resolved, not that you should actually do that. So absolutely, we’re trying to scope the work today to focus on the skills, and then... Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry, I know I’m jumping the queue, so I’ll be brief. I think this is a good opportunity since you both are here just where there are points of perception matters that should be cleared up, there’s a misconception I think in something Geoff said, that we deliberated over the scope rather heavily early on, and we’ve had it for a while. The gap analysis thing – I’m sorry, the fact-finding trip, that’s not even in the scope. That’s something completely separate that came out later. And the scope is something the team worked on collaboratively. There were minority outstanding reports on that, but it’s been in our terms

of reference since May, and it was codified before we submitted them.

I know that that doesn't undo anything that you guys have asked us to do, I just thought it was worth setting the record straight. We haven't iterated and circled on it for nine months.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. Thank you, Eric. And just to make sure that we've dispelled the FUD that seems to be going around on that, the team operates by consensus. We had a strong consensus. It wasn't 100% unanimous, but a strong consensus on the scope and terms of reference that were submitted to the Board on May 3rd. So we have not been working on our scope and terms of reference for nine months. That said, if there is direction – which there may be from SO and AC Chairs that we need to revisit the scope and terms of reference, ultimately I think we do work at the pleasure of the community, so that direction would be helpful. I have Jennifer in the queue next.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks. I also want to note that Alice Jansen is in the Adobe room, she would like to be added to the queue. I'll read Mr. Matogoro's comments that have been there for a while. He's saying he supports Denise's idea. "The staff can help on the

work plan. The staff can help to put the draft that we have in a format that is required, and make it public for comment.” Thank you. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. In general, I agree with what [Geoff] said, but to add to that, I think there’s also the natural or physical order to this thing as well, because if the team agrees – and this is what I heard multiple times, also from SO and AC leaders – is there needs to be a serious look at the composition and the skills within the team. So before addressing that, and before, for example, getting new members, whatever adjustment that’s acceptable by the SO and AC leaders and adopted by the team, looking into scope or any of their work will be at least excluding them. So that’s the minimum, correct?

If we think we need more skills to look into this stuff and to solve the issues, then yes, first let’s get the skills and then look into the stuff. Just doing them in parallel won’t be good, because then these new people will come into the work at the middle of something that’s already decided. And I think what I hear, everybody agrees that scoping is one of the most important parts of this review.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Kaveh. So we do have clarification and direction from the SO and AC Chairs that determine our work to address skillset and scope, and it would be really good to surface any disagreements, misunderstandings, direction right now.

Noorul? I'm sorry, Noorul, did you want to have a follow-up specifically on this? No? Okay. Norm, you're next, and then Noorul and Alice. Apologies.

NORM RITCHIE: I was going to comment a bit more, but I actually agree with Geoff's comments quite a bit. So the one thing I want to really mention though – and this might be just myself – is on the scope issue, it's the depth, not the breadth, because a lot of that is defined. But the depth of any type of review or analysis we do of any particular topic that I struggle with, with how do we go. And that really depends on the topic, in my view. Not all topics are going to be the same. So that flows through to the skillsets as well. When we do that, we can't just say, "You have this skill," because everybody has skills at different levels. So you have to have that proper [match] between if you're going to look at something to this depth, then the skillset should match that depth.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Norm. Noorul.

NOORUL AMEEN: Thanks, Patrik, for your valuable suggestion for the skillset gap analysis and all the things for the betterment of our team. I just want to ask some clarity for the scope issue. That is the most relevant issue we have to discuss. So what we have done in L.A. is a kind of BCP analysis, a fact-finding session with ICANN headquarters. We have done some fact-finding session in risk management, BCP, and especially in the incident response frameworks and all things.

I'm an incident handler working in this area for the last ten years. I'm not perfectly happy with the kind of response I got in L.A., but still, we got plenty of information in that fact-finding session. So my clarification or a question to the community is, is there any scope creep that happened? Is there any scope widening or something that happened beyond the predefined scope? I need some clarity regarding this. Thank you. I don't know, anybody can answer, I'm not clear about whether a scope creep happened or not.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm not sure if I'm the right person to answer that, but I'm going to do it anyway because I'm probably not as smart as I think I

am. So my perspective personally is that we're essentially conducting a set of large scale investigation/experiments maybe, mostly, and that's necessarily iterative. And so we started with something that at the beginning we could sort of say made sense, and as in Madrid, we refined it. We didn't codify the refinement of that, but the subteams that we broke into that are now subgroups, for the last couple of months we've been talking about doing it that way, that is part of our iteration. And so it's possible that there was sort of a- we ought to have gone back and recodified that in the scope, the scope as it is now is not deep enough per Norm's comment, I believe.

And so I don't know that we'd call it creep from my perspective, but I think it's refined, and we may have not kept the documentation up maybe, possibly. I'm not sure that we had like an operating procedure that we need to follow on that one. That one could have just been the best laid schemes. So I don't think we had creep, but I think as we basically sort of got closer and closer, we were able to refine more, and we sort of subdivided and we focused. So I don't know if that answers your question, but that's my personal perspective. And I'll do queue management. I think Kaveh has something.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, do you want to respond to this specifically? Okay, thank you, and I have Alice in the queue as well. And Rod, did you – okay, Kaveh, then Rod, then –

KAVEH RANJBAR: Quickly, Eric, you’re right, it is like on details, and then the devil is in the details. But if one wants – and this is not what you were doing so far, but if one really wants to read Bylaws to the letter, actually, the review is [caused] when both scope in terms of reference and the work plan are in place. And actually, the combination of these two gives a very good picture of what the team is going to do, because work plan has elements which refer to the scope and clarifies, “Okay, based on this definition, we are going to do this and this.” So I think one approach is to actually have also – when we talk about scope, you have to keep in mind there are basically two documents which accompany each other, and they clarify the scope and what the team wants to do. And you cannot separate them and then talk only about the scope document, because the scope document just has a scoping part.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I’m sorry, I don’t want to drag this out. My sense is these conversations are intellectually stimulating and I think they’re good, but I think we’re at a different point now, so I’d propose –

without trying to sound like I'm muting it – we should probably move forward with what the SO and AC Chairs have directed us to do.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

So to that point, I think that a couple of things that between – actually all three of you just iterated on and touched on, depth I think is a bit of what we're talking about with flavor, and that's really important to understand that and get as close as you can to agreement or a plan for how you're going to get agreement on that, because obviously, you don't have the full quorum, or [inaudible] members here. So I think that's really important.

You mentioned there were some iterations here. I think that going back and taking a look at what those iterations did and list out where that may have touched the original scoping document would be helpful. I don't know what those all are, but you mentioned it so I'm assuming there is something – yes, so as you were iterating through what you were going to do, review that and add that back to your scoping. And while we didn't mention work plan in the letter, which I'm not sure how intentional that was or not – Patrik might be able to shed some more light on what we were thinking – the thing that we discussed at [a little] ad-hoc meeting which got disseminated, hopefully I think that part of that came out as actually doing

some sort of document adjunct to the scope that is the explanation, the interpretation of what's in – because you're taking your scope from the Bylaws, and there's a fairly brief response to those Bylaw points.

So the actual scope document is fairly small, which is fine, it's supposed to be, you don't want a 20-page tome. But there is this interpretation – and I think that's where this whole thing is getting gummed up, is how we interpret that. And I think having some clarity and some real hard definitions around that – now again, you're not going to be able to get that done today, but the plan of how to do that and box that in and capture that I think is really critical, because what you really have to do is corral this beast that is the scope thing that is an amorphous issue in the broader community, but it really comes down to very specific things which lead to various results.

And I think if you concentrate on getting a plan forward to that and those things that I just suggested and that have been suggested, I think you can get done what you need to get done in the time you have today. Patrik, I don't know if you want to add anything. No? Okay.

DENISE MICHEL:

Great. Thank you. That's very useful. Poor Alice. Alice is in the queue. Thank you, Alice, for being so patient.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thank you, Denise. This is Alice Jansen, ICANN Org. I just wanted to flag that in October, we circulated a draft and a document to the co-Chairs with a suggestion that [inaudible] template. The document's purpose was to help the subteams reach an understanding on detailed objectives, determine, anticipate the resources they need, briefings, interviews, input from [S&E.] and also outline the [climate] they're working towards.

So initially, this document was to help support the subteams in building up their own respective work plans in response to the co-Chairs who actually asked all the subteam members to feed into the master work plan. So hearing some of the discussions today, I think this kind of document could be potentially a good starting point. It could help you structure your methodology for moving forward, connecting some of the topics, the skills, resources, potentially clarify some of the scope, and also identify some of the synergies and/or gaps.

So we do have this template in our documents for the face-to-face meeting if you want to project it at some point today, but [inaudible] one to think about. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Thank you, Alice. And Alice of course is quite a veteran of many Review Teams and other efforts within ICANN, so that's helpful and we'll definitely take a look at that. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I propose that we consider a break in the near future.

DENISE MICHEL: Jennifer, did you have –

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes, if I could just read out Matogoro's comment here. He said, "The scope is a very tricky topic to the team. We developed scope in either ICANN staff or ICANN Board, but it's out of scope. If there's a specific scope that exists, let ICANN staff or Board or SOs/ACs share it. I'm confident with the scope that we have developed."

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Mr. Matogoro. Any other comments or questions on this issue? Again, Patrik and Rod, thank you so much for giving up your Friday morning to come give us more guidance and interaction. We really appreciate it, and we'll do our best to meet your expectations. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, and while you guys are both here, I brought celebratory material that you are both welcome to join us with at some point, at least after the day. It starts with an S and ends with [an otch.]

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: The S in IoT stands for security, right? So let me once again wish you all the best for the day, but I really would suggest that you are – as I said, it's already now like 10:40, and I understand you run until 5:30. Is that what I see? Or something, 5:00. Anyways, that you [inaudible] structure the day, because running a review actually requires really strict sort of moving things forward in an orderly matter and focus on the things that are easy so you can get some achievements, some results today and deliver that back to us SO and ACs and Chairs, and we will come back to you on that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And I just want to thank you guys all for your hard work, and we will try to make ourselves as available as possible for any further questions, etc., both at the SO/AC level, at various community levels, and at personal levels as well. And we're looking forward to getting any questions back that are really substantive and all that through to our SSAC – from our SSAC perspective, from the SSAC perhaps. But thank you so much for your hard work. We all

want you to really succeed and come out with a good product at the end. So looking forward to seeing what you guys can come up with.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you very much, Rod. Okay, we'll take a 15-minute break. We'll reconvene at 10:58 at the latest. Thank you. Okay, everyone, we're reconvening. Do we have everyone back here? And Jennifer, have you heard from Ram? I know he was intending to be here today. I wonder what happened.

Okay. And Noorul, we're getting started. [inaudible] Alright, so we're doing skillset for the next hour and a half, two hours. That's something I think we can explicitly tackle, and I'd like to propose that we use some of the skillset initial suggestions we got from SSAC just as a starting point.

First, I guess on process and calendaring, and Eric and I would appreciate input from the team members on this. I would propose that here over the next two hours, we develop a draft skillset matrix. So just the listing of the skills that collectively the people involved in this meeting feel are necessary to carry out this review. Then we put it out on the e-mail list for comment through, say, Monday night or Tuesday morning. Then we will consider the skillset matrix set. We'll give members a couple of days to then go down and check the box on which skills they can

cover or do cover, and then propose that that will be a deliverable to the SO and AC Chairs.

Once that matrix is completed, we'll give members a period for any other comments that they may have in relation to that. We'll develop a short conveyance letter back to the SO and AC Chairs, and then send that back to them. Are there any objections with that process and timeline moving forward with respect to skillsets? Okay, seeing no objection, that's what we will move forward in doing.

After we complete the skillsets, we'll come back to the scope, to the session that we had this morning and map out trying to get agreement on our game plan to address that and in what fashion and in what timeframe. Sounds good?

Jennifer, could you please? Okay, so in the chat room – and if you could all hop online – Jennifer shared a link to a Google Doc spreadsheet. Take a few minutes to look at that. Geoff, do you have a question?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, Jennifer, was this just a straight cut-and-paste? Was it? I'm a little bit confused. Line 17 and 25, you have "SSAC:" – you didn't mean SSAC, did you?

JENNIFER BRYCE: You can see the gray 1 and 10? That's where I got the information from, just to be clear.

GEOFF HUSTON: Ah, so that was where it came from?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah.

GEOFF HUSTON: It was your SSAC meeting that sourced it as distinct from?

JENNIFER BRYCE: The call for volunteers.

GEOFF HUSTON: Sure. Thank you. So you think this list is all one list? Because it seems like we've got generic attributes and specific practice skills and subject. I like the grouping as it sits, which is why I got confused. I thought, instead of just simply producing the sources, you had actually done a little bit of editorial. Because I like what you've done. That's all.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thanks, Geoff. And thanks for kicking off our discussion about this initial list. Eric, did you have your...? Okay. Does everyone want to take a few moments to read this Google Doc? Again, for those who are following along in the audience or online, Jennifer has dropped a link to this Google Doc. Can everyone get into this, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, if people are on the chat room, they can click on the link. Right now, I'm the only person who can edit, but I can change that. But people should be able to access it freely.

DENISE MICHEL: I think you holding the pen on this just to have some ability to follow things would be good, but everyone should be able to access this. And maybe you could also drop Column A into the chat room so people can see it there too in case they're having trouble getting into the Google Doc.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, this is just a suggestion. I'd like to see what people think about it just to streamline this. Jennifer, the list, you've typed it all up, right? Or is it still evolving right now? How about we go through – I mean, as much as I think I want to make our time productive – maybe we can go line-by-line and just see if

anybody has any concerns about leaving something in. Then we can decide as a group if we want to yank something out. And by the time we get to the bottom, we can see if anybody feels like there was something missing they want to add in.

It might be a reasonably quick operation and just keep us all on the same page. Then, obviously, we'll do an iteration on the list for various people who aren't here and for people to take even more time. But just as a quick pass, everyone is reading at a different pace, we can either just do it ourselves or I'd propose just somebody read through it and poll the room on each one. Does anyone have any thoughts on that?

DENISE MICHEL:

Any thoughts? I think line-by-line would be a productive way to get this list into shape. There aren't that many. It should be fairly easy to do. Noorul, perhaps you could, I can't hobble over there, perhaps you could bring Ramkrishna – welcome – him up to date on what we're doing. Since you're sitting next to Ram, if you could just let him know what our exercise is. We'll take a few minutes among the team to process this, and then we'll start on the first one on Line 2.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Denise, are you ready for comments on Line 2 then?

DENISE MICHEL: Jennifer, would you be able to give all the team members – ?

STEVE CONTE: We'll have to go through and identify who the anonymous animals are. I don't know if the team members are necessarily logged in. So just as a note that we'll have to perform that exercise.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Geoff, go for it. Now we're discussing the first.

GEOFF HUSTON: Line Item 2. Realistically, and this is merely an observation of the reality out there, down on Line 32 you have PTI Functions. To be perfectly frank, the issues around IP numbering, AS numbering, and protocol parameters for the scope of this work is really a PTI function. We're not delving into what the RIRs do. We're not delving into what the IETF does. We're not looking under that hood to the extent that it requires deep subject matter expertise. I was really thinking the real interaction there is actually a PTI function rather than specific subject matter. So my suggestion I think for 2, I don't know, you already have DNS on Line 26. It sort of seems like overkill.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Geoff. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, with my Chair hat off, I think that what we're doing is we're trying to let people represent what their skillset is. How that relates to scope or the purview of the team is a separate issue that I think we plan to do when we get to the scoping. But I think at this point if we want people to be able to express who they are and what they are able to do, I think it's perfectly fair to at least at the beginning have potentially some duplication.

