EN

BARCELONA – SSR2 Face to Face Meet - Day 1
Sunday, October 21, 2018 – 08:30 to 17:30 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Let's go ahead and get started. I just want to – I understand that recording has already started. You guys want to start with the roll call?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to day one of the SSR2 Review Team face-to-face meeting at ICANN 63 in Barcelona. As Russ mentioned, the meeting is being recorded, so please remember to state your name before speaking. I know it's a little different, you don't have the push to talk microphones so you may have to make an extra effort to |[inaudible].

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: I can hear it on my phone down here.

JENNIFER BRYCE: My name is Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Organization. We're going to [inaudible] do our roll call. I'll start on my left.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Charla Shambley, ICANN staff.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

ZARKO KECIC: Zarko Kecic.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric Osterweil.

ALAN AINA: Alan Aina.

BOBAN KRSIC: Boban Krsic.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Naveed Bin Rais.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I think we have in the Adobe Connect room Ramkrishna. At the moment, we have no observers. And Ram says hi everyone in the Adobe room. Hi, Ram. Back to you, Russ.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We sent out an agenda a couple days ago. I didn't hear any screams, so I guess we're going to follow that agenda.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Someone requested – or something to consider. Oh, yeah, [inaudible] question, are we planning on having a lunch break or not?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just need to arrange for a business call and just wondering if we have an estimated time for lunch.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My memory is that we were told when lunch would be.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. Sorry. [inaudible] at the beginning. So yes, lunch [inaudible] start at 12:00, so at the moment, the agenda has a 90-minute break, but 12:00 is the point where people [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Also, there's coffee up here for you all, and 9:30 and 2:30, there'll be more coffee and snacks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Got you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I know that's very important. And restrooms are just along the hall to the right in case anybody hasn't figured that out just yet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: I just wanted to tell you that today afternoon, I won't be in the room. [inaudible] TLD Ops Standing Committee.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I'm sure there's a lot going on this week and appreciate that people will make as much time as they can. Okay. So, the first thing we're going to do this morning is finalize the slides for the engagement sessions. Thank you, Denise, for sending edits. I'd like to go through those and see if we can get those quickly sorted out. Just so that we all have the same messages.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Do you want me to project these? I can actually project these for a while.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. That's fine. Who's – Jennifer, you're going to do the edits from the discussion?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I can do that. If you're projecting them – yeah, I can –

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Yeah, because then you can make edits.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. But it's not going to be live, is it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: No. Did you want to project?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I could – maybe [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That would probably be cleaner than [inaudible] see the edits. Right?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. Let's do that then.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Which one do you need? Do you need [inaudible] on here?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. That's the one you need for a Mac.

JENNIFER BRYCE: You have to –

RUSS HOUSLEY: At least a modern mac.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: [inaudible]. So, while you're waiting, if you haven't had a chance this morning, I sent an updated draft to the SSR2 list. It fills in some of the missing information. Really just the explanations pulled from our Wiki of broadly what the different Work Streams are focusing on. You may want to in particular take a look at that to make sure it's appropriately characterized. Wasn't quite sure what to say about Work Stream 4 particularly, so that might need particular updates. So this is distributed, of course, to everyone to continue to review and edit.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So obviously, the first thing we're going to remove the "Draft for RT consideration" from the title slide. Because if at the end of this, it will be [inaudible]. So, next slide.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And this is the one – so Jennifer's doing the edits, right?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: No, I'm –

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So you just remove the "Draft for RT consideration" box.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: [inaudible] box.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Cool. Alright. Next slide. This one hasn't changed in a while. Any –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So we're asking for people's inputs?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

NORM RITCHIE: At the end, I guess.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Indeed. That's the "How to get involved," right?

ZARKO KECIC: Just to say something generally. Those slides are based on slides we were using in Abu Dhabi.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

ZARKO KECIC: It was different occasion. At that time, we got paused, and we're trying to get attention that it was not that bad and that we are actually doing our work. And I don't think that we need to repeat that. I would [shorter] and I would rather ask people to talk to us, is there anything that [inaudible] in either how we are doing stuff or what we should do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, you think the – what do you think [inaudible] the agenda?

ZARKO KECIC: [It's long.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I get that.