GEOFF HUSTON: I misunderstood you. I thought you were doing line-by-line of Column A looking at what the headings were as distinct from line-by-line who has what. You weren't clear.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry. I think the point is just to line-by-line, is this a valid way for someone to express that they have expertise? Because eventually what we'll do is it will become a matrix where we have team members. So for example, I might say that I want to put a checkbox by something that's in there. And later on, we can say that has nothing to do with our scope, which is fair.

DENISE MICHEL: Geoff, you look like you....

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm completely confused, Eric. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So for example, I don't see on there something about drives a Cadillac, but we could put that and I could say, "Yeah, I drive a Cadillac." It will have nothing to do with our scope, but in the event that somebody thought that was relevant to our scope this is simply to say who we are and what we have as background.

Now admittedly, we don't want to go as far afield as who drives an awesome care like me, but at the same time if some of this stuff could potentially be relevant, which is why we culled it from lists like for example the call for volunteers from the SOs and ACs, so this list was hand-curated. It was kind of in the area. It's just a chance for people to check boxes because I think a lot of people want to express their expertise. That's all.

GEOFF HUSTON: You cleared my confusion, Eric.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So do we have anyone else in the queue? Kaveh, you're next.

KAVEH RANIBAR: Eric, I don't think the problem is what you might add and then we can always remove because it might be irrelevant like who drives a Cadillac. But the important thing is what might be missing from the list. That's the important part, and that's what's not being covered in this process.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think our plan was to do that when we got to the bottom. I think we said after we get done going through everything, if there's something someone feels is missing, then we'll add it at the bottom. But we could do that upfront. Whatever you want. But I do think we do want to do additive and subtractive work here.

DENISE MICHEL: My reaction to Number 2 is do we need any kind of qualifier in there? Does anything as a skill or person you do anything involving Internet unique identifiers? It seems to be a list of identifiers, but are we talking about operational expertise with the unique identifiers, and do we need to be more specific? Or

policy expertise relating to the unique identifiers? What do you guys think? Is that too granular? Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

To the point that you're saying and potentially what Geoff was hinting anything, maybe developing a shared understanding of a general level of granularity we want for these things. So before we go down the list, decide like you just said. That might be too hard to do, or maybe we do it after the first pass. We may have to do multiple passes. But, yeah, saying, "I'm good at being a good person," which is arguable but I could claim that I am, may not be something that winds up being quantitatively useful. So is that kind of what you were at saying, Geoff, as well? That this is too blah?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I was kind of looking at the list as a list going realistically certain skills and experience are covered in other areas from the perspective of the SSR Review. But you then explained something a little bit different, that this is just a list and we can look at it later. Kaveh's point then seemed more resonant with me which is, are we missing anything? Good question and perhaps looking at the whole of the list and seeing if there are other bullet points might help. But then I was going to just take your idea of going, well, there might be something about drives

a Cadillac, whatever. But we'll just accept it there for the moment and just move on and then come back and cull it later. That's what I thought you were saying. Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That was my strawman proposal.

DENISE MICHEL: Sounds good.

GEOFF HUSTON: On the basis that I was able to repeat it and he thought I said the same thing as he said, we seem to be on the same page, yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Let the record reflect that Eric Osterweil and Geoff Huston agreed on something.

DENISE MICHEL: All right, let it be so. Hey, Jennifer, could you just highlight Number 2 to remind us to come back to it after we've gone through the rest of the list, and we'll see how people feel about that one next? Unless there are any further comments, we'll move on to Number 3, Mitigating Unique Identifier Abuse. Any comments on that? Noorul?

NOORUL AMEEN: I would like to [refer a discussion] with Eric Osterweil regarding the definition of unique identifiers. I think we have to include the Port numbers that we have discussed in our offline discussion.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Noorul. Any other comments on Number 3 or any issues with that one? If not, we're moving on to 4, Registry and Registration Security and Abuse. Any comments on that one? Steve?

STEVE CONTE: I'm sorry. Since we're all looking at this document, I just swapped over to Adobe Connect and I'd like to read a comment from Mr. Matogoro that happened about five minutes ago, so just to put that in the context of the conversation. He says, "I was of the idea of the staff supporting this team to access the CV that was submitted during our application and compile the required information."

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Matogoro. I think staff may be able to reply to this. My understanding is that the call for volunteers skills and experience section of this spreadsheet and the call for

volunteers desired attributes in this spreadsheet were pulled from the application process. Perhaps staff could clarify that.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, so we just took this list from the call for volunteers. Is that the question?

DENISE MICHEL: Am I understanding Mr. Matogoro's comments correctly? Yeah, I think we're on the same page. Moving on to Number 5, if there are no comments on 4, Operation of the DNS Root Name System. Any comments on that one? I'm sorry, Žarko, was yours?

ŽARKO KECIC: It depends how deep we are going here, but if we say just DNS name system, it covers root and TLD and other DNS.

DENISE MICHEL: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think to the point that I think Geoff mentioned, this one might for example have a heavy intersection with the PTI discussion down below. So I think there's probably a lot of duplication and certainly it doesn't say what level of

understanding someone has of the operation of the DNS root system. Like, are they an RSO or did they just read a paper about it?

I think we're self-reporting at this point. I think we want to be comfortable this matrix has allowed each of us as a team to represent our skillset in a way that it can be evaluated against our objectives. So if something seems like it might be too general to be useful, then that will be probably judged by the people that are looking us over.

So I think my two cents, and it's just my two cents, is that it's a little bit of a general category which means that if we put a checkbox by someone's name, it doesn't necessarily mean that that's going to carry a lot of weight when we look at a deeper scoping issue. Does that make sense?

ŽARKO KECIC:

No. We are talking about skills, so having DNS root server operations means something and DNS operations in general means a different thing. I would remove "root."

DENISE MICHEL:

All right, there's a suggestion to remove "root" from Number 5. Anyone like to discuss that?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm okay with that.

DENISE MICHEL: Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: I was actually going to make exactly the same comment. It's a bit specific and maybe just remove "root." Also, and this specifies operations, so there's usually two parts to any type of skill. There's a knowledge level and then there's your experience in applying that knowledge level. So we have to be careful about are we mixing those two up.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you have a more specific suggestion of how to tackle this with the knowledge and skill separation in mind?

NORM RITCHIE: As stated currently, operation of a root DNS implies both a very specific skillset and also an application of that skillset, and it's going to be at a high level, obviously. That's what brought that comment to mind, first of all. If we're going to eliminate the "root" part, are we specifically asking for the skill that involves

operation of the DNS or are we just asking for DNS knowledge?
So I guess I'm confused.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, well, let's work through that right here and now. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think these are good points. As I read it, I think guessing what the spirit behind what the original wording is, is do you understand how it works. I'm not saying that's what it says. I'm saying that's what I think it might mean. If that's what we think is worth codifying, maybe we change the wording. Because I think if someone in the room were an RSO, then that would be one thing. It would be a very small set of people that could say they were, and I'm not sure that was what the objective was.

It says "operation of the DNS root name system." I think that means, do you know how it generally works? Like the system? I suppose that might mean the system of RSOs, the PTI function, I don't know. So maybe it is sufficiently vague that we should decide whether to keep it or focus it up. Do people like the idea of "knowledge of the design of the root name system"? Very vague but at least more specific maybe? Or should we just yank it? Because we have a whole bunch of other stuff that we can put in there.

GEOFF HUSTON: I note that the bottom half of the list contains what is called “practice areas,” which is operational management, and it contains “subject expertise,” which is about raw knowledge. The DNS in that case is being put into it’s a knowledge thing. Interestingly, in the SSAC list there, there’s no specific DNS operations. It becomes somewhere between information technology, risk assessment analysis, and of course information security. And maybe that’s appropriate that the operational areas that they’ve notified here are relatively broad as practice areas rather than “I operate a blue widget or a Y process.”

DENISE MICHEL: I see. Would it make more sense to, as we go through these, to break the whole list up into practice area or have people add a “P” for practice or an “E” for expertise on all of these things to make it clearer? Or do you not find that helpful? Go ahead, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I have a strawman proposal. I propose that we take the bottom two categories, the ones that we received from SSAC, and we treat that categorization as our canonical way forward. And we treat the upper first two categories that we inherited, those need to either be imported down below to practice or expertise or

booted. In other words, the first list that we got, because it was designed for something slightly different so we can decide to keep it – in which case, we decide where to file it – or we decide to boot it.

DENISE MICHEL: Does that work for everyone? Did everyone follow that? Steve?

STEVE CONTE: I'd just like to put Mr. Matogoro in on a general question on the exercise, whether or not it's appropriate to read it now or wait until this is decided.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that again?

STEVE CONTE: Mr. Matogoro has a question on the broader aspect of this exercise. I'm not sure if you want me to read it now or if you would like to finish what you're discussing.

DENISE MICHEL: I think we should address it now. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Mr. Matogoro writes: “How have we come to this point? SO/AC has the matrix for each one of us. I think we are doing something which is out of scope. Please, co-Chairs, stay focused and avoid off-track agenda to benefit from our valuable time.”

DENISE MICHEL: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Mr. Matogoro, I believe that the AC Chairs that were here this morning specifically directed us to do this.

DENISE MICHEL: And I would further indicate that if you look at the correspondence on our open e-mail list, we received a letter from the Board. I asked for clarification specifically on what we were authorized, if you want to use that term, to do today. We have a clear direction from the SOs and ACs Chairs to do a skillset exercise, and that was reinforced this morning from the SSAC Chair. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Just an observation. Maybe Mr. Matogoro is referring to the step of evaluating current review team members’ skills relative to this because he made a reference to the CVs as well. So perhaps a

clarification from him. I think he is talking about potentially the next step of doing the gap analysis, maybe.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, thank you for that clarification. I think that makes more sense.

STEVE CONTE: Mr. Matogoro says yes to Larisa's comments.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, thank you. Any other comments on this one? So to circle back to Eric's suggestion of taking the two groupings of skills provided by SSAC and incorporating the rest of the skills outside of those two groupings into these two groups, in other words take everything from Line 10 and above and drop it into the appropriate one of two categories as we work through this. Any other comments or questions or concerns? Norm, I think you had your....

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I'm sorry. I keep forgetting to flip my card. Yeah, that works. The typical way is after you identify the skill, then you actually having going the other way you say, what's your level of

knowledge? What's your experience in using it? But I guess it works the opposite way as well. We could do that.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, so you're cool with it?

NORM RITCHIE: I think so. We can try it.

DENISE MICHEL: Really, if you'd like to change it, now is the time. Everything is on the table. So do you think there would be a better approach?

NORM RITCHIE: Well, a skills matrix usually has, here's a skill. What's your knowledge level? What is your experience level on a scale of 1, 2, 3? It's that simple.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm totally cool with whatever we want to do. So I'm not espousing a personal perspective on this specifically. But I think just to look at the list, I think what they're trying to say is the

SSAC list was designed to draw a distinction between you know how something works and you actually do it yourself. I could say I know how PTI works, but it doesn't mean I work in PTI. I don't know if we care to make that distinction or don't, but I just point out that's why I think there are two general categories.

Maybe to Norm's point, we should look at it and say, would I describe my expertise differently based on whether I roll my sleeves up on it every day or I think I know how it works and I wanted to make sure that was known?

DENISE MICHEL: Norm, just wave.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. I think I understand now. [But] [inaudible] practice areas and then subject areas, looking what's there now, the items are distinct. What I'm saying is they can actually fall in both. So we're clear on that?

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Okay, I got it.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you for that clarification. So now our path forward is with the idea in mind that we're walking through each of these items, we're going to then construct a matrix and process that will allow people to indicate separately on each one their knowledge level and their skill or practice level for each one, right? Are we clear?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think that's a good point. Just to underscore what Denise just said and what Norm said as well, we're actually proposing to put a scale, so not just a checkbox. So whatever we pick, 1-3 or 1-5 or 1-10 or 10-20 (well, we could do that if we want), that's on the table too. So I guess the first step is to come up with a canonical list and, just to underscore what you said, not categorize them. Just greenlight them. Then we'll have two separate columns: one for you understand it and the other one for you practice it. Is that what we think we're about to do?

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

[ŽARKO KECIC]: [inaudible] instead of level of knowledge to have two columns: understand and [did].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Level for each is I think what Norm was suggesting. Like DNS, I understand how it works. I practice it.

[ŽARKO KECIC]: Okay, from 1 to 5?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, for each of them. So everything that's there could be, like information and security, I could say I understand it really well and I never practice it, or something like that.

[ŽARKO KECIC]: Two columns, okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, does that work for everyone? I would propose that we get through this list and then circle back on the discussion of how we want to quantify the level of people's knowledge and practice to make sure we are really clear on that, what standards we want to use and if we still agree after going through this list

that assigning a number makes sense to everyone. I want to make sure we capture everyone's input on this.

So it sounded like we had agreement to remove the word "root" from Line 5. So it's "operation of the DNS name system," correct? Jennifer, could you make that change now?

Number 6, understanding of malware and abuse vectors and mitigation. I think I would propose to change Number 6 to "malware and abuse vectors and mitigations" at the start. Understanding is going to be captured when we do a knowledge or practice area.

Noorul?

NOORUL AMEEN:

We have included this malware [inaudible] [since I'm off the discussions] [inaudible] or something like that. But [inaudible] decide that is too operational. So shall we make it generic like "threats and mitigation" or something like that? Because malware analysis no longer coming to any [of the subgroup] activities. [So I left it to the floor that we have to decide it's a common issue or operational issue.]

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, so the proposal on the table is to change [6] from understanding of malware to threats and abuse vectors and mitigation. Any comments on that? Again, keep in mind too we're putting this out to the list, so you'll have another crack at all this over the next couple of days before we finalize it. Hearing no other comments, seeing no hands, Jennifer, if you could change 6 to "threats and abuse vectors and mitigations" or whoever is holding the pen on this. Great, thank you.

Number 7, risk assessment and management. Any comments on that one? Seeing none, we're going on to 8, corporate data security and/or business systems. Any comments on that? Norm, go ahead.

NORM RITCHIE: Is that two different things, or does that mean security of corporate data systems and security of business systems.

DENISE MICHEL: The way I read it was security in business systems. Does everyone understand it the same way? Žarko? Should we clarify this? Corporate data security and/or security of business systems. Are you comfortable with that, Norm? No, I think it's good to clarify. Yeah? Okay, Jennifer, if you could add security of business systems in there.

Then we'll move on to 9, incident response. Oh, I'm sorry, Žarko. Did you want to go back?

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, risk assessment. I would rather see there analysis than assessment.

DENISE MICHEL: So would that read – so we're hopping back to Number 7, people. That would read then with Žarko's suggestion risk analysis and management. Any problems with that? Any comments? Okay, so Number 7, if you could change assessment to analysis please. Thanks, Jennifer.

All right, we're down to Line 11, multi-stakeholder community understanding. That's a loaded category. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Numbers 11-16 are actually attributes rather than skills and practices realistically. I think you can put them to one side and simply call them desirable as distinct from a qualifying condition and move straight to Line 18 because they are an orthogonal concept. So my suggestion is leave them there, but it's an attribute rather than a – do you want me to put this up? Will you

listen more if I put it up or something? Yeah, right. Just say so.
Yeah, so....

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Geoff. I think that makes a lot of sense, although I would like to state that understanding this multi-stakeholder community is a real skill if you can claim that. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Would we want to just yank them, except for the one that Denise just liked?

GEOFF HUSTON: I wasn't suggesting yanking them, but they are conceptually different. The other ones, because we're now getting into some [meat and] pruning as soon as you hit 18, are really, do you do this? Do you know this? Whereas, 11-18 are you really should have these attributes on some scale because that would help.