ZARKO KECIC: It's long and we're explaining something that we already passed to the community a year ago. [Who remembers remembers.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's my concern, is how many will remember from a year ago.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but we can shorten that, put that on one or two slides and then there's no slide for each task that we are doing as the ICANN SSR, and that's long, and expected to add something. And [DNS SSR] also.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The first slides we looked at on the plenary call had what's now slide seven, and that did not have eight, nine, 10 and 11. And people thought that we should at least say something about each of those.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, but we can put five subtopics and say one sentence. It's too long.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's too long.

DENISE MICHEL: So I guess I was thinking of these slides as [inaudible] material for people. I take your point to engender more focused conversations, we can make the slides available and sort of talk about this in a different, much more focused way. We don't necessarily need to go to all these slides. I guess when I think about the ICANN meeting, I think about how people come into a room, pull up slides and sort of use them as a reference point. [inaudible] do that, but yeah, I think part of the thinking was that it's been over a year since people have looked at what we're doing, so I think we were thinking of the slides more as background reference rather than walking through everything [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: Alright. Those slides are saying, "Okay, here we are, we should do this." We could have things like in the last year and now.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ZARKO KECIC: There is [no] much progress.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, we've been paused the whole time. How could there be?

EN

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] I'm not saying anything and I'm not saying that we are bad, but there is no much progress. I understand if we have some results, we should present them. But just stating what we are going to do in each of these subtopics is too long.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] adjusting –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] remember where we were? They're like, "Oh, yeah, I remember you guys, you were doing this."

ZARKO KECIC: If they didn't, they will not remember even this, because we are not having any stuff to present in it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think the flipside is – so if we wanted to do a presentation about like where we're going to go next and how we're going to get there, we probably haven't had those discussions internally yet enough to put them into slides to be concrete. All we've said is we'll probably follow the path we were on, [modular,] will make corrections as we get to things. So I think we're talking about the path we're on because we're presuming that'll be where we go [inaudible]. So, is that – but no one

may remember the path we were on before, so I think we're reiterating it. You think it's too much?

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, I see. So basically, you don't think people want the details.

ZARKO KECIC: In our review, we are going to review implementation of SSR1 recommendations.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So if we did –

ZARKO KECIC: ICANN security, we are going to look at ICANN systems and procedures and roles.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I hear your point. So basically, if we were a little more inductive and we just said like, "Here's kind of a blurb of what we're going to talk about and then we'll have drilldowns down below, feel free to leave the room after you've seen the blurb if you want." We could do that, but then we'd have to walk the fine line of how do we get – like ICANN SSR, what is that? If you just say that, people don't know what that is. So we have to

do something. And so I think these slides try to sort of say in a slide what are these topics. But you're saying it's just too long in the tooth, right?

ZARKO KECIC: I know how I would feel sitting within another group if some bunch of people come in and show me 40 slides with long explanation what they're doing.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: So we could – yeah, we could transfer – streamline the agenda, note that the background summary of the team's activities are included in the slides with like 12 font text. Would that be useful, are you –

ZARKO KECIC: What I'm saying is we should shorten that and –

DENISE MICHEL: The agenda or the whole slide deck?

ZARKO KECIC: The whole slide deck.

DENISE MICHEL: The whole slide deck. Yeah.

ZARKO KECIC: We need people to ask questions and to give us suggestions what [they are willing to do.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Do you mean the 15 slides are too much, or are you talking about something else?

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] the 15.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: 15 is too much? How much time we have for the –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Depends which session. One of them is only 15 [minutes.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think part of what Zarko's saying [inaudible] more than just the number of slides. It's like he feels some of them are heavy.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you want to consume all the time that you have with another group talking, or do you want to spend some time listening?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. We certainly don't – yeah, I think probably thinking of the slides not that we would walk through them and talk about each one, but they would be available for people to look through if they needed a refresh on what we're doing. So personally, I was approaching these as a kind of background summary, but not something we would actually walk through with the whole room.

[He] raised a really good point. This really speaks more to how we want the tone and structure of the discussion for those people who show up.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [I think we can –] the slides [inaudible] the Work Stream, we can have them as backup slides. Somebody asks what we have done, we can present it like after the questions, and if time allows. So the slides should be in such a way that allows us to expand if we want and to shrink it if we want. Like the Work Stream ones are getting in too much and the people not having the right background might just get irrelevant from those slides.

NORM RITCHIE: I tend to agree with that. I think slides eight through 11, and move on to the background.

ZARKO KECIC: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Like don't get rid of them, move them to a backup.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we should move five as well, which is just who we are in terms of our names. Keep it in the deck, but there's no reason to read that to them.