DENISE MICHEL: I agree completely. Any other comments on this? So we're going to skip. Thank you, Geoff. We're skipping down to Line 18, moving on with these, information security. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Numbers 18 and 8 are the same. I think 8 can go. Or to be perfectly precise, 18 and 19 cover what 8, corporate data security and/or security of business systems, is attempting to cover. This is where you get this strange overlap of words because in some ways the qualification of corporate and business really doesn't matter. It's the practice of information security and the practice of information technology and knowledge thereof which is a superset of 8.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. So we could another idea is to add to 8, specifically including information security and information technology. Eric, do you have a comment?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that because information security and IT are so general that they cover too much to be specific, yeah, because corporate data security and security of business systems tells me that I might have experience with endpoint management and stuff like that, that's very specific. But an IT professional might be a completely different end of the spectrum. So inasmuch as I don't think we should try to be overly verbose, I think leaving those in there in the event that someone checks one and not the other or whatever, I just think it gives us more visibility. But certainly, I think corporate data security and security of business systems

tells me a lot more about someone's background than information security. That's just my personal perspective.

DENISE MICHEL: Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: I tend to agree with that, especially the IT. You don't want someone saying I know how to write a Bash script, therefore I know IT. We're actually interested in the security aspects.

DENISE MICHEL: So where does that leave us on 18 and 19, folks? I think Eric wants to keep it in.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: My perspective is just let's keep them all, but I think that's because it's the safest thing considering.

DENISE MICHEL: Geoff, how do you feel about that?

GEOFF HUSTON: I feel happy about keeping them in after hearing the conversation. I was in for a minimal list, but then I think why the

hell do I care whether the list is minimal or not. So I'll keep them in.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, a rousing endorsement of this practice. Thank you, Geoff.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Suggestion that maybe you just cross reference these two, 18 and 19, to Line 8 to say that they're connected or related.

DENISE MICHEL: Do we need any other qualifiers on Line 18 and 19. Are you comfortable with the wording as it is, folks? Okay, moving on. Project management is Line 20. Comments on that? Okay. Number 21, security auditing and standard. People like that line. Okay, risk assessment and analysis.

GEOFF HUSTON: Geez, that looks a lot like Line 7.

DENISE MICHEL: It sure does.

GEOFF HUSTON: What did you expect me to say?

DENISE MICHEL: I threw you a softball. All right, Jennifer, if you would please delete Line 22. Number 23 is data analytics. Noorul?

NOORUL AMEEN: Is it data analytics or big data analytics?

DENISE MICHEL: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I feel that data analytics is appropriate and big data analytics can be a subset of that. But I think a lot of data analytics doesn't have to be done on Hadoop, which is a lot of people's assumption when you say big data analytics. So my personal bias, which I admit is a very personal bias and so I'm willing to be overridden, is that data analytics is [awesome].

DENISE MICHEL: Do you think it needs to be qualified like "including" or you're comfortable? Anyone else on that line? Okay, we're moving.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm trying to understand where the application of that would come with this group. I can't think of it. Can someone enlighten me?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. One just small example that immediate comes to my mind is we are looking at the DNS abuse report that was released recently. The data analytics that were used to produce that report, I found it to useful to look at whether they did a full scan or they just did sampling. That's just one example for me. Eric? Ah, brilliant. We always think alike. Any other qualifications you think might be useful on data analytics, or can we move on?

Contractual compliance. We should put ICANN contractual compliance in there, do you think? Was that laugh an agreement? No? Yes? Okay, so I would suggest that 24 be changed to ICANN contractual compliance. That has a very specific meaning within the ICANN context of registrar and registry contracts.

Moving on to DNS, Line 26. Žarko?

ŽARKO KECIC: I don't see that specific line as somebody's skill.

DENISE MICHEL: All right, Žarko, are you referring to 26?

ŽARKO KECIC: Uh, 24.

DENISE MICHEL: And I'm sorry, what was your comment on 24?

ŽARKO KECIC: I don't see that as a specific skill somebody should have. [Will] gain some knowledge about contractual compliance, but that's not a skill.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Žarko. So having myself a knowledge in ICANN contractual compliance, I find that to be a really useful knowledge to have as we're looking particularly at some of the recommendations in the first SSR review. Some of the 28 require us to look at some abuse issues, look at some of these issues on security in new gTLDs and IDNs. They have some specific compliance references in there.

Understanding what a registrar's and a registry's obligations are contractually, understanding what ICANN's obligations are in enforcing those contracts, I find that to be – and that helps keep us in scope on some of these issues, of course, speaking personally here. And

then I also find it to be a useful knowledge basis to bring to bear in this work area. Norm? And Žarko after Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: I didn't put my card up. I actually would – no.

DENISE MICHEL: You had that look in your eye.

NORM RITCHIE: I know I had that look, but no. I was going to do the card thing. I agree that should stay though. Having done a number of gTLD applications, you have to understand the contractual framework as it affects security as well because some things you have to do, some things you don't, some things you get conflicted with the contract. So I think that's an important area.

DENISE MICHEL: Žarko?

ŽARKO KECIC: It is an important area, but it is not a skill. I don't feel more skilled after L.A. meeting where we gained some additional knowledge about contractual compliance for ICANN. So we should put that knowledge of security framework of ICANN and

some other specific stuff for ICANN, I don't see that as skill. That's knowledge about something.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes, but I thought going back to the discussion we had before that each item has two components: one is, is there a knowledge level to it? What is your knowledge level of that area? And also, what is your application in that area or experience? That's why I was thinking. I understand what you're saying, but I also don't know if we should drop it off the map. Somehow we have to capture it somewhere.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Norm. I would also say that I have knowledge in ICANN contractual compliance and then I also have a practice or application in ICANN contractual compliance since I run registrars as well. And I find those both useful in this context. What do you think, Žarko?

ŽARKO KECIC: I think that's the same as putting I know how to drive a Cadillac.

DENISE MICHEL: I'll suggest this. Jennifer, could you just highlight that, and then we'll come back and discuss that further over some Scotch.

STEVE CONTE: Denise, I'm sorry. I was doing the edit on that. Do you mind if we put parentheses around ICANN since that was an add word at this point? So that way we can tag that as the original text versus the proposed new text and then have it flagged?

DENISE MICHEL: No.

STEVE CONTE: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: I don't think so. I think it's pretty clear that SSAC was referring to ICANN contractual compliance, so I think we should add that in there.

Okay, so we're on to DNS. Any comments on that? We've got Number 1 that we need to go back to and discuss, which seems a bit duplicative, right?

GEOFF HUSTON: [inaudible] 5 because if we're doing operation and skill, then you don't need 5 because it's just the DNS operation and skill. I'm suggesting we yank 5.

DENISE MICHEL: Anyone object to crossing out 5 and then 26 spelling out Domain Name System? Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: It's not an objection, but clarity again. Around this community, DNS is used to mean two different things. There is "the DNS," as you just said, and there's "DNS," which means this whole system of domain names and how it operates and everything else. And depending on which group you're talking to, the terms are bantered around but you know them in context. Just to clarify that.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Yeah, thanks, Norm. Did that come as you're volunteering to add further definition to that? Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I bet I can make Geoff's brow furrow more than it already is. To that point, Norm, one of the things we could do is we could break it into three constituent parts of DNS. We could break it into the DNS namespace, the DNS operational system, and the DNS protocol. Those are three ways to dissect DNS into separate views, separate tracks, separate management, etc., and that

might be a way to tease out some of what you're saying. But the namespace management very different from the protocol development – arguably not in scope, maybe, maybe not – very different from operations, RSOs and PTI, etc. and so forth. So we could call those things out separately if we wanted to be more granular.

NORM RITCHIE: Not to create a rathole on this, it's just clarity. As you say, I don't know again what the answer is.

DENISE MICHEL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: You're just trying to get skills. I'm actually happy with the original broad church of the DNS, recognizing it is a very broad church and it encompasses everything you said, Norm, and most of the others. Most folk in my experience get exposed to a lot of this and maybe not all of the protocol, but in a skills analysis I think it's one better than unique identifiers, isn't it? In the same way that we talk about Internet protocols a bit further down, it's the same level. Whether it's the DNS a system, a namespace, a resolution, a root, DNS is okay with me.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, thank you. We're on to 27, network architecture/design and operations. Is everyone comfortable with that? Going on to 28 then, root server operations.

GEOFF HUSTON: There you go, Norm. One of them is called out there for you. I'd actually leave it in because of RSSAC. Because of the particular attention and responsibility of ICANN, the root servers deserve a degree of concentrated attention, and this is a reasonable skill to inquire about.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Moving on to directory services operations.

GEOFF HUSTON: Here's where I do have a naming quibble about the word "directory." I'm just lost on the word directory. Do we mean, going back to Line item 4, do we actually mean registry and registration security and abuse?

DENISE MICHEL: I guess I would interpret Number 4 as, I would say, registry and registrar.

GEOFF HUSTON: [I'm sort of saying] directory services means very little to me in this context. You're sort of talking about registry, registrar and the general idea of registry style provision and service. But then we had 4, registry and registration security and abuse. You're kind of overlapping in a lot of ways, and directory doesn't do it for me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I agree. I don't like the directory one, but the security and abuse doesn't include operations and stuff like that too. So I don't know if we want to – I'm cool with mixing directory services, but if we want to talk about what you were talking about, I think [inaudible] just security and abuse. It's like management and policy and [blah, blah].

DENISE MICHEL: I think we need to discuss this a little further before we delete something that SSAC specifically added into this skillset matrix. Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: I was actually going to suggest we delete it unless that means WHOIS and there's a specific need for that skill. I actually don't know what that means.

DENISE MICHEL: Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I was reacting a bit more sensitively to what you just said going, well, maybe we should have a good rationale to delete it. In which case, if you simply replace the word "directory" with "registry and registration services operations" you're kind of in the same ballpark but you've removed a weird word, "directory," and replaced it with a word that has a lot of context in this community.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Geoff, Norm. So then we're just deleting it and using Number 4, which is registry and registration security and abuse. We don't put operation in there because we're going to ask people for their knowledge base and their practice, right? I think. Yeah, Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I guess I felt what Geoff was saying is leave 29 – Geoff, keep me honest – but leave 29 but yank out directory and change it to registry/registrar so it says registry/registrar services and operations.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, you might as well [inaudible]. [inaudible] ask about operations, Denise, directory gets replaced with registry and registration, services gets left, operations gets deleted. And you can ask about operational experience and knowledge. Question 4 from the original what are you skilled in is a very particular subset of that, which is security and abuse. So you have this generic topic, registry and registration services.

DENISE MICHEL: Did you catch that, Jennifer? Okay, while we're waiting for the edits to catch up on Google Docs which is a bit delayed, there we are, registration. So I think it would be registry and registration services. So why isn't it registry and registrar services?

GEOFF HUSTON: Uh, in my head I have the same, but if you think there's an important distinction, I will go with your sense.

DENISE MICHEL: I think it should be registry and registrar services. Great. I think we're set on 29 then. ICANN policy, that seems really broad to me, but I'd like some input from people around the table. Is it? It's fine. I'm okay leaving it, but any comments on that?

NORM RITCHIE: Again, I don't know what it is.

DENISE MICHEL: So you're comfortable leaving it then?

NORM RITCHIE: It's a bit broad.

GEOFF HUSTON: I had a generic conversation somewhere over morning tea about whether even policy is within the remit of this particular review, the policy development process. Are we [over this]? I didn't think we were. So it becomes is this a useful expertise or not, and that's all I know. I have no particular opinion, like Norm, one way or another. Because if you're asking for expertise or even [inaudible] experience, I'm a big X on that one.

DENISE MICHEL: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Do we think it would be? So, yeah, this is skills so blah, blah, blah, but do we think it would be useful if someone was a policy heavy to help us when we're adjudicating whether something is in or out of scope?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. I think also just understanding how the policy development process works and the obligations it requires and how that feeds into the contracts for registries and registrars is a useful background to have. Okay, so I think for now we're going to leave Number 30 the way it is. Yeah?

Okay, 31, ICANN strategic plan and budget.

[NORM RITCHIE]: Again, I can't think of why we'd want to know that. Why do we need that skill?

DENISE MICHEL: I have a couple comments on that. I think the ICANN strategic plan lays out the strategic direction and specific KPIs for the organization flow from that. There's a number of security and stability items in the strategic plan that can obligate the organization to take things on. And then the budget, of course,

how much money they're spending on security and stability activities, what their staffing and resources are. So I've just mentioned several things that are in the 28 recommendations from SSR1. So I think that's where my mind jumps to when thinking about 31. Does any of that make sense?

[NORM RITCHIE]: Yeah, I'm thinking more that that probably is required reading for everybody in the group as opposed to as this is something that we should have some special skills in.

DENISE MICHEL: Or knowledge. So is it the sense that we want to take that out? That these are more of a document or information gathering exercise for everyone rather than a knowledge or skill? Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Again, I just want to say my personal perspective is we're in safer ground if we leave too much in than if we take too much out. I don't have a preference on this one. I don't completely see it either way, so I would err on the side of caution personally. Just my two cents.

ŽARKO KECIC: I just want to comment, do we need ICANN here? Because strategic planning and budgeting is [inaudible] area and if I have that skill I can do [it] for ICANN or for anybody else.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Thank you, Žarko. How do people feel about Žarko's suggestion of removing ICANN and making this a knowledge or practice of strategic planning and budgeting?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I like that.

DENISE MICHEL: Any objections, anyone? Okay, Jennifer, if you could change 31 to strategic planning and budgeting and we'll move on to 32, PTI functions. Any discussion of 32? Okay, 33 is Internet protocols, which is duplicative of Number 1, right? And caused Geoff to laugh. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't think it's – oh, duplicative of 1. Sorry, I thought we were talking – I think it's different. I think this potentially to me implies understanding [if nothing else] the protocol development process potentially. Also to Noorul Ameen's point early on he wanted to mention something about Ports. So this is

a very wide net, but it includes a lot more than is in Number 1, which is unique identifiers, IPs, ASNs. This potentially is understanding how protocols get designed, understanding different protocols [and Ports]. That's just my read on it.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you for that clarification. That makes more sense to me. I would suggest that we add a few more words to this, yeah?

GEOFF HUSTON: Either that or you just delete 1 because, again, Internet protocols is a really just broad topic space and it is a whole bunch of infrastructure parameters. It's protocol, it's applications. In some ways, I don't think even [Vint] is across all of Internet protocols. None of us are. We all have sharp points inside that space, and maybe that's what we're after anyway.

DENISE MICHEL: So are people comfortable on 33 maybe adding to it Internet protocols and protocol development? Does that help?

GEOFF HUSTON: Not in the sense of this review. We're not actually reviewing the IETF and the way in which it develops protocols.

DENISE MICHEL: Having that as a knowledge base to draw from?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It seems useful to me. Geoff, to your point, I don't think it is something that we want to use, but I think someone understands how it works like yourself have been there a lot understanding it and then how registries work and they're curated here but generated. So I think my question would be, do we want to enrich this one? Do we want to add another one? Internet protocols. Another one Internet protocol development? Or do we just put Internet protocols and development and just lump them all together?

DENISE MICHEL: Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: I'm not seeing the development part of that as applicable, but again it's not a major item for me.

DENISE MICHEL: Geoff?

DENISE MICHEL: One of the very specific questions I was facing in subgroup whatever it was, was this whole idea of to what extent do we adhere to recognized standards developed by the IETF and to what extent do we replace it with community process and is that necessarily a good or a bad thing when this happens? Which kind of requires some skills on both sides of the fence about what you're discussing when you refer to Internet standards. That's why what you said made me pause and think about whether Internet protocol development is indeed relevant. And I think it is from this idea that particularly there's another group who are really concerned about security, stability, and resiliency and the extent to which in standards development, protocol development we as in the production machinery that deploys it, what's the sensitivity and awareness is actually a decent question. You might want to separate out development. I've spoken too long.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, so I guess I've personally circled back to I think 33 is fine. Internet protocols includes protocols and development. I think you make a really good point. I have now several examples in my mind where there is a conflict or a very strong relationship to an IETF protocol and then a policy promulgated by ICANN. Any other comments on 33? So what do people think? Do you need

any more qualifiers on 33, or can we go on? I think status quo then, huh?