DENISE MICHEL: So, should I change the agenda to say "Welcome, where we are today – "

RUSS HOUSLEY: Scope and terms of reference.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you want to walk through the scope and terms of –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think – no, just move it to the backup slides.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, because I –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It was a big deal. Like we were kind of smacked upside the head really [inaudible] with that stuff.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we kind of have to put that in.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The team or the scope?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The scope and the terms –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] we have to talk [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, Russ. That was the whole [inaudible] like, "We don't really think this is relevant. We put it in the back of the deck and we don't care what you think."

DENISE MICHEL: So we have where we are today, our scope, terms of reference, and then –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Then our work.

DENISE MICHEL: Then leave the rest of the stuff to – and then [inaudible] discussion?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [We keep our work at the four-bullet level.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So purge slides to the backup, then keep the – I don't know about the outreach or not.

DENISE MICHEL: I think that's a pro forma obvious thing that all the review teams do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The outreach thing?

DENISE MICHEL: I think it also can be moved to the background, personally.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Because I'm from the academic background, I tend to present as my daily life routine. With the 15 slides or even now we are keeping it at ten, we can't have an agenda that has like ten bullets. So what I would suggest, let's keep the agenda bullets to two, three, four points, because if the agenda is too long, you speak too much about only the agenda and you waste two, three minutes already among the time that you have.

We can always have in the slides what we want to have, but this agenda should only have what is really important for people to understand what's coming in the rest of the slides. So these are too much. Like outreach slide, that's what we are doing already, right? So we might include it in the slide, but I don't think we need to have one bullet per slide that we are presenting. That would be too much explaining the agenda only.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. So I think we were just suggested that where we are today, scope, our work without the sub-bullet, current timeline, how to get involved, is the agenda.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. [inaudible] I would compress.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: And the thank you and questions, no need to have it in the agenda, actually. The last bullet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: You have to come –

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Come over here, Denise.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Actually, I don't have the right dongle.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm going to lend you a dongle.

ZARKO KECIC: I have dongles. Which one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: The universal.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, so [inaudible] where we are today, and then the second item is scope and terms of reference, and then third is work and timeline, fourth is your input requested.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yep.

NORM RITCHIE: I would keep the outreach plan because there are two very important points in there. One is for the [inaudible]

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yes. So the terms of reference, you're saying we're inviting your input. That's actually an ask to the audience.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

NORM RITCHIE: Very important. And then the next one is actually saying we're going to be seeking your input in some other areas.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Got it from a [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: But I would move the outreach plan after the timeline.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I got it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We really want to get people involved [inaudible] question form, ask people [inaudible] we're about to unveil from like animation bullets. That'll just make them think and then we can do everything that Zarko said. That'd be my two cents.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: We have to have an ask, right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. The sooner we start asking them a question, even if it 's just perfunctory, they'll start to pay attention.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, it's not a [tell, we need to] ask to engage them.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: Ask them for a beer, I don't know.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Bigger.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Wine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Wine [inaudible] Barcelona?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] thing yet?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Scott and Kaveh.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry, yeah, Kaveh saw me yesterday – I totally forgot to mention, thank you – and he said he's busy board [paloozing,] he'll be here later.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I saw Scott in the elevator.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Scott? Okay, I haven't seen him.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Also is] on the GNSO council, so he may be hopping between the two.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, yeah. Didn't he say that when we were in D.C.? He [said something like] "First day will be tough because I'm on the council."

RUSS HOUSLEY: He did.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Norm, can you repeat what you would like to –

NORM RITCHIE: Oh, like I said, I think we should keep the outreach plan, but I'd move it after the timeline.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: So it just proceeds –

DENISE MICHEL: So I put outreach and your input requested as the fourth goal up here. Does that work for you?

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Russ, are you –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Fine.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I'm just looking at –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I assume I'm going to have to present this, so I am paying attention.

DENISE MICHEL: That's my assumption as well.

NORM RITCHIE: Well, I just think it's a flow of work, because then you have outreach plan, then you have how you get involved.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Which are we doing?]

DENISE MICHEL: Boban and Zarko, are you okay? Does that work for you? Zarko [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Zarko, does this meet your needs?

DENISE MICHEL: Naveed, you're –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah? Thank you.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This one might be okay. [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: All right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That slide we haven't changed in a while. So, everyone happy with it?

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Next.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: We want to move that to backup.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I think [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: We want to hide it, but I don't want to –

DENISE MICHEL: Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so maybe the [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So we could try and work on something real quick and submit it.