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm happy with status quo. Eric had suggested add protocol development, and I was going harmless, but if you want to retract that, I'm equally okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't care.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, it stays as is. Penetration testing, 34. Noorul and Steve. Noorul first and then Steve.

NOORUL AMEEN: I just [inaudible] part of [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, I missed that.

NOORUL AMEEN: It should be [inaudible] testing [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: It should be DNS penetration testing and not just penetration testing, is that your suggestion? That we add a qualifier?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: As I understood Noorul Ameen, he said we should add DNS to make it DNS penetration testing, and I guess I think a more general penetration testing background is helpful, especially with the group formerly known Subgroup 2 [fact finding] in L.A. So I think it's generally good to have it at a higher level, personally. My two cents.

DENISE MICHEL: I have Steve and then Žarko.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks. I was trying to get into the Line 33 if it's okay to jump a half step back here for a second.

DENISE MICHEL: Certainly.

STEVE CONTE: If I missed this part of the conversation, I apologize. Is it worthwhile to consider under the Internet protocols however you guys end up defining it the implementation of such

protocols as they relate to the work that ICANN does? Not necessarily the development of the protocol, which is broad as Geoff mentioned. But taking it into consideration of the parameters in which ICANN is responsible for those protocols, how are they implemented? Just a suggestion.

DENISE MICHEL: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I see the point, but I think my two cents is that it takes us closer to scoping and away from skills. I think I'd feel much stronger saying I have Internet protocol experience if it was general than if it was as effectuated through ICANN, for example.

STEVE CONTE: Okay, fair enough. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Okay, so back to penetration testing. Žarko?

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, I just wanted to tell Eric don't imply that we were trying any penetration testing in L.A.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, no, no. We weren't. We were not. Sorry. Absolutely not. Let the record reflect, I don't believe we were at all.

NOORUL AMEEN: It can't be [inaudible] sense [inaudible] assessment.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry. There are a couple things going on at the same time. Noorul, can you repeat that please.

NOORUL AMEEN: [PT] is kind of open, so people may have multiple comments on that. So shall we make it a more lighter [and more generic] like [vulnerability] assessment or [vulnerability] analysis?

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Noorul. What do people think about that? As you wear your hat of people filling out a matrix, does it help make it more clear or more useful?

GEOFF HUSTON: I think it just complicates things. I'm really having a hard time following at that point. So many other areas it is broad, and we're okay with broad. And pen testing is one of those things that, again, is a broad application. It has application to ICANN's

own internal systems. It has applications into the subject matter. That's okay. Like many other broad terms, it's just another broad term.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Geoff. Noorul, is there another – obviously we can add to this list. Is there...?

NOORUL AMEEN: I feel vulnerability analysis is also important like penetration testing. So shall we make it together or something like that?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's what I was going to ask. Or we can make it a separate category or add it to this one. Which one do you think is best? Then we should have people comment on it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that's a good point. I think vulnerability assessment should be a separate point because I think that is separate and we could do a lot inside of that domain. We could do code analysis, static analysis, blah, blah, blah. But I think vulnerability assessment should be a separate one in addition to pen testing. My two cents.

ŽARKO KECIC: Just to correct here, analysis not assessment.

DENISE MICHEL: So we have a suggestion on the table to add Line 35, vulnerability analysis. Any comments on that? Are people comfortable with that? Jennifer, could you add vulnerability analysis to 35?

NORM RITCHIE: You should just probably note that you're seeing nodding heads when you just add things on.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, this is not a unilateral directive. People around the table were nodding their heads. Great. Okay, that takes us back up. Go ahead, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I just stand by for when we're ready to start adding things that aren't there.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, I just wanted to know as well about Boban sent an e-mail I think this morning with some items. He had some comments on

this, so I don't know if you want to take a look at that e-mail and we can go through it together.

DENISE MICHEL: That would be great. Could we please?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I'll pull it up.

DENISE MICHEL: And Noorul?

NOORUL AMEEN: [inaudible] 26 to 33, these are operational steps. Somehow we need to add the security perspective also because the operations and secure operations, these are different things. There was operational [inaudible] and [inaudible] somewhat different I feel. Both are related, but since – so somehow we need to add that security [cover].

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Noorul. That's useful. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: One way we could do that is add a third column. So we have knowledge of, practices, and then we could say practices security or has security or something like that. Would that do it for you, you think?

DENISE MICHEL: I don't know as a third column because not everything in our list is applicable to security. But we should definitely circle back on that. Jennifer, is everyone able to read Boban's e-mail?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: She has also put the link to the [mailman] in the archive in the chat.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'll go ahead and channel it since I'm looking at the e-mail. The first thing that Boban suggests is that – oh, wait. Sorry, I started at the bottom. Risk management instead of risk assessment analysis as they are of the general process. And he'd like to add business continuity management as a separate are. I think, did we touch on some of that of our own volition? I'm just wondering if we wound up putting it in the skills assessment, I mean in the whatever we're calling this thing. So risk management, we have risk analysis and management so we have that instead of risk assessment. So he had the same idea.

And then business continuity management as a separate area. Did we do something with that? We have security of business systems, but it's not business continuity. We don't have business continuity in there, do we?

DENISE MICHEL: No, we do not.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Do we think we should put business continuity management in? Does anyone have any thoughts on that?

GEOFF HUSTON: If you ever do a risk assessment of a company, business continuity sits inside your risk assessment. If you are skilled in risk assessment and management, you understand this. That's what the skill is about.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Žarko, go ahead.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, I agree with Geoff what he said, but without risk assessment/analysis, you cannot make business continuity, but business continuity has inside operational and organizational

stuff. So that's a little bit different than just risk analysis and assessment.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Trying to get broad skills and then trying to say how they get applied in particular cases is where we're trying to draw the line and going we're after skills and expertise and understanding of operations versus particular fine point things. In the same way that DNS and Internet protocols cover such a huge range. I personally think the issue of if you understand risk analysis and management, factors such as business continuity, information security actually follow right inside most of that traditionally because you can't do a comprehensive, you can't understand risk assessment and management unless you factor that in. So it's a very broad church, that's a pinpoint area.

ŽARKO KECIC:

What I am trying to say is business continuity is broader than risk management. Risk management sits inside business continuity. After that, you have resources management, organizational management, and other stuff which is added to risk analysis that you have to do first.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so I think not to try and break a tie or weigh in, it sounds like people might feel this out differently. So I suggest we add a category and we'll see what happens. So business continuity management should be in there.

DENISE MICHEL: So, Jennifer, could you add Line 36, business continuity management and then highlight it in color so it's something we can come back to after we get through this list? And I would note that lunch is outside, so let's quickly work through the rest of Boban's e-mail and then have some lunch.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, I'll try not to keep us from lunch. Yeah, okay, so the next chunk he has he basically suggested we incorporate stuff from the call from volunteers, which I think we started off with. So I think we've already touched on these, but just for completeness: corporate data security, business systems, incident response, malware and abuse vectors. As I recall, we've added and iterated on these already, so I'm going to treat these as handled.

Okay, so then he says, etc., some other stuff, additionally AS numbers and protocol parameters as part of the Internet unique identifiers. I think we've covered that. I don't know if we want to

open it because of the e-mail but basically I think we have it covered. Does anyone think that we don't have it covered as –

DENISE MICHEL: It's certainly number one. Yeah.

ŽARKO KECIC: Would they seek a copy of the regional requirements from a call for volunteers. On some parts and then add a few comments.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Right.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Yup. Okay, so down below he says we should add further registry and registration security. I think we had hit that one already. Penetration – he think we didn't need pen testing but we've definitely crossed that bridge already.

And so, I think that takes us to the end of Boban's. I'd like to just suggest that maybe after lunch we start thinking about other things we want to add but we could do that after but Žarko, go ahead.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, sorry. I'm an old man. I may forget. After lunch. Should we have a business process analysis and development?

DENISE MICHEL: Business process analysis and development, any objections to that? Great. Jennifer, could you add business process analysis and – is there an [and] on there? And development. Yeah, business process analysis and development, if we could add that as a – yeah, we already have. Thank you. Okay.

Anything else from Boban's list? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry.

DENISE MICHEL: Go on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you give me an example of what that would be? What would be a business process that opens? Business processes, how we are doing many things, so steps and tasks that we have to do before we accomplish something.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I was just wondering [inaudible] but okay. Process development.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Yup.

DENISE MICHEL: Let me give a little energy check around the table. Would you like to break now for lunch and come back? Would you like to have a break for 10 minutes and come back and have a working lunch? How are people feeling? We need to add additional items to this list, scrub it and send it out to the list. Do you want to take a break and do that or you want to have a working lunch? That's the question on the table. And Žarko is leaving.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Just –

DENISE MICHEL: Voting with his [inaudible]. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Just to engage what's left to be accomplished today so we know whether we have enough time or not.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. So, on skillset, we need to add additional skills, deal with the highlighted items. Make sure we don't have duplication that we're comfortable with the list. And then we need to address how we're going to ask people to do this, revisit the knowledge and practice in 1 through 3, 1 through 10, how are we going to define that? That has to be done now.

And then, additionally on our schedule, we have scope. We need to come back to scope and see if we have a common understanding of what our next steps are on scope. So now, I'm getting into the rest of the day's agenda.

And then, we have some of the items that we raised this morning to come back and address. Things like an articulation and understanding of resource needs, communication needs, those types of things. Eric? So that in my mind rounds out our agenda for today.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, just to serve one thing that I think I thought I heard Patrick say was he underscored that he wanted us to do the skillset gap analysis or have the discussion about that. Unfortunately I think what that means is we need to discuss where the scope is so that we can map out from these categories which parts of our scope need to have certain skills. He wanted us to do that gap analysis.

So, I think to reiterate what you're saying, Denise, we need to wrap this up. We need to figure out a timeline for when we're going to call it complete, socialize on the list, etc., have people sort of close the comments on it but that's sort of a longer term. So we need to have that timeline established today but we also need to go and revisit our scope and figure out how to componentize that in the things that we can cross reference to this, and I don't think we can do that today because this list isn't final today but we need to basically have an understanding of how we're going to do it and when we're going to do it by.

So our plan is skills, our plan is a scope gap analysis and then scope I think in general, like when we're going to hit those milestones down the road.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Eric. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. So, I will suggest that we either have a quick lunch or a working lunch, one of the other and we'll have a good one, then I'm going now and not to let that fall away.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Norm, for repeating what I said. I love it when that happens. Thanks for reinforcing it. So, show of hands, who wants to work through lunch? Okay, two, three, four, five. All right. You have 15 minutes to grab your food and then I think and come back here and we'll continue on, okay?

Thank you everyone. We'll get working again in just a few minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's just [inaudible]. Do you know what your ETA when we started? Mr. Matogoro – five minutes? Mr. Matogoro, five minutes from now, we'll be starting again.

[BREAK]

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Pardon? I think first, we want to make sure that we capture any additions. Formally to start, this is Denise and we're going to get started again. Thank you, Matogoro, for bearing with us on the phone as we got lunch.

So, to recap where we are here, now we're going to discuss additions to this skillset list and it's part of that – so, additions that people have in their minds already. We'll add those, then

we'll look at some previous list that Žarko had created that referenced skillsets that matched some of the items that the team was tackling and Jennifer will drop a link.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Yes. That will give us a good jumpstart on reviewing that gap analysis on scope and skills. Those are the specific steps we have ahead of us to wrap up this skillset part of our agenda item.

All right. With that, I'm opening the floor to additions to this skillset list. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So yeah, I'm obviously just sort of absolutely speaking without my Chair. I had on just my perspective. The first to the things I think we want to add on there is familiarity with cryptography.

DENISE MICHEL: I think one – yeah, cryptography.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I'm sorry. The next one I would add [if] no one jot that down but we can always revisit [inaudible]. Software system

architecture. If we did, then we can normalize it but I don't remember.

Yeah, I mean, that's my proposal.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah, so I would suggest that we just do a really short brainstorming here. Let anyone add their ideas and then go through the list. So from 38 down are ideas that we're going to then discuss. Go ahead, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I'd also propose I would say HSMs (Hardware Security Modules) and as it relates to root zone management and signing, why not? And again, this is just my perspective, so I'm happy for people to say, "Oh, we think that that's not worthwhile or whatever." But I thought it would be worth adding. And the last one would be computer architecture.

I can explain my perspective and if people think that they're too far filled, I'm a 100% okay with that. My perspective is that when you look at systemic dependencies like a software architecture background, lets you map things out, sometimes I found it useful.

The cryptography, again, I know we're not dealing with crypto but again, I think understanding the depth of crypto and where it is and [it] sometimes helps you have perspective. These are all just things that I think help with perspective.

And, HSMs, again, that's for other field, a hardware computer architecture for other field, so I'm happy for people to say that those are out of bounds but I just thought it's worth the discussion.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Eric. Your ideas, Žarko.

ŽARKO KECIC: Computer architecture is too specific and I really don't think that we need that. Cryptography is okay. Software system architecture is okay. And HSM, are we going [inaudible]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Žarko, yeah, we don't have to.

DENISE MICHEL: Another option is to add it as an includes X in another category that we already have in there if you feel it isn't drawn out enough. A question that I would raise is and of course that matters the context, we put the skillset in and I think it will be

important to remind people in really big, bold letters several times. This is not suggesting that the team is going to get into cryptography or any other area listed here necessarily but that didn't say knowledge base and practice base list of – for the SO and AC Chairs to consider because I think there's potential for people to be confused about conflating scope and a work plan with a skillset of list of knowledge is in practices that would be good to have.

Other discussions of lines 39 through 42, Steve?

STEVE CONTE:

Just to comment on your last comment there, thank you for clearing that up. I admit that I was kind of hesitant and concerned about the pen testing for that very recent one. But I made a presumption that what you said is the intention and the spirit of the team, so I appreciate you spilling that out and making sure that for the record, we all understand that.

DENISE MICHEL:

So I think the question on the table or Eric's ideas and Žarko's follow-ups, where does that made these specific suggestions in people's mind?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, Žarko thought a couple don't make sense and I'm fine with that unless other people have other perspective, we can [yank] some of the [inaudible].

ŽARKO KECIC: Other than the root zone people, is there anywhere else where the HSMs are going to be applicable?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry, working lunch, I have food in my mouth. Yeah, I mean, we were talking about business continuity and risk assessment and stuff like that. And, HSMs have a lot of [inaudible] that you need to pay attention to like battery lifetimes and the stuff that you would normally think of and then that become part of the process for like root zone signing and key management.

And so, the extent to which you ever get done the path of saying the process that something is following is important. There are elements of how HSMs work, how they can and can't be paired with each other, etc. that may or may not be useful. I'm not saying we should go there. Again, specifically, I'm not trying to define the scope with this. But I know a lot about some aspects of HSMs and it's come up in the context of root zone maintenance.

And again, I'll just reassert, I'm definitely not married to this. I just thought I'd throw them out as food for thought and I want to go what the team's perspective is.

DENISE MICHEL: Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm having trouble with all four different reasons. As a group, we're not exactly installing an HSM anytime soon or [inaudible]? That's not the plan. And in some ways, even understanding that particular piece is quite strange technology in all its gory details. I wouldn't applaud as particularly relevant skill for assessing whether someone who operates this stuff and they have – doing a competent job in looking after them. We don't want to solve the problems. We just want to know they're doing an appropriate job.