DENISE MICHEL: This is the scope and terms of reference slide, the highlights were added to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't –

DENISE MICHEL: But [if they could be] more comprehensive, but –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I have one remark about where we are today. Are we going to update the slide, or are we keeping it as it is ? Because I think we have worked on the workplan now, [it says currently refreshing] our plan. So that – something that has been done already would communicate [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it's next on the agenda today.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. It's a good point [inaudible] think about that after [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Because [inaudible] will present it afterwards , and –

RUSS HOUSLEY: But it's – by today, we will.

DENISE MICHEL: Have it, yeah. So let's maybe revisit this just to make sure we have updated our –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Updated.

DENISE MICHEL: Updated our workplan moving forward with substantive work.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I would say updated workplan; now moving forward with substantive work.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can you go back to agenda?

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] working on that [inaudible] right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible]. That's true.

DENISE MICHEL: You want me to go back?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, it's okay. I just want to see what you have on the agenda. Scope. Just making a copy. Our timeline. Okay. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: For the record, Ram is saying he's okay so far with the changes [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, great. I'll send these around too, I just want to make sure that we're capturing in real time [people's] changes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good?

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, where we are today, Naveed, are you good with that? Russ, [in agreement?]

ICANN 63 ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

RUSS HOUSLEY: Um-hum.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: I just want to note that the efficiency of a face-to-face is about ten times that of a conference call.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, no kidding.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the last bullet –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's obviously new.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Your point is the reason remit is there is about the pause, or no?

DENISE MICHEL: Well, we explicitly added that [inaudible] have that in our terms of reference and footnoted, and so I threw it in, but it's a good point to

discuss. We're not getting into all the details of the scope, so I was looking for more of a catch-all phrase that indicated [the] activities we were doing. All ultimately will be – any recommendations or ultimate work [products] will be within our scope and remit.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It feels obvious to me, because if it was outside ICANN's scope and remit, obviously, this is an ICANN activity.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'm picking up a little bit on –

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's why I'm trying to understand the [sensitivity.]

DENISE MICHEL: There were accusations that the team was going outside scope and remit.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

DENISE MICHEL: Before the pause.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. [Is it] outside the scope and remit of the team or outside the scope and remit of ICANN?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: [Of] ICANN.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, there was complaints that we're going outside the scope and remit of ICANN. [Geoff Huston] was very vocal about that.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: He's like, "We can't possibly care about anything about DNS except the root servers that are operated by ICANN."

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see. Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's like we need to sort of consider broadly and then focus [inaudible] that whole conversation.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] the main point is that the board and ICANN Org were concerned is [inaudible] in ICANN SSR workplan.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, they were.

ZARKO KECIC: [Comprehensive analysis] and stuff like that, and they had some concerns about that. And they said, [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I'm just saying I think there was some conversation before that as well. But yeah, there was certainly that too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, isi t better to say then that our activities are focused on ICANN's SSR activities?

ZARKO KECIC: There is [inaudible] systems [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Indeed. But those are SSR-related, right?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

ZARKO KECIC: Can we just [inaudible]?

DENISE MICHEL: What would you like to say?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is focused on ICANN's SSR-related activities is what I was thinking. Now that it's up there –

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: What do others think? I just feel that the other was – we're going to stay in our box is what [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]. I like that one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: You're not sure, or you're sure?

ZARKO KECIC: No.

DENISE MICHEL: You're not sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So what do you want to say instead?

ZARKO KECIC: That [inaudible] to bylaws.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Let's pull up that –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Shall trigger a review.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's 4.6.

DENISE MICHEL: 4.6. Okay. So, Zarko, do you want me to grab this part right here?

ZARKO KECIC: It's too much. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is that CI? Is that what you're [inaudible]?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Because Zarko says it's too long.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It is long.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And that's a problem, right? If we want bullet that's [that.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's what the ICANN bylaw says, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. That is the bylaw [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I was thinking that we must present what we included in the updated scope. That should already be a subset of this, so what are the words and the terms?

RUSS HOUSLEY: These words for scope.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, so we would need to keep it to that. If there's a conflict there, we have already a problem that we need to resolve. But what I'm assuming [once] we adopted that updated scope, we should just stick to presenting that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'd rather let it be verbose and when I'm presenting, just say, "That's exactly what he bylaws say" and not say all the words. If that makes sense. I don't have to read the slides to them. Right? But if the slides are in conflict with the bylaws, then we have an undefendable position. So let's copy the words and I'll take that approach in presenting this. Yeah, now we have to turn it into a sentence or a phrase or something. But let's see what it looks like when you paste it.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, it's great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible]. Yeah, exactly. That works.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's long but okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Zarko is [going for brevity]. I'm not sure what to do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But it's completely defendable, that's for darn sure. And it ties to the previous bullet, right?

ZARKO KECIC: [I'm fine with the sentence if it's much shorter but it covers everything.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good luck.

DENISE MICHEL: Should we come back to this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, he's going to go look.

NORM RITCHIE: Before we leave this slide though, on the link at the top there, that's not the actual link.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's not?

NORM RITCHIE: No, it's not. ICANN/x/ [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I never –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible]. I don't [regress] to that level. So –

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Let's just include this.

NORM RITCHIE: It will take you to the right place if someone clicks on it, but if someone has a slide and they're clicking on it, they can't. That will take them nowhere.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So you're making a statement against URL shorteners just in general?

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Alright. [Submitted.] I like that link.

NORM RITCHIE: What's the actual –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It almost looks like you paused.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, I see.

NORM RITCHIE: It's /display/ssr/termsplusreference.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] good point. Maybe we could ask Jennifer or Charlotte to update the links.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I just want to make a point on the [fourth one,] which is outreach. From the presentation point of view, we are already doing outreach when we are presenting. But do we have something in mind by presenting this bullet point? I remember that we have like two, three lines only in the updated scope about outreach, it just says we need to engage the community and that's what we are going to do. But whilst presenting, are we going to emphasize on this, why we are having it here?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think – so this reflects the main – the subheadings in the terms of reference, and outreach is one of them. So it was that, plus the fact that we have an outreach plan, we've committed to a lot of engagement with the community, so sort of a placeholder for all of that. Are you thinking it should be removed or clarified?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm just thinking we must have a plan behind, like when for example Russ is presenting that. So, are we going to spend some time stating what is there and why we have it there? Something like that.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Is that –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's fine.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]. Are you okay with that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Zarko's still looking for a shorter way to say that, but he'll either find it or he won't. Alright, next slide.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just a quick remark. I'm assuming that this long sentence that we included is taken from the bylaws as it is, keep it in quote so that it automatically conveys. Like it's in italic already, just to be –

RUSS HOUSLEY: So make it quotes and italic. Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What did you just do?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm just noting Norm's suggestion that we have the correct link here and adding a placeholder. Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: So when I look at the slide [inaudible] put myself in the audience, by the things I look at this saying, "You guys were suspended, you found religion, you have a new scope and people on the team and you are renewed in some way." That would be what I'd walk away from.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure.

NORM RITCHIE: Speaking to this, I would say that the exercise we went through during the suspension has made us more focused. Because I still don't know why we were suspended.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sure that we – as we said in Washington, let's remain focused on where we're going, not where –

NORM RITCHIE: But everyone's going to [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: That's what everyone's going to ask.

NORM RITCHIE: Whether they say it or not, that's on everybody's mind.

DENISE MICHEL: And then we'll say "Oh, we weren't suspended, we were paused."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Paused. Right.

DENISE MICHEL: "Why were you paused?" "We're not really sure, but we're focusing on [this issue]."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly. I don't know what else to say.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] we should make up an answer.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just have like a party line. The party line is we needed to find religion as a team.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that I would say there is no consensus about why we were paused.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Yes sir.]

DENISE MICHEL: I like how you use the ICANN [words.] Well done, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because there's not.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]. And Naveed, I'm sorry, what did you want me to do with the bylaw quote?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just in quote.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Are you [inaudible] this slide?

NORM RITCHIE: I think I'd walk away with a good feeling when I saw this.

DENISE MICHEL: Great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So I like the addition here. Okay, we're going to move the next four slides to the backup.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. That's one, that's the [inaudible] four Work Stream slides we're going to move to the back.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We'll review the yellow when we get there.

DENISE MICHEL: The next slide then is –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we want to move that to the backup as well.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, this is the one I would not put in backup but actually present it.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, after the timeline, that's what we [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Next should be timeline. Yes, good.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you want to do the timeline first and then outreach?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, that's my suggestion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just want to make outreach the last slide, right?

NORM RITCHIE: Oh, okay. [inaudible]. Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I can send it now. Should I send it?

DENISE MICHEL: So the current timeline – so just to review, we've got our work and the four work streams and the current timeline as reflected in our, I think, scope [and terms] of work. Right, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: We pulled that out of it, yeah, the scope and terms of work.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just a question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can we change the colors?