Crypto too is kind of – well, this is going to get an extended discussion on whether we're using ECDSA, this is our say versus right. There's a little bit of overkill going on in trying to get someone well versed in crypto who I'm really not sure their skills would be called upon to the level that crypto tends to suggest.

We've already put that information technology and information security but in particular, information technology it kind of

covers a lot of this area that you talk about particularly the software and hardware architectures in my mind. Maybe the overview of information technology is so soft that it doesn't encompass further down the stack. But in my mind, I always thought information technology went a long way down the stack and you're expected to understand those kinds of architecture principles of hardware/software in order to understand IT.

DENISE MICHEL: Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. So software system architecture absolutely is not covered by IT. Software system architecture in my opinion is basically implementers, knowing how to build large scale systems and I guess it doesn't say large scale systems but large scale distributed systems are built by a certain person and they're built and architected in such a way that they have data affinity models that are decided upon, they're built in a specific way.

And, IT infrastructure or operators, some of them manage some of the systems but they don't necessarily have the skillset to know why you built it that way. They may learn retroactively but having been a software architect for over 10 years, I can tell you that there's a lot that goes into how you build something, why

you build it and those sorts of principles help you dissect other large scale distributed systems from an implementation level. That should have been my experience.

GEOFF HUSTON: Are we trying to second-guess the choice of vendors for technology?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, no. I think what we're doing is we're saying there's a large scale distributed system and I have a principal view of why it works a certain way, where there are sort of liabilities because it comes from having built.

GEOFF HUSTON: Which is the system in your mind?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The DNS root is a giant large scale distributed system. I'm not proposing that we build it or that we audit it but I understand certain aspects of it from my background is what I'm saying.

GEOFF HUSTON: Apart from [tech replaying] microphone, [hubs] got huge, which is kind of cute.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON: You're right. I didn't think we're delving into the root server, the RSSAC territory as a particular area of study here. I thought that was RSSAC's kind of problem and therefore, I'm really kind of unsure about the particular issues with distributing the root once it leaves ICANN's door and heads towards – actually your company heads towards Verisign for signing in onward.

I'm not sure where our delineation and scope begins and ends in that system. So, I'm still raising my eyebrows a bit here because I kind of have a – which door or which bucket is this sitting in problem.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so that's fair. I gave a kind of a general [inaudible] example, so maybe let me give a more detailed one. So, take the name collision's issue. Name collision is part of a lot of consternation around ICANN's purview because of a lot of things. It's got the CI policies and requirements as illustrated with that.

A lot of the work that we do with that was through analyzing software, analyzing data, we have data up there but understanding the software functioning so we knew why they were admitting big queries and being able to track them down and we have a couple of top tier scientific publications on it last year and this year.

And, those sorts of pieces of work were very beneficial during those pieces of work to have a software systems architecture background because you're looking at how systems are built, you understand – I mean, I'm not saying that's the only way you could understand it. I'm saying that that was a skill that was very helpful.

So when it comes to like why did someone build it that way, someone that built things before sometimes has a perspective on it. That's all I'm saying.

DENISE MICHEL: So we'll need to bring this to a close in terms of what you think should be on the list and should not [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'll stand down.

DENISE MICHEL: Žarko.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, Eric, I understand your explanation but we are not going into – hopefully, we are not going into those issues. So, software system architecture is a specific skill that I don't think that we'll need but that's acceptable. HSMs and computer architecture, I'm sure we are not going to build computers here or to open up ICANN computers to check – are they well built or not.

So, those last two I would remove and software architecture is questionable, also cryptography, yeah, I don't think we'll need but we can just leave.

DENISE MICHEL: All right, what does leave our list? Or is Jennifer tracking this? I think we're taking all four of them off. Is that nodding of the heads? Eric indicated – he has educated us and he's standing down. Žarko.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah. I just want to follow-up what Steve said. We have to think about our wording here because that assessment and other stuff got us to trouble. Penetration testing, can we say that on a different way?

DENISE MICHEL: Any suggestions of rewording on penetration testing?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think pen testing is a thing. I think it's a known term. It carries a lot of weight with it.

ŽARKO KECIC: It is but may lead to confusion that we are going to do pen testing.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, and maybe this is part and parcel for the last conversation. These are skills that we have. They don't in any way say what our scope or direction as a team is. And so, if we have a pen testing with us, I tend to think that that's a very useful thing, like you might have hunters in your network and they're constantly looking for exploits, that doesn't mean you want to exploit your network but you take someone that knows how to do that and they help you effectuate a solid [info sec] posture.

So, a lot of these, the latter ones I was proposing and this pen testing one as well is we want someone who knows how to do that stuff so that when they sit down with us, they have a perspective that maybe we don't all have or they see something

that somebody without that perspective. That's also pen testing. It is very helpful personally because we don't want to pen test. But a lot of white hats come from gray hats or darker.

DENISE MICHEL: And Žarko but I think Norm wants to jump in here, too.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, just to comment to this. Okay, I agree that it is a skill that we definitely need but we have to say something clearly that we are not going to do pen testing.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Norm, do you still have a comment? And then [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I was actually to go support Eric. I think it's fine just as it is. We don't get defensive about things everything we say something. Because that could still [ball] and we can't say this either and like we can be oversensitive, that's what I'm saying, I guess. If there's a particular thing in here I'm not aware of like if they do something bad, then I'll leave it on.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Norm. Noorul.

NOORUL AMEEN: I support Eric in this discussion because we are doing a review, another penetration testing, but penetration testing is still so very much important for this kind of review because the guys who have an offensive mentality that can be utilized in a better way for securing the architecture and the systems.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, but my comment is if somebody reads that and see that we need penetration test skills, may raise wrong assumptions, so we can end up in trouble that people outside this group comment that we are going to do pen testing.

NOORUL AMEEN: See, in the scope and in the rules of engagement, we never specify about the penetration testing all the time. These are the skillset requirements. These are the skillset requirements. So, I don't feel any problem in putting in the skills requirement because internationally, it is an acclaimed skill, information security skill.

DENISE MICHEL: So I think we've established that it's a useful and we've also established that there's... Gentleman, okay, so to move this

along, I'd like to suggest that our offer that we have attacks on computer systems and then in parenthesis, includes penetration testing and things like that. Can we have a broader – so, understanding there's a concern about a misunderstanding if we have the word penetration testing and some people feel strongly that this would be a useful skill. Can we word it in a way that goes further down the road or disabusing people of what this is about such as attacks on computer system, something broader? And then in parenthesis, penetration testing.

I'm just throwing that out there as an idea. Noorul, Žarko, and Eric.

NOORUL AMEEN:

See, attacks on computer system that will create more offensive sounds because penetration testing is a kind of ethical things. You know what your rules of engagements are. But attacks on computer system that will create more problem than [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Noorul. Žarko, did you have a follow-up on that before we go to Eric? Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Will we be more comfortable at something that's not exactly the same but close like red teaming?

ŽARKO KECIC: No, I agree that this is a good skill to have. I just don't like wording over here that can be too confusing.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I understand. I think we understand that. So, would red teaming be an acceptable substitute for pen testing? How did people feel about red teaming? Yeah, I don't think it sounds as threatening. And there's different types of red teaming to be clear. What do you think, people? Noorul?

NOORUL AMEEN: Then we could make a more general like knowledge of exploits –

DENISE MICHEL: What exploits?

NOORUL AMEEN: Knowledge of exploit writing or exploit code, writing – I don't know.

DENISE MICHEL: Žarko? No, you can't raise a problem and not have a solution.

ŽARKO KECIC: How about pen testing techniques? So, not asking for experience and knowledge and hacking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

ŽARKO KECIC: No, pen testing techniques.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I support that.

DENISE MICHEL: And if you change that to pen testing techniques – other additions to this list? Other comments on the list? Let's move through the – if you could then please put up the table that Žarko had created for discussion several months ago that flags some skills on it just to refresh our memory and look at that to see if it raises any additional ideas for us. Žarko, did you want to provide some more context for this?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I just get a sense of the room? Did anyone else lose Internet? We might have problem sharing it. You did and if we did then I can go chase that.

DENISE MICHEL: And Jennifer, you put a link in the Adobe Connect Room as well, thank you. Žarko, did you want to give some thoughts on that?

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, Jennifer, can you go to the bottom of this document first? I had to be careful. Below – nothing else? Okay. Hopefully I shared the right one.

Okay, I put a number of skills and explained them, what each of skills means. I believe that PAL is process – no, Policies And Legal stuff. T is Technical. IS is Information Security. BP is Business Process, etc., etc. And, I tried to break down each of 28 requirements into tasks that should be done.

And also at the bottom I put what output should be for each recommendation and I put three things. It is completed. Is it satisfactory and sufficient and needs more work – something like that and then just trying to remember what I did in [Mesa]. That's it.

And, I believe we all together I expected that we'll work on this document but no additional work was done from June. Jennifer, did you [inaudible] add it in June? Is it? Yup.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. And Žarko, can you – is there a key to the column F abbreviations written down or if not, could you repeat that again?

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, I thought that's the bottom of the document but maybe either I didn't send the right one or it is lost.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you remember what they stand for?

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, just to be – TS is Technical Skills, IS is Information Security, BP is Business Process, PAL is Policies And Legal stuff.

DENISE MICHEL: So I think we've captured those. Do you feel like we've captured those broad skillsets in the list already or there's any additions based on this?

ŽARKO KECIC: I don't see a process – yeah, policies out there and legal stuff is not, everything else should be.

DENISE MICHEL: So policy is on the list, ICANN policy is on the list but what is not on the list, hmm? Legal, okay, great.

Going back to the list, we would add under 43 legal. It is broad.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We have ICANN Contractual Compliance listed as number 24 and that – it's not all of it that's part of it.

DENISE MICHEL: So, yeah. Legal – so having a law degree, having legal background, I could see that being a useful background for some of the issues that we're tackling.

Let me just jump out for a moment and welcome Don to the conversation. He's in the Adobe Connect Room. Hi, Don. We're developing a skillset to send out for consideration of the whole team and then we were comfortable with it. We're just going to be on a quick timeline have team members fill it out. And Mr. Matagoro had a couple of interventions on the pen testing. I think we've incorporated I think his comment.

Then Mr. Matagoro if you have any additional clarifications, I was having trouble with the Adobe Connect room so please do post them again if we've missed any of your comments relating to the skills we're reviewing.

So back to legal, which is broad. Do we have suggestions of any way of narrowing it? All right, well let's leave it as legal for now, highlight it. We may come back to it.

Another contribution that I received during lunch was that it would be that people with background with public policy like governmental regulations and public policy could have useful knowledge and applications for this for some of our work.
Noorul.

NOORUL AMEEN: We have already discussed the Internet governance.

DENISE MICHEL: Internet governance, which is a more specific set. So do you think the appropriate thing to put down there would be Internet governance?

NOORUL AMEEN: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Any objection to adding an item titled Internet governance? Okay. Any other additions to this skillset list? I'm just quickly looking through the SSR1 recommendations to see if there's any areas that are specific in there that might contribute to this?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Matagoro has just typed in the chat that he supports – it's important we have someone with legal skills.

DENISE MICHEL: Do people feel like standards and certifications are covered? Or if there's anything else that needs to be added there? Again I'm just walking through the 28 recommendations to see if that raises any issues that we might want to consider for the skillset. Any thoughts? Is that too generic to be applicable?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just I'm fine with that. I just sort of reframe Denise's question from a different perspective without espousing one myself. If someone were to say, I'm a [inaudible], therefore I think it matters what I think so that would be a certification level. If someone were to say, "I'm a JD, therefore I have some ability to blah, blah, blah." So I think that's kind of what I get from part of Denise's question is, do we feel like we need to have something

in there that sort of allows identification of credentials or certification or something like that. So I mean that again I don't have a perspective but just to reframe that in case it is helpful.

DENISE MICHEL: That's not what I meant but it's still a valid question. I think your point goes to our discussion of how someone will indicate their knowledge and skill level. It then goes that my question was specifically about the recommendation of ISO standards certification for ICANN activities. But if you feel that's – just raised it as a question, if you feel that's already covered within the elements we have, I'm not looking to add any more skillsets than we need.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I propose that we've reached a point of natural – I was going to say natural pause but diminishing returns. I think maybe what we do now is we move on to timing and then on to gap, etc.

DENISE MICHEL: Well before we do that, let's take the shaded items in hand to make sure that we've circled back on those where people have raised questions. Geoff, can you remind me where we left number 2 on this chart? Internet unique identifiers including DNS IP numbering AS, numbers and protocol parameters. We're

okay. Okay. Is everyone okay with ICANN contractual compliance? Okay. This is continuity management they'd highlighted. There was some question about that. Any issues? Okay. Understanding that you all have another crack at this when we put it out on e-mail list. Legal, we're just going to leave it like that or you want to make it any more specific?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I say leave it.

DENISE MICHEL: Žarko and then Steve or Jennifer? Žarko, did you have your hand up? No? Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Matagoro had a comment on legal, one more addition. It should also have a strong understanding of the current Bylaws and and NDA we're asked to sign. And I don't think any legal contracting governance have overlap with legal.

DENISE MICHEL: So Mr. Matagoro, is your comment – are you suggesting a clarification to an existing skillset or an additional skill? Okay. Any ideas of how to incorporate and address that? And Don, he was noting some overlap in legal contracts and governance –

legal contracts in governance and system security for legal. Certainly some connections with these categories but Don are you suggesting that they be further refined or combined in the interest of getting to an initial set list that we can work on? Is there a specific action that you're recommending? Okay. So we have a suggestion by Matagoro to add another category called "ICANN Bylaws" and another category called "NDA." And then when Don has a chance to post the list on whether there's a – if he's recommending a clarification or an additional skill, that would be helpful. So I think we're getting down to the end and we need to move on.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So this just proposes to the team to see what you guys think so we were just past 1:30. We started tracking along. I want to make sure that we've got time and energy going forward. So I propose that at some point now or soon we started terminating iteration on this list. We establish timelines for when it goes out and when we call it done and when we call it final. So people can start to then check the box by their name. [Just start this real quick]. I'm not saying to that right this second but that comes up and then we have to go to look at our scope, the things that we're going to work on and figure out what the gap analysis is basically, what skills are necessary for what pieces of work we have in mind so that we can see are there any pieces of work for which we are

not appropriately staffed by our skillset? Not that we'll evaluate that now because the list isn't done but certainly come up with a framework and the timeline on that. So I think that next big item involves scope and involves timing. So that would be the next thing I would suggest we move on to.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Eric.

ŽARKO KECIC: Let me answer your question. We still have a lot of work to do before we can do that to see what skillset we'll need or do we have sufficient –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think today what we're trying to do is just establish the framework and the timeframe to do that. I don't think we can do it today. So yeah, sorry. My thought was unclear. I think what we have in front of us is the need to build a skeleton and then when we expect it to be fleshed it so the timeline around it. That's what I was suggesting but I'm open to suggestions.

ŽARKO KECIC: Okay. I misunderstood you. Expecting that we are going to do that today. Just to clarify, ICANN Bylaws and NDA, what

Matagoro said, we need legal with strong understanding of NDA and Bylaws. So I would add that next to legal and parenthesis not as separate items.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. All right. So on the legal item, please add in parenthesis, included Bylaws and NDAs. Thank you.

So the suggestion now is we look at the current terms of reference, make sure there aren't any skills related to that. Is that what your suggestion? Timing? Okay now we want to address timing. So I would propose that we send this out to the list, ask people to provide any edits or additions by close of day Monday. Is that too tight a turnaround or you want it Tuesday? Are you still traveling? Okay, Tuesday. So close of business Tuesday. Universal business day. All right, Tuesday. We'll figure out the UTC time. All right. General timeframe of late Tuesday early Wednesday and we'll figure out how to word that. That'll be a deadline for making any edits or additions to this list. And then I would recommend that we use e-mail within 24 hours to resolve any disagreements over the edits or comments that we have. And then create the matrix for people to fill out. In my mind, this is a really quick exercise for people. So I would prefer to give people 48 hours – oh no Geoff's scowling at me.

GEOFF HOUSTON: I am and I'm applying the reasonable test. Do we expect 22 people on this planet, any... if you had your brothers who would actually cover all of this list or what? At some point, the kind of the wish list is become its own mountain rather than surviving a reasonable test. And to my mind, we're probably spending our time on it. It's a case of just move on with what we've got because this just doesn't seem to be a productive use of anyone's time so no. Send it out. Do it. Finished. Done. Move on.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm a bit confused. So we're going to give people who are not here and not online a chance – a lack at it. I'm proposing a pretty aggressive timeline within which they have to make any further comments. And then get on with it. I think you and I are on the same page, Geoff. I've got Eric and Jennifer. Or Jennifer then Eric.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Mr. Matagoro is online. He says, "Are these skillsets to help select additional members to the Review Team or to assess our own skillset?"

DENISE MICHEL: It's the former. We're suggesting them as the skillsets needed to address the current scope and work of the Review Team. And

we'll provide these skillsets – completed skillset matrix to the SO and AC Chairs as they consider whether and how to add additional members to this team.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I just want to add some sort of support to I guess if you guys are in agreement to both of you. But I think we want to be able to get everyone on the team to have a chance to have input on this. Not everyone could be here today and some of the people that couldn't be here are online with us but not all of them. But to Denise's point and I think also to Geoff's, we really need to move expeditiously through this. So a tight timeframe is an unfortunate side effect of where we all landed. And so I think how about we do 01:00 UTC time on Wednesday. Something like that. And we'll just say like, by then we will have all of your comments. And then Denise, to your point, 24 hours later we'll expect there to be some sort of – I hate to say it – majority consensus on the disputes. We'll just do a count. And we'll have a bunch of iterations that day. And some of us will be on flights a couple of days later to go to IGF unfortunately. So this is necessarily a tight window.

DENISE MICHEL:

So with the caveat that if someone raises a few – people raise a big flag that the timing is just not going to work and they need

another day, we can certainly be flexible but I think my point is that if you're not around the table creating the skillset, then you're likely back at home working and can do a tighter turnaround for any additional comment. So I would propose that we give the rest of the folks who are not with us – that would be Saturday, Sunday, Monday – to add any comments to this. I would suggest that any additions or red lines be completed by Tuesday. And I'll figure out the times here. By Tuesday, we've closed edits to this list. And then by... let's see if we could do it by Wednesday. If we need to chase down stragglers, we will. By Wednesday, we have people filling out this matrix and have it done.

In parallel with that, I'd like to take volunteers to give some context and language around this in a letter to SO and AC Chairs. So that's an action item that we'll come back to. Okay, I've sketched out a timeline. I don't see anyone objecting to it. So that's the timeline that we'll do our best to follow.

Before we close this out, I'd like to bring the conversation back to how we're going to portray the knowledge and practice or application level of members. I think a couple of options are on the table. One is it's just a checkbox. You either have the knowledge or a practical application in an area or you don't. Another idea is to assign 1, 2, 3 level of knowledge and practical

application in a skillset. What do people think? Do we need the additional... go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I propose a 1 to 5 scale inclusive of your familiarity and a 1 to 5 scale of your duty, like you perform the duties of. 1 to 5.

DENISE MICHEL: Does anyone have a problem with that? Žarko.

ŽARKO KECIC: Usually when you have two different professors and one student, they will grade the same student differently. And if we have to grade ourselves, we'll do that differently. So I believe it's sufficient to have – I know something about that and I did it.

DENISE MICHEL: So you've just kind of taken us back to the two general categories, knowledge and practical application.

Eric? No another – something else to throw in the mix is we could just keep in on the simpler side with no gradation to knowledge and practice. But tell the SO and AC Chairs when we convey this that if they would like more granularity for more information on skillsets in this area as portrayed on the team,

we can provide that. Are you comfortable with that approach?
Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: In order to hopefully make this a more useful tool for ourselves as well rather than not just totally satisfying others, I suggest that we actually have four levels. Zero knowledge, the basic intermediate advanced. So 0, 1, 2, 3. The reason for that, if you had 10 people that all had basic knowledge or something and put them together on a task, it might not get you anywhere. You may require someone that has an advanced knowledge of the topic.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So there's a proposal on the table that we have basic, intermediate, and expert as the level in the knowledge and application of these. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Either way it's basically going to be kind of we're honor bound to represent ourselves properly. So I mean, if it's a [bullion] yes or no, I mean I've worked with a lot of lawyers personally and professionally. But I don't think I should click a box next to the legal. Yet I could. I could say yeah, I'm familiar law. I've been there myself. So it's always going to be kind of on

us to be honor bound here when I've done technical program committees and reviewed research works and stuff like that, the reviewers all self describe themselves per the paper topic of am I familiar, am I versed, am I an expert in this. And yet usually it's like a 1 to 5 scale. And so you can essentially disqualify yourself. I've no idea. That was wise proposing it but I really don't care if we do bullion. It's certainly faster. And if they really just want like a low pass filter, then that will do it for them. It's like yeah. But we can't. I can't say that I know legal. I mean I could but I shouldn't. So it's all [looping on] [inaudible] us all.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Eric. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. Counter to my own point I just made and said that it was triggered by Eric's comments, in my case I report to myself. But I understand that other people report to companies and putting in different levels of skills in a particular topic may not in a public manner may not do well to their companies. I might want to go back to just the yes or no.

DENISE MICHEL: All right. I think we've talked ourselves out of assigning a level. Žarko? Comment? All right. Anything else on the skillset that we

need to take care of today? I think we have a path forward with the schedule. I would like a volunteer to draft the conveyance letter to the SO and AC Chairs. That will need to be done towards the end of next week. Don't all raise your hands at once.

GEOFF HUSTON: I see this as an example, if it really is [inaudible], please find attached. Da, da, da, da, da.

DENISE MICHEL: I think Geoff just volunteered.

GEOFF HUSTON: No, I said – and in particular, this is the kind of thing I'm saying. There's a bunch of times that really are just a waste of... It's just time and nothing else. I thought support staff would help us with that. Pro forma letter? Easy peasy.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Thanks, Geoff. And so two things here. One, we're happy to do it just a straightforward conveyance letter. Trying to be mindful of the comments we got early in the morning about the potential for misunderstanding here. If people feel more comfortable now that we've gone through the list, then it doesn't need any further sort of warnings or clarifications or

intent. Happy to do that. I would also note that we were going to – we also talked this morning, Geoff, about using as an opportunity to once again ask the SO and AC Chairs, tell them that we’re responding to their specific requests for skillsets and use it as occasion to ask, let them know that we’ve already paid for a meeting in January. So to keep that in mind and to give us an indication of when they’re going to make a decision about un-pausing it. Again, nothing has been decided but those are two reasons why I wanted to come back to whether we want to use the conveyance of this to make a point, ask a question that’s an open item here. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I want to agree with both of you despite the fact that you’re both disagreeing with each other.

DENISE MICHEL: I’m sorry. We’re not disagreeing. As the Chair, I want to make sure we don’t leave people’s comments in the dust. We have kind of two things I wanted to bring back in here. I’m not saying we have to do them. I’m saying these were raised earlier. So if people feel that we don’t need to make any additional explanations about the skillsets, great. And if people feel we don’t want to use that occasion to ping the SO and AC Chairs,

also great with that. And if I can get a sense of the room, I would love to move off this topic too. Yeah, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: You just talked two letters, Denise. You really did.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm trying to be efficient.

GEOFF HUSTON: I know. But you shouldn't be. Not in this case. I mean it really is. Here's the skillset as requested. Full stop. Bang. Done. If you have questions relating to future arranged meetings, in fact some, if not all of us, have started booking tickets, because I certainly haven't, that becomes really another letter of probably folks needed a decision from the SO and AC Chairs. But that really is a different letter.

DENISE MICHEL: Steve.

STEVE CONTE: We have some various comments from the chat room. In discussion about the ranking, Don says he agreed. I think was when Norm was talking about the ranking levels. If you report

[inaudible] agrees. He then goes on to say he's got Geoff's thoughts on pro forma. And then Mr. Matagoro says we need to put some of the challenges that have resulted to slow progress and that need to be attended before un-pausing this team. Put out some of those challenges, right.

DENISE MICHEL: All right. It sounds like there is agreement for just a pro forma. Here's the skillset. And then we'll move on to our next task. Is that okay with everyone? Yeah? Okay. So we were going to circle back to the scope of the team.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I think we want basically today build skeletons and templates and timelines. So I think we're starting to rough out the skill timeline in the sense that we need to stabilize the set across the team. And we need to then sort of construct when we're going to have the team fill out all of our information on that. Right? Okay. So we're ostensibly done with that. And I think what we need to do now is say what would it take for us to take some aspect of the scope, like whether it's the terms of reference, whether it's the subteam's work, whatever. How are we going to structure understanding what scope is so we can then dissect that into the gap analysis with this matrix.

So I think just describing how we're going to do that. I don't know if we want to sort of figure out how to codify the scope. Like I don't think we want to do it right now and can but I think we at least want to basically have a plan. So the plan would be we'll take the terms of reference and we'll take the subteams and we'll put them in blender. I mean do we want to talk about that today? I think we just accomplished one of our objectives. But I think we had three. Right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think we're [completing] a couple of things. Steve?

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. Mr. Matagoro has two more comments. "One of the challenges is slow response from staff to respond to asked clarified questions." And then he says, "Due to time zone differences, are we breaking for one hour for lunch? I might not be able to connect to the meeting."

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Mr. Matagoro. We'll definitely follow up online on these issues to give you an opportunity to address them. So it's a good time to make sure we're all on the same page. We may have some different understandings, some expectations here.

So personally my understanding is that the exercise we've just gone through reflects broadly the skills that we think are relevant to the work at hand. And that would include the terms of reference and scope. So yes, my expectation is that the skillset task is we've got a plan to complete it. Separate from that, we've been asked to address scope. And in my mind, those are two separate conversations and two separate deliverables. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

As I commented before, I think they cannot happen in parallel. So you need first look at competencies and this list and see if SO/AC leaders and SO/AC actually want to make changes in adjustments in composition of the team. Maybe they want to add people. And then discussion of the scope should be [started eventually].

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Kaveh. I absolutely see your point. I think part of what I'm struggling with is the directive that we got from the SO and AC Chairs to address the scope. And the further suggestion we got from the SSAC leadership that we instead of doing anything to our scope create an addendum document that explains how we got – how we reached the point of the scope. And any additional dialogue around the scope. Highlighting the

change that the Board requested that wasn't done and putting any other context around the scope that we feel is warranted and sending that explanation to the SO and AC Chairs.

That was just a suggestion from the SSAC leadership but we do have direction from the SO and AC Chairs to address comments raised regarding scope. And then just finally an alternative Eric, I had an idea that I want to put back on the table about getting additional comments on scope. There's no guidebook for this. We're making this up as we go along. So there's a lot of ideas and potential ways, directions we could go in there. I think Eric and then Geoff.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So by my notes, the final comments from Patrick this morning were solution dissolving skillset matrix today. Plan to populate it. How to do a skillset gap analysis. Plan for how to do the scoping. Those are the things that he wants from us by his final comments today according to my notes, the extent to which I transcribed them faithfully. And so that to your point, Kaveh, that some of the stuff may need to be serial. I think some of it can be parallelized because we're planning. I think that all they wanted to do today being reasonable in expectations was that solution dissolving the skillset matrix today the solution. So I mean like we have a strawman and a solution. Nominally, we

could call it done. But I think what we're realizing is with the high bandwidth face-to-face time, we might be able to sort of like – and this is all planning, right? So I'm not proposing that we can get it all done today. So anyway that's my two cents.

GEOFF HUSTON:

So just to get back to your point, the first three, they're all skillset related and I fully agree. The scoping as well is propose a plan, which I think my suggestion doesn't... So my suggestion is in line with my suggestion because what I'm saying is we should plan and propose to basically if there are adjustments to the composition of the team, then we do actual work on the scope. This can be the proposal from the team. I think and I strongly suggest, if the team doesn't want to do that and wants to continue with the current composition for the work for the scope, communicate that to the SO and AC leaders very clearly and tell them that because based on experience, I can tell you for sure that if there is going to be change in composition, maybe they're happy with it. But if they expect or there is going to be change in composition and those changes come after the scoping, the team will still have issues. So I strongly suggest to either point it out or plan it.

DENISE MICHEL:

Geoff in the queue. Who else? Norm.

NORM RITCHIE:

I'm conscious of the time. I'm conscious how much time we've got left. I'm conscious that I'm rapidly losing the will to live. So in amongst all of this, what you really need to be aware of, what you can do today is very short generic principles. Now I know approximations horror certain types of folk that seem to love computers. But you just have to relax and run with it. But realistically and at a very broad level, this is actually about very generic choices. Is this an audit or review? Because that has a lot of substance in the classification of behaviors. Because if it's a review, not an audit, you immediately rule out investigating a whole bunch of detail about the way particular things happen and chasing down exemplars of procedure and trying to sort of understand the way in which an organization is functioning. This is a review, which is much more generic.

Is this about an examination of organizational capability or behavior? In other words, you're just simply talking about the generic way in which the management has particular responsibilities and is able to... versus what they do. And also this hollow edition do you examine competency or do you look at cases? Now I would have thought, if we can actually just simply say a generic principle or XYZ, you can be out of here in an hour. Because that's I think the level of detail that has been in the discussion through the week. And quite frankly, that's the

only level of detail the SO and AC Chairs are willing to digest, to be perfectly honest. It doesn't need any – I was going to use obsessive but that really is too pejorative. It doesn't need an exploration of detail to the level that as a committee, as a team, we tend to get into regarding the skillset. Right? I don't think it deserves that level at this point. It is a very quick short document that kind of goes, "We believe in looking at the kinds of ways we could structure." Generically we would tend towards and just leave it at that. And look at three or four parameters which would describe the range of behaviors and say, "Generically, we would opt to do this over that." Does that help?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's very helpful. Thanks, Geoff. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah just my own clarity. We were talking about what to finish off for today. Were Patrick and Rod speaking for the SSAC or for all Chairs of the SO and ACs? All? Okay, okay.

DENISE MICHEL: That's a great question. So I ask for clarification back to the whole SO and AC list on the pause and what to work on. And the response back was skillset and scope. And then my understanding was that their further contributions were further

explanation of what the expectations of the SO and AC Chairs wanted and some tactical guidelines on how to get there was my interpretation of –

NORM RITCHIE: My questions were formed by if we'd follow that advice, do we satisfy everybody?

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So the reply we got to clarification were from – which I think Patrick also replied. But that was on behalf of all SO/AC Chairs. That was just clarification off the letter which was sent. What we have this morning was SSAC for sure. There is no question on that because I know the dynamics and how it works. So that's SSAC which I think is in line. I'm not saying that's not in line with other SO/ACs but that wasn't representative of all of that so any decision that's made for planning in all of that should be communicated back to the SO and AC leaders.

NORM RITCHIE: No I'm sure it's on line and enlightened by the whole group but I'm just –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So Patrick was not representing any other constituency other than SSAC.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So that leaves us with the discussion and development of a short document stepping off from our terms of reference in discussing the depth in which we're addressing the issues in the – delineate in the terms of reference and how. After we take a coffee break because the members seem to be a little wilted. All right. 10 minutes everyone. Cigarettes and coffee and we'll be back here at 2:16.