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] happier colors?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Now that these two are next to each other, one, two, three, four are not the colors of those bubbles.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, I see.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [I see what you mean.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just want them to not be the same sequence.

DENISE MICHEL: I think – yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you see what I'm saying? In fact, if you make one, two, three, four all the same color, it would be fine.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, I know.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: That's a good point.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So I just want to make sure that what we are saying by ICANN 63, we mean that we have already completed that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's right.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] going to say it like this so that we need to focus on what is there, and did we actually achieve that? If not, then we might need to update that. Like what we achieved prior to coming here should be by ICANN 63. [inaudible] you know? So now –

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you want to just make that "done?"

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Done. We can say while presenting, but I just need to make sure that the sentence we put there is inclusive of all those that we have completed already. It should not have something that we have not done yet. Just a review of –

DENISE MICHEL: So I change this to [by at] ICANN 63 so we have the scope?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: So, updated scope and terms of reference.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Work plan, outreach plan, gathering and assessing [facts. This] actually already started on SSR1.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Gathering and assessing [facts] related to SSR1 or something.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [That way –]

DENISE MICHEL: It'll be a very long time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. That's fine.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Naveed, is that –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Do you want to send this]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Anything else on the slide?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So Zarko and I have been working on a little splash slide just for submitting for people's consideration about how to prime the

presentation. It's just one slide that we could put up front that I can try to transmit somehow.

DENISE MICHEL: [Once you have something I'll throw it up there.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] e-mail. Okay, next slide. Yeah, I want to put that at the end.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, so that's what we have left. We have the outreach, and then how can you get involved, and then our team and the rest of the slides we move to the back so –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I'm thinking about swapping the –

DENISE MICHEL: Outreach plan with the –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, outreach plan and the how to get involved.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think the outreach plan is [inaudible]?

DENISE MICHEL: [Will facilitate] people's involvement? Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. And so we don't have a slide that explicitly asks the question of what [inaudible] input. Suggestions for our work.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, why do we have the question mark? [inaudible] how to get involved. So for ["Want to ask a question?"]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, I sent it to you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: How about we just say "Get involved?"

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Come sit in our – sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's – exactly. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Did you send it, Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I just sent it.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's alright. [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, in ICANN world, we rather than input, we prefer to have engagement. You know, it's a very famous word.

DENISE MICHEL: Engagement. Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's more inclusive.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I haven't received it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Subject is "slide."

ALAIN AINA: I have a quick question maybe to staff. Jennifer, how is the input [inaudible] it goes to staff.

JENNIFER BRYCE: It goes staff and then we forward it. Obviously, it's not been very active.

ALAIN AINA: So [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So all it does is filter spam? Is that?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. Pretty much.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you want to just –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Present it?

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sure. Sorry. Watch my coffee. Anything else? Can I knock anything else over? Anybody got any liquids I can knock over? There we go. [inaudible]. Thank you.

NORM RITCHIE: On the slide about the engagement –

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

NORM RITCHIE: That slide risks being motherhoody, this – just the topic in general, and especially in this community. So I think it might be worthwhile to note that this is a community review team. So it's more [family.] I like the term "engagement," so it's kind of like, yes, you can be part of this, it's not just us going off to do something.

ALAIN AINA: It looks like the last point [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I was just looking at that too. They're either going to say "Do it faster," which we all know we can't, we're already struggling.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, I've got a better [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: I think [– but then we should be] prepared, there'll be a question –

RUSS HOUSLEY: We don't know that for a fact.

ALAIN AINA: There'll be a question [inaudible] "Do you think you're still aligned with the timeline?"

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, it crashed.

ALAIN AINA: Because this was supposed to be – I think the original timeline was we were supposed to do this in one year's time. Right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. It's still one year?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It is now, yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, it's another year.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. So if it is another year, we just need to make sure that our timeline [inaudible] the one year, then we are done. So don't [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] my cursor.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm really –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Where'd my cursor go?