[BREAK]

DENISE MICHEL: All right. Let's get started. So we'll get started again. All right. Tackling the scope issue. People seem to be coalescing around the idea that at this point, what we need to do is as a team, agree on a very short articulation of clarification for intention with the terms of the scope, terms of reference, and our activities. Is that consistent with people's expectation and understanding?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: So, something along the lines of when evaluating the aspects or topics covered in the Scope/ Terms of Reference document, we will review and assess whether the obligation or requirement has been met sufficiently.

GEOFF HUSTON: I have been typing. Let me share with you some thoughts in the way of an initial strawman of an approach.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Go ahead, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: “We have been requested, as part of the final actions of this Review Team, before the requested pause takes effect, to offer some comments about the scope of this review to the SO and AC Chairs. The final levels of the detail of the scope of this review aren’t quite properly going to be the topic for the resulted Review Team, and it would be inappropriate for us, at this stage, to prejudge that effort, particularly as we understand that there will be an augmented team and potentially some changes in

focus and timeline. We would like to offer some general comments about the choices and the approach to scope that will be helpful to the SO and AC Chairs in considering the parameters associated with resuming this effort.”

“Breadth versus depth. We believe it is more helpful to look at breadth in such review rather, and look at the broader aspects of security, stability, and resiliency rather than to dive into depth into a small number of issues.”

“Capability versus behavior. We believe it is more helpful in the context of this review to look at the capability of ICANN to manage issues related to security, stability, and resilience rather than being prescriptive as to how ICANN should respond to particular circumstances.”

“Competence versus cases. We believe it is more helpful to review the levels of awareness of security and stability within the organization and community rather than examine in some postmortem fashion the behavior in particular cases. We hope this is helpful in your efforts as you work towards a circumstance that will allow you to resume this very important community review process.”

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Short, sweet, and we're out of here at this point.

DENISE MICHEL: I know how sweet it is but I really appreciate you getting the conversation started. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I think there's a lot of well-phrased comments in there. I think the overtone feels a little defeatist to me, and so I think probably we could revisit it without being prescriptive about the wind down and reformation of the team and simply talk about what we are asked, which is what is our view of our remit in addressing issues? So, I think that sounded like the beginning was strong, the end was strong, and there was some stuff in the middle that sounded a lot like reformation, reconsititution that maybe is more better left to the SO and AC Chairs.

GEOFF HUSTON: I interpret the word pause quite literally. I don't see that as being defeatist. I just think that it's being an acceptance of our situation as to where we are and the limited remit the letter gave us as to exactly what was expected to be given before we stopped at this point. And that's literally their words, not mine.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we were paused and I think it's not worth our time to sort of argue about that. It's the case. There's probably some other words in there that we might change, so maybe we put that up in a Google Doc and then we sort of do a joint editing session.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you need an IT expert to help you? Someone with skills. I'm just teasing you. I hear you. Okay, great.

STEVE CONTE: Sorry. We're getting requests from the AC room to please use microphones.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Thank you for that reminder. Yeah, and just, well, Geoff, while you're getting that out to the group, I think that's a really useful start. I would be uncomfortable stating an assumption that the SO and AC Chairs will add more people and reconstitute or change the terms of reference. I think all that is certainly a possibility. I don't think we need to get into that. What they do is their job but I really liked your language around breadth and depth. I think that goes to the heart of a lot of misunderstanding and concern about what we've been doing, and I'd like to talk

more about the capability versus behavior, competency versus cases, and what we're committing or promising not to do. I think that deserves a little more, in my mind, a little more wordsmithing. Other comments? We need to see the... yeah. As soon as we get the text, let's dive into it a little deeper. It would be really great if we all came to an agreement on this language today that we can put to bed soon on the list and share with the SO and AC Chairs.

All right. Thank you. Thank you, Geoff, for getting this strawman out there and Jennifer has put a link on the Adobe chat room. Let's take a few minutes to read it and see if we can start editing and come to an agreement. Just and feel free to jump in and add comments. I think we don't have editing rights, correct, Jennifer? Okay. I think only Jennifer does.

So, I guess just to take this section by section. And so we've been requested as part of the final actions of this review. I would just say actions. It hasn't been indicated as a final action and it's not before the request to – so before the requested pause takes effect. So, we are paused. I guess I'm a little confused about that. Anyway. We certainly have a directive from the SO and AC Chairs to get back to them on scope.

Is there any way you can allow us to...? Oh, okay. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: For the remote, that just means we're having technical difficulties and we'll have the document shared in a second.

JENNIFER BRYCE: If you click on the link now and give it [inaudible] you should have editing rights. If you're still view-only, can you please send me in like a private chat in the Adobe Connect which Gmail address you want to use and then I can invite you or you can request? I don't think it has to be Gmail address but sometimes people's account... I'm not really sure how it works. Anyway.

STEVE CONTE: Just as a reminder to any of our remote participants or anyone here in the room that's an observer, this exercise for edit rights of this letter is for the Review Team only. I guess if there's a mechanisms that the Chairs want to discuss for taking input from any observers, we'll leave that to them to comment on.

DENISE MICHEL: Certainly always welcome input from the observers and if staff could keep track of that and share it with us, that would be appreciated.

GEOFF HUSTON: Eric, I agree. The other way of doing this, rather than saying define levels with someone else is to admit that and say our current is it terms of reference? There were some documents up on our wiki. Here, can be found here at the end of the letter. So, if I sort of enter in and you can put in the URLs of what I'm talking about, which is terms of reference and something else. Was there a... Do we have a scope document?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's in the terms of reference. So, yes.

GEOFF HUSTON: So, we'll just point them to the terms of reference, our current working terms of reference.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's a working document and yeah, so we can update it when we need to, if we need to.

DENISE MICHEL: We have some people editing in the document right now. If people would prefer that we stop and discuss it, we can do that. Give a shout-out if you'd like to discuss anything. Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: Sorry. Once we finish the bashing here, I think we should go through it and is that the plan? So, we'll actually go through it and double check it, yes?

DENISE MICHEL: Absolutely. We'll have competing times.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. As long as we go through it.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Russian roulette here [we're working out now]. We're just joking. Yeah. Again, we're going to get some ideas on paper, on the Google Doc and then we're going to discuss it, so we'll just give ourselves like five minutes to bash away and then we'll begin discussing all the edits and ideas. Thanks.

Okay. Just a time check on the edits. Do people need just a couple more minutes and then we can start discussing these, or do you need more time than that? Two minutes then. Yeah. I think it's important to have a reference point [at top].

GEOFF HUSTON: Eric, as you write things, I think you're heading into sort of justification rather than a simple explanation. That's why I kind of said we believe it to be helpful to and it's kind of just saying

straight up the top. That was the reason why I phrased it that way.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Fair point. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: All right. Let's start talking. People can still keep writing but in the interest of moving us along since it's 3:00. All right. So, shall we take this section by section and try and move through this?

GEOFF HUSTON: Sure, Denise. Happy to do that, if you want me to help you walk through it since I wrote it. Start. But if that would be easier.

DENISE MICHEL: Go right ahead, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: And you've been doing such a great job all day, I thought I don't think some load off you. So, we're basically doing one single – no, we're not. This is the cover note for the scope section. The skills is a separate cover letter we have discussed, so maybe the skills paragraph should be removed because it's two different letters, isn't it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Do we plan to deliver these at the same time or [inaudible]?

GEOFF HUSTON: [inaudible] just make them a separate note so [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I was just wondering – do we want to say the next one’s coming and this one and just [inaudible]?

GEOFF HUSTON: No. I just simply go here’s a scope letter, here’s a skills letter, just leave it at that. I’m sure the SO and AC Chairs can cope.

DENISE MICHEL: I think, actually, they would appreciate us. They told us to do two things and I think just for the sake of completeness, it’s good to say we’re working on the skills and here’s our response on the scope. I think it looks responsive. We’re not delivering the skills, we’re just saying we’re working on the skills and here’s our input on the scope.

GEOFF HUSTON: I would table the formal correspondence because this will go down all over the place. I’d leave the we’re working on to

[weave] an e-mail and just simply slap this down, going here's scope, bang.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm good with that.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. In the Scope document, I have actually tried in style to replicate precisely the conversations we had yesterday with the Board and then the SO. It was really with the Board and the SO and AC chairs. Leave it right up in generic and it was sort of the language that was used yesterday, so we're repeating that very same language back to them, kind of going details, no, you wanted general description of scope. Here's the approach that we think is helpful as you go forward without even worrying about sort of what happened, so that's why the wording is all about we believe it would be helpful, too. And I thought there were three axes that made sense here and we've discussed in the past audit versus review, which is the first one, and so here it's look at the broader aspects of security, stability, and resiliency rather than dive into depth on a small number of issues and I think that kind of captures the sense of the difference of breadth versus depth.

And capability versus behaviors, the comment from Denise is true. We don't want to box ourselves out from necessarily never commenting on a particular issue, so I added the word overly. And if you just use that one word, it's kind of we're not being overly prescriptive, but that one, that one deserved comment, and it just gives you an out where the sense is still there that we believe it's more helpful to look at capability rather than specifics, but if you really want to touch it, there's an out there for the Review Team to touch.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm good.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. Perspective versus prescription. Originally it said competence but I think, Eric, that's a better way of looking at it. It's trying to get a broader view of the aspects of this topic rather than here's what you have to do in this case. And I think the word prescription is dead-set accurate on that.

And in closing this, I've kind of tried to wrap it, just sort of give a weasel room and sort of we hope this meets your requirements. It's very hard to argue with that kind of statement and then point to the Reference document that you also put at the head going if you really wanted to get into a large amount of detail,

it's there already, which if they want to forward that to the Board saying here's some terms of reference, whatever, it has the word "final" on it, I noticed. They can't complain that nothing's happening. So, I would have thought as a letter, it's short, sweet, and does the job and we've done it in half an hour.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Geoff. Yes. Go ahead, Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Is there anything – I like this, by the way. Is there anything in the SSR1 recommendations that requires us to act differently than is stated here? So, in reviewing the SSR1 recommendations, I think Žarko probably knows the answer.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah. I see review of SSR1 recommendations as Steve wants to say, binary. Implemented, not implemented, and I'll add another thing. Not sufficient but it goes back to our recommendation to work more or further on that. I don't think that we should look deeply into something. If we need, we'll communicate with community and the Board and we'll do that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, that's good then. I was working on some language to say notwithstanding where the mandatory review of the SSR1 recommendations will take us, but I guess we don't need that, so that's good.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah. What we have to do is, yeah, we talk to SSAC people about that, there will be maybe cases where we are going to look further than we are supposed to, but I don't think that in this point of time, we can say that we are going to look. There are public documents, there is report of SSR1 implementation, so that's something that we should look right now.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, Geoff. So, what's meant by pro forma detailed prescription of the implementation? Can you flesh that out a little bit for me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. That might be my fault.

GEOFF HUSTON: That was Eric's words.

DENISE MICHEL: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, this is what I thought the sort of gist of the paragraph was because I kind of seagull managed it. I thought the gist of the paragraph was to say we want to go in and we want to look at what's there, so we can say that we think it's good or it's not good without saying what you should do to fix it, so the prescription would be here's what you have to do. And the sort of the perspective is that "Hey, there's something there and this is why we think it's a concern," or something like that, or you need to go and figure out for yourself what you ought to do, but there's no prescription in there is what the –

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. That makes sense. Thank you. Žarko.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah. I have one question. Is it possible, and that's probably for you Kaveh and anybody can answer. Usually, when you have some security reviews, there are two kinds of reports. One is public and another one is just for security people and technical staff. So, can we do that to write recommendations and maybe just for ICANN staff to give more clarity what we meant by recommendations?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Others please correct me. This is my personal understanding. That's not the expectation. The expectation is to have a public report and if there is going to be things that confidential parts of the report, first of all, it should be referred to like there are these parts, maybe not the detail, but this reference to them in the public report and then I guess, and this needs clarification, I think, but I guess the subject of that will be the Board, not the organization them. Because this is a review community originated review after organization, so the idea is not actually the letter to [clarify this]. So it's not to fix the organization, it's to look into the current operations and see if they're in line or not. So, if there are issues, the Board has to know, and because it might be fundamental in management, for example, so the Board has to know and [know to react]. But I need to clarify if that's the case. My understanding is the idea is to have a public [inaudible].

ŽARKO KECIC:

I am saying that we'll have public but we don't want to go specific in public because that can raise another security issue.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I know what you mean but I don't think because it is a review, correct? It's not a pen test, it's not an audit, so the expectation is not to figure out those kind of stuff. You just review and say [inaudible]. But again, if the team thinks that something that they might come up or they want to come up with, that's something that needs to be discussed and clarified but this is not my current expectation.

DENISE MICHEL: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Kaveh, I think this is a really good point. I mean, we need a mechanism for conscientious disclosure. I mean, in the event that there's, and in general, and I think any Review Team in the future is probably going to need this, too. A public report is really important but as with anything, if there is a discovery that requires conscientious disclosure before it's made public because, eventually, things, we need to make sure that impacted parties have a chance to do something first, we could obviously not report but if there's a concern, we need to... I think it would be great if you could go and get clarity on that, if you think you need to, but it'd be great to have that mechanism.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I can look into that but reading the text, capability versus behavior, actually that's exactly the level that it should go. So, this is a review, correct? This is not an audit. This is not a penetration test. This is not like "Oh, you're doing this wrong and this is..." Actually we think you're managing, for example, I don't know, the... [inaudible]. It could be in the scope. You're managing L-root. We think that the management of L-root on [inaudible] are not safe. This is that's all. This is a high-level argument. You're not going to get into detail how it's unsafe and why it's unsafe or how to figure it out, how to mitigate it. You can also look into the SSR1 as a good guideline and to my knowledge, there was no – maybe Denise can help with that if there's background [info] – there was no confidential part of that report because there level that it goes to is just a high level that okay, L-root management needs more attention because there is general risk of attack, but this is not an audit, this is not a pen test, this is not a red team.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Kaveh, I get that and per the letter we're drafting, no one's intending to try and go and find points of vulnerability. We're not looking for that at all. I think just general OPSEC, if there's a way for a conscientious disclosure to be made, not that we're looking for it, not that we found it, nothing like that, just literally it seems it would be a useful mechanism for what will obviously be

a public report whereby we don't want to be prescriptive, it's not in our objectives, our FOV at all. It's just sometimes you discover something, just in general. I just think in general, it might be a nice mechanism to have [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR:

For the record, if you really want that, that can be a protocol. That should be a protocol between the team and the Board, so it's not to the organization, it's to the Board. I can make sure we can set it up but from my – and this is my personal warning, I already see scope creep because I really don't expect anything like that come up in such a review.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

We don't, either. I don't think anyone here does, either. I think we're just trying, as security practitioners, I think we're just trying to be, yeah, OPSEC.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

We can set it up towards the Board. If it comes up, I don't think it needs creep. We don't need to [preview] to set it up now but I can guarantee that if it's needed, we can set it up and it should be towards the Board.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. I don't think any of us hope it comes up, either, and I don't think any of us expect that it will.

DENISE MICHEL: Just to be clear, I expect that there will be areas where the Review Team will want to go beyond "This isn't working" or "We found an issue here" and be more specific. I think there's a big area between being prescriptive and saying we think a best practice should be adopted in this area. So, I think these are things that the team will ultimately have to work out. Wouldn't you agree with that? Yeah.

I'm sorry. Steve, sorry about that.

STEVE CONTE: No problem. I have some comments from Matagoro but I'm willing to let this conversation finish before we insert them. Okay. And I must apologize to Mr. Matagoro. My brain seems to be about two minutes behind my body and it's making an already difficult task of facilitating remote discussion even more difficult, so the delays are mine and I apologize. Mr. Matagoro writes he is not in support of the wording from breadth versus depth to perspective versus prescription. Then he goes on to say, "I am aware that our mind are tired and doing a better job

now. I wish we could have more time to do this. I will have also shared my view in e-mail on how I see this review activities.”