ALAIN AINA: [So if] we are within the one year [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: If we are asking some questions to the audience, I think that we should say something like "We seek your engagement/input on a number of

issues, including…" not just two or three questions that we'd like them to focus on. It should include anything that the community thinks that we need to address.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, that's really what the first bullet is.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is supposed to get people thinking [inaudible] go through the rest of the slides and we go through the structure that they've already started to think about this so that they'll have – that was the goal of this. And – let me see if I can find my cursor again because I'm having a rough day. So this one we think is a bad idea.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I do think that's –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: How about that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yeah, I just kind of put a few in there based on what was on our – whatever, beginning slide. But if we start off with–

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it's a good idea.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I think we should put it even before the agenda.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't know, can we do animations? I don't know if you like animations, because I feel like this is when people really peak up. You hit a couple bullets. Up to you. I heard that. I'll tell you, getting class participation is not easy, but when you get it, [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: Don't mix ICANN community and academia.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: People are people. If you bore somebody, they'll be bored. If you grab them, they'll –

NORM RITCHIE: ICANN people are not people.

RUSS HOUSLEY: ICANN people are not people. We know that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, fine. So, Denise, have you not received that still?

DENISE MICHEL: I've got it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, good. So the only change –

DENISE MICHEL: So it's got the time, and you'd like this slide to be at the beginning?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Somewhere towards the beginning. The sooner the better because it doesn't have any content, [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So we'd like just to review this again.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Are we taking this as an objective to the presentation? Like can we tie to this like objective, something like what we want to achieve from that presentation?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible]?

DENISE MICHEL: You think that's going to change, or just something to –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] do like – that one, the questions. The next one. Here. Like, are we talking about this is the objective of the presentation?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Well, so I see the objective of the presentation and the discussion is to both inform and receive feedback. Do you want to be explicit or add some additional text here?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Before we finalize this, I just want us to think on what is one take home message that we want to have audience take away when they leave and what we want to get from them. So these are the two main things that I want to have from any engagement session. One is what they take away from the presentation, the second is what we learn from them and what can help us in doing our work. If we can achieve things at the end of that presentation, I think we will be successful. That's the two things we want to –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: If we can review these slides with these two things in mind.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, any additional changes then that reflect that? So after the agenda, this is the next slide.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible]. So, either remove the bullet from [helpless] answer or push the two in.

DENISE MICHEL: Got it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] "That'll be great, I'll bring it back." And then it's sitting right where [I left it.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. That works for me. Yeah, put some whitespace there. But other than that, [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You didn't mean that.

DENISE MICHEL: I didn't. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just hit return.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Jennifer will clean these up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There you go. That'll work.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, so let's go to the backup slides and look at the yellow [one then.] You're going to fix the colors, right?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: So this [is] before we leave. After the timeline then we've got this. Norm, is that [inaudible]?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. And backup [inaudible] –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can you just go back for a second? [I haven't] finished reading it.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The link also has to be cleaned up at the bottom.

DENISE MICHEL: All the links need to be checked.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, are we going to put a slide in there that says backup? Just a separator.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible]? Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great.

DENISE MICHEL: Outreach plan?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: [That's milestone] [inaudible] describe that from [outreach by itself?]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Then is the team –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Then we have one slide for each work stream. So this slide just –

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's just the table, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, so Work Stream 1 just pulls from what we have on the Wiki for the mandate and notes how we're addressing each of the 28 questions. Those are the questions we're answering for each one. Any further comments on that? Okay.

Work Stream 2 – and again, [inaudible] just summarize what was on the Wiki page for the activities on this. Anything, changes there?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Looks fine to me.

BOBAN KRSIC: No, just in general, as already mentioned last week in the message [inaudible], are we sure that we should continue with this work stream in general, or should we revise the structure after completing the first work stream? Yeah, because [when we're] talking about the content, I'm fine with the content, yeah, and the requirements and so on. But is that the right thing? It was my idea, we started it.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

BOBAN KRSIC: And yeah, we could –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Work on it?

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah. I'm fine with it, but we should discuss of the structure, yeah, how we work [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

BOBAN KRSIC: [Is this the right place? Because we're the host here,] and then we can say, "Okay, we revised it" or not yet, but we [inaudible]. So what do you think about it?

DENISE MICHEL: So we definitely changed – so we – I think my recollection from DC was we were concerned that the subgroup structure wasn't the best way for the group to move forward and that we were going to call the subgroups work streams to sort of indicate the main pockets of focus.

BOBAN KRSIC: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: But you're right, that can change depending on some of the [suspicions] we make here about – particularly [work in buckets] three and four which aren't as far along as the work in number two.