And then, finally, for the most relevant discussion taking place he writes, “What does Kaveh mean on high-level report? Staff are always insisting on coming up with specific recommendation that is smart acronym.”

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry, no. I meant to clarify high-level. I didn’t mean that it should be vague. I meant... I think SSR1 actually is in general, SSR1 can be a good guide. SSR1 plus input, implementation input, we already got from staff, which [there] it wasn’t clear enough. So, what I meant it shouldn’t go into operational details or technical details of how to mitigate [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: So, we have to make sure that SOs and ACs are in line with that, as well. Their opinion must be the same. That is correct.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think it’s good to clarify anything the team has doubt, especially at this point, I think it’s good to write it down and clarify with those SOs and ACs. That helps.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, yeah. I agree. I think, and I think our hope is as concisely as we can do it, that this document conveys that. So, to the extent to which as you read it, you think it's on track with saying that or not, I think would be really helpful, so if you guys see that theme in the document writing, that's great. If you don't see it, then let us know, so we could try and make it say that. Yeah.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I will do my best but this is kind of gap analysis, as well, inside, so there might be things that are missing and I also don't see them right now, so this is also the collective, but if I notice anything definitely I will [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Mr. Matagoro, does that address your concerns or do we need to discuss further editing on breadth versus depth? Because I want to make sure that we... a lot of things have been happening this week, so I want to make sure we don't lose, Mr. Matagoro, the comments that you put in e-mail.

STEVE CONTE: He's typing right now.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, while he's typing, I'm going to ask him a broader question. Do team members feel like we need to give more explanation and background on how we reach because some of that came up earlier in the week? What are people's thoughts? How we reach consensus on the terms of reference. Yeah, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: My two cents is I think Geoff's right. We should just have a forward-looking optimistic go forward plan. I think, yeah, that's my perspective personally.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. And the reason I'm asking is because it specifically says to resolve the issues identified and discussed before and during ICANN60 related to scope. Certainly, open to interpretation and, boy, did we have a lot of conversations with a lot of people, so Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah, and a lot of what was more about as we're all aware, including the SO and AC Chairs, it was really the actions of the Board in the statement and so on and so forth as distinct from this team itself. And I think someone made the comment, there was only one substantive comment, and that was from the ASO

at one point about a particular question. So, I believe that we have appropriately given them guidance at a general level, referred them to a detailed document that went away and it's kind of big tick, we're out of here at this point, over to you, and whatever you want to do to unpause, we've given you what you asked for.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So, yeah. I was sort of fencing with something in my mind I didn't type, but down at the bottom, we say – and so maybe this addresses, maybe it's still that I didn't type it. We say, “We hope this meets your requirements regarding.” I was playing around with some wording that basically said, “We hope this addresses your requirements but we're...” I don't know what the words are, but “We're happy to iterate if this isn't blah, blah, blah.” That way, we leave the door open if they want to have a conversation. Yeah, I see Geoff [inaudible] that was just sort of the point of like because there was a lot flying around and we may not have locked on to the issue to actually worry about, but maybe it's not worth saying.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I think it pauses a pause. They called a pause, it's a pause. We're fulfilling the actions before a pause. This is not life after death. Bang, gone, done. It really is taking them at word value. And if

they want to have a conversation with a pause Review Team, there's a little bit process that they themselves have taken into account. So, a pause is a pause.

DENISE MICHEL: Don't use the word death.

GEOFF HUSTON: I told you earlier this afternoon.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. Mr. Matagoro responds back, "I was in support of the general statement of what we have achieved so far rather than guiding the SO/AC with the wording that we are putting in a reply. I am not sure if the message conveyed with these wordings are in support of all the Review Team."

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Mr. Matagoro. So, to be clear on the process, we're going to use for this document when the people at the table are comfortable with it, we're shooting it out on a list, we're going to agree on how much time people have to iterate on it, edit it, add

any comments. Žarko will be providing some thoughts on that. And that's the plan, and sending it out to the SO and AC Chairs. So the team members who are not here will have an opportunity to offer any additional edits, but I think the shared goal here is to get it out to the SO and AC Chairs very quickly. Žarko?

ŽARKO KECIC:

Okay. I didn't want to comment but since you said that I should, I will [inaudible] that we have to send this letter as soon as possible, so since a lot of people are not here, they are probably [at home]. I don't know where they are, but I would give them a much shorter than Wednesday or whatever. Let's say 24 hours and after that, we should send them.

DENISE MICHEL:

Okay. Sunday? I'm sorry. What day? I'm happy to take input on how long we need to give them, so if we're comfortable with this document here, which it seems like we are, we send it out now. It's Friday. Sunday? And then we send it? Is that comfortable?

ŽARKO KECIC:

Hang on. It's Friday here at 3:24. What time are other people in? Do we have Friday still to send them?

GEOFF HUSTON: This is Geoff. Sunday. Go for it. All the Asians are here.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Anything else in the chat room that we need to factor in here?

STEVE CONTE: Nothing else since the last time [I read]. Thank you for asking.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Anything from observers that relates to this activity before we close it down?

STEVE CONTE: Nothing in the chat room. I look towards the physical room and see if there's any input from them.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. So, while we move on to our final set of issues, could we ask staff to grab this text, put it out on the e-mail list, tell them that the team developed it here in Abu Dhabi, and we would like their – yep. We would like any edits or comments before Sunday night. If you can just shoot that out to them with a note of action needed, that would be great. Yes. UTC time. Sunday night UTC

time. Okay, great. Thank you, all. Thank you, Geoff, for your kicking off this item for us. Okay.

It's 3:25 and I think we've got some strategic decisions to make regarding our agenda. We're going to discuss some, and I think as Mr. Matagoro reminded us, some key items regarding support for the Review Team's work. We've been asked to, I mean, both by some SO/ACs and by the Board to let them know what we think is needed to help this Review Team go forward to make it more successful. I think the burden's on us to add details to that, so that was our additional agenda item, and then if the spirit is willing, we can also come back to other issues we've discussed this morning about how we're operating as a team and those types of issues.

Thoughts on those two agenda items? Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. I propose that we take the work we did this morning and we codify that timeline of we'll go out by this day, we'll close by that day, we'll be filled in by this other date, and we're prepared to send that in a pro forma message to SO/AC Chairs, whoever that was supposed to go to, as evidence that we're prepared to follow through on the skills, whatever the heck, and then we have this about our scope, and then if we want, we could also talk about a timeline for doing the gap analysis or we could just

sort of say that we've delivered this by the end of today. I mean, we've delivered this here by the end of the day.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Eric. So, my understanding is that we've already factored the gap analysis into our schedule for the skillset. We're going to be asking for any comments to the skillset list by Monday, we're going to finalize it by Tuesday, ask people to fill it out by Wednesday, and then we're going to potentially have some holes in the matrix that we can address on the e-mail list. So, I guess the vision that the idea in my mind is that if there are unchecked boxes in the skill matrix, that indicates that it's a skill that the team broadly felt was useful on the team and it is unfilled.

I was not thinking that we would do any more lengthy analysis than simply identify the gaps that present themselves when everyone completes the matrix, and that we would convey that to the SO and AC Chairs with a note that X, the following skillsets were identified as useful for the team and not met by its current membership. Does someone else please, I'm giving you what's in my mind, and if that's different from what's in your mind, now would be a great time to raise that.

[NORM RITCHIE]: So long as we're confident that the skills we identify will satisfy all the items that we need to accomplish, and I think we are. Normally, there'd be a step comparing that against your work items, but I think we're confident with it.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Žarco.

ŽARKO KECIC: I just want to have people to understand this is not job hunting or something [that] we have to indicate where we are comfortable and what we want to do. Not "I know this, I know this, I know this" to check everything, to check where we feel comfortable and are willing to do something.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Žarko. So, back to the two kind of general areas. Discussion of the resources and support that have been discussed broadly today, adding some details to that, and continuing discussion about teams' operating methodologies.

Any comments on that agenda item? And understanding, and I can see in the room that the energy levels are flagging, so a suggestion I have is that we take some, the general groupings of issues that have been raised, make sure that we have a common

understanding of them, and then take volunteers to flesh out what they've heard as the issues, needs, things that would be useful, and bring that back to the list and work on those on the e-mail list. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I will bring up my comment of life after death. I think we have, at this point in time, fulfilled the requirements that the SO and AC Chairs asked of us regarding the pause in activities, and responsibly done so with due attention. We can close off the skillset report and we're kind of done at this point. I don't think we need to actively engage in other areas of work, even including staff support issue until we get a clear indication of timing and circumstance of the resumption. Because it's all kind of a waste of words at this point in time because this isn't going on. So, as far as I'm concerned, I believe I've done a big tick on requirements and my work here at this junction is done. Thank you, all, that that's where I feel, so if you want to talk about it some more, that's okay, but I honestly feel like I've done my day's work and that I've fulfilled the mission up to the point they paused us, so I'm going to press my own pause button. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Geoff. So, we were ordered to review and discuss all of the things that came up, arose during the week. We were asked by the Board and SO and AC Chairs for details on support that broadly that we felt was needed to make the team successful. So, that's why the agenda items on and I think worthwhile and not going into a great level of detail but giving a broad response of back to the Board SO and AC Chairs of items that we think are needed to help make the Review Team successful. I think one of the takeaways I think was that the community and the Board are definitely interested in – there was a collective and public agreement that they want to make the team successful and move forward. They were asked explicit questions of what support we need to be successful, so I think the question on the table is providing at least a high-level response on that. All right. Yeah.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, I think I will get back to my comment. I think this is too early to work on that. The main reason being if they think adjustments are needed to the team, people will possibly be added to the team should be part of this discussion. If... Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: So, I think the, again, there's not really a roadmap for this or any guidelines, but I would point out that in the Board and SO and

AC meetings, we were explicitly asked to provide details on what's needed to be successful. They did not say, "And we will absolutely be adding people to the team and after we add people to the team, then we want to hear about it." They said, "So the issue of whether or not people will be added is out of our hands and it's unknown. They may or may not be." But the request that we got was to provide specifics on what support that we think is needed to make the team successful, so I think that's the question on the table.

I understand your kind of chicken and egg issue, Kaveh, that you raised, but I think part of the challenge for us is it's out of our hands and we don't know the people will be added and we had an explicit request to provide some response on what was needed to make the team successful.

I mean, I'm not envisioning a lot of work but we keep talking about things that we think are needed to be successful. We've gotten explicit requests to provide that to the Board and SO and AC, so since we're all around the table, I thought it would be a good use of our time to just spend a little bit of time getting an agreement on that.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I'd like to see that explicit request, please, as a starting point because the e-mail is in front of me and I don't see that.

DENISE MICHEL: In the Board SO/AC meeting... Was it yesterday? Seems like further, a long time ago. It was Thursday.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I strongly suggest and this is [inaudible] for the record. I suggest only work based on the letter, which was received by the SO and AC leaders towards the team.

DENISE MICHEL: Now is the time for people to offer their opinions on what else we need to do, if anything, today.

NORM RITCHIE: Energy levels in the room are going down a lot, so we're not going to get a lot out of this room or the group at this point, either way, so if it's we're going to do more, make it something simple and short, and that is not too taxing on the brain.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The only thing I think I can really muster right now is a question for we have this timeline. Who's going to draft a note to the team with skillset and etc., the pro forma, whatever Geoff called it? Yeah, no, yeah, yeah, timeline.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'll do that. I'll put it out on the list and then send it off to them.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. So, then I guess the only thing that I didn't see come out of this and maybe it's implicit so we don't need to, is since we have a team full of volunteers that have spent quite a bit of time and energy on this review and we've now, hopefully, at least executed on what the SSAC Chairs mentioned to us this morning or at least shortly will, it'd be nice to get some sense of when we might hear back. I know it's sort of prescriptive to ask the organizing, the SO and AC Chairs or the Board, whomever, when they might get back to us, but with this sort of being cognizant of the fact that a lot of people are kind of in limbo and we, as volunteers, have spent a lot of our personal energy and time on this and we've gotten where we've gotten so we're here without judgment of the past, it feels like it would be nice as, from a support perspective, if people would not keep us in limbo any longer than we had to, so getting some sense of how long that would take would probably be very courteous.

DENISE MICHEL: Kaveh, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

If I may comment, because I double checked the mail. So, basically, they expect two feedback from the team. One is statement of what is scope and the skills, which the scope is being done, if I understand properly. The skills also, we made good progress. I guess it will be done soon. And I think with that, there should go a statement exactly what you said by the part of that [inaudible] that we really need to get feedback from you. I know Org also has the same feedback for the SO and AC leaders, which Board also agrees with, because in Org, they have resources and they wanted to know if they can reassign them or they cannot just sit and then wait.

So, there is also, there is alignment, which we never want to make a decision as fast as possible. So, I think when this two pieces of work are available to the SO and AC leaders, the Board is fully [inaudible] and Board and Org would also support the idea to make to a decision as fast as possible.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So, yeah. That's awesome. And I think we all very much appreciate that spirit and we appreciate the sort of perspective that or we appreciate the position that we're all in. I just would hope that maybe upon receipt, if someone could give an ETA. I know that's not always feasible but if that's possible.

DENISE MICHEL: So, I proposed that... I dropped a short e-mail letting them know what our timeline is for delivering the skillset and in that note, also note our January plans and as an FYI, and ask them for basically an ETA on there once the scope, we'll let them know when we expect to deliver the scope and the skillset and ask them for an ETA on their decision regarding unpausing the team. I'll put that up to the list for people to comment on.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Can you mind? Because the scope, I guess, that will be sent Friday or Monday, correct? Sorry. Sent Sunday or Monday.

DENISE MICHEL: Monday.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, Monday. But can you remind me of our timeline for this skillset?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. The timeline –

KAVEH RANJBAR: Almost a week, correct? So, just again, there's no [inaudible] communication level, if it's send this, I don't think there's that much rush and then the letter right now, we might just add... I think it's better to send a completed work, so we send the scope on Monday and maybe by the end of the week, skillset, and right after that, so I think it's good to start drafting, right after that, explain our concerns and the timeline of the team, January [reports] and all of that, and communicate that to the SOs and ACs that "Hey, we have done our job and now you have to respond and please be timely because of this and this and this." And I can make sure that from the Board, we also support that maybe even add the statement to the SO and AC leaders in that.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, thank you. I think what we heard from Patrick is to communicate out what we did today to the SO and AC Chairs, so I think it's important to do that, to let them know we expect to deliver the skillset X, the scope X, yeah. Please let us know [what your ETA is].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, and to that end, we obviously can sort of only ask and suggest, right? And so what you said is like yeah, the recipients will be timely, hopefully, and I think what we're saying is especially with Denise's point of giving a heads-up now, they can

maybe put some thinking around who do I have to call together, what kind of meetings do you have to schedule, and hopefully upon receipt, they can say, all right, within 48 hours, 24 hours, seven days, whatever, we'll have an answer back to you. That's what we're hoping for just because the team, we really don't want to keep our team in limbo. You can imagine the heat dissipating kind of we're worried about.

DENISE MICHEL:

And, of course, there's a lot of volunteers on the team that have a lot of time locked in. It's only fair to the volunteers to have a sense of when this would be resolved and we can update our calendars as needed. Okay. Is there anything else that we need to address before convening this evening? Jennifer, do you feel like you have clarity, as well, in your end? Is there anything else in the Adobe chat we need to address?

STEVE CONTE:

Nothing else to chat at this point.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think we're adjourned. Thank you very much, everyone, for spending your Friday on this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, everyone, for the entire week.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. And the week.

NORM RITCHIE: Thanks to you guys, as well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]