NORM RITCHIE: I think I get what you're saying, like are we going to continue having everybody work on one topic at a time? But I don't read that on these charts, so I just read this as work that's being done. It's not saying how we're doing it. So for these charts, I think it's fine, but yes, we need to have that discussion.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, we should definitely address that here.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, we have to reshuffle many things here, because we have two topics which we don't know what to do, IANA transition and future tracks.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ZARKO KECIC: So we'll end up with SSR1 implementation review and with DNS and ICANN security topics. So we'll have to reshuffle that. And what I wanted to add, the way we are doing is inefficient and unproductive. So we cannot work like this. Here is 28 recommendations, pick one, and two or five or all 28, and work on that. It should be dependent of what skillset needed and what people want to do. So subtopics were really good approach, and I believe that we should reshuffle some stuff, add some stuff.

I'm wondering, we're going to put – we had discussion in Madrid [inaudible]. There is not a word here–

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

ZARKO KECIC: You had some good [work, interpretation] and [inaudible]. So that's something that we should include and to see what ICANN can do and how ICANN can help in solving that problem, because it's really huge problem and serious problem. We have to discuss about that. And I really think that we should work more on methodology and how this stuff is done, because [inaudible] recommendation, and [inaudible]. And we are at the beginning. Actually, I hope we can finish today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I hope so too.

ZARKO KECIC: But [inaudible] do that in [inaudible] September. Same thing. [inaudible] Are we going to look at all ICANN documents, have they implement what is in glossary or not? [Who cares about that?] Who can do that? And we spend one conference call on that. And there's another conference call discussing about first recommendation, which is clear definition of security and ICANN [administrative remit. One.] Is there definition? Yes. Is it clear? We can discuss that. Is it published? Yes. Done. So, we have to work more effectively, and what I'm proposing is to try to reshuffle these topics and see how we can [put subtasks.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I hope that we do exactly what you're describing Wednesday. So for the purposes of this briefing, do you have a problem with this is the current way we –

ZARKO KECIC: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I just wanted to separate the two.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because I agree with what you're saying. Okay? Especially the work more effectively part.

ZARKO KECIC: This is what we have now, so –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, exactly.

ZARKO KECIC: We cannot change that.

NORM RITCHIE: Are you going to be here Wednesday?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're in sync.

NORM RITCHIE: Are you going to be in the SSR2 session Wednesday?

ZARKO KECIC: Yes.

BOBAN KRSIC: I will be, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah. Maybe I will be in the afternoon but not in the morning.

ZARKO KECIC: I'll miss today afternoon [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: And I will join remotely.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay?

DENISE MICHEL: So, Work Stream captures the main activity [inaudible] this group under Boban and Zarko, and up until the pause.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. I think if we [can just] go back to that, I think that's about the stage where we're pretty much ready to start drafting a report, right? The stuff's a year old now, but –

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] some work.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, it's a year old, but –

ZARKO KECIC: [To clarify some things.]

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're not done, but there's a fair amount that is done.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes. It's well along.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Moving on then, three. May want to add to the topic areas, indicate that –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Key rollover [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: We're reviewing [inaudible] activities in this [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We have to say something about [inaudible] we'll review the KSK rollover. We haven't done that yet. So you've got "reviewed." [There's] another one.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I've heard that there will be consternation about the last bullet, abuse and threats.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Abuse and threats?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The perennial, you know, "Why are you guys looking outside the DNS?"

DENISE MICHEL: Well, this is –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because it's DNS abuse and threats.

DENISE MICHEL: DNS abuse and threats.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Don't shoot the messenger.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not. I'm just –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You're not, but can you stand a little to your right?

DENISE MICHEL: [Thank you for that. That's a useful clarification.] So I've added DNS abuse and threats.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] submitted questions. So did we get answers already to – or I'm assuming this is a year ago kind of where the team, the sub-stream actually submitted questions. So, did we get after that year – like with the pause, the questions were also paused?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Some people have questions [hung in their throat –] [inaudible]. That's what I heard.

ZARKO KECIC: Problem is that the activity for this subtopic were done in summer last year. And unfortunately, [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that's worthy of the team's reconsideration from [first principles that matters] held by this sub-stream. In other words, I wouldn't stand on what's been done. I think we need to [inaudible.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: When I look [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So [I'll sort of] go all the way back to where we were when I think we first struck the iron about the subteam, which was basically that this is a really complicated set of interdependent network systems, so we need to consider how they relate to each other, how they work with each other to figure out what's relevant to our ultimate remit, which is more narrow than that.

So looking at things like room zone management practices seems m ore obvious than some people seem to think things like DNS abuse and threats are, but we have to look at what those are, how is somebody misusing a system. That's how routing showed up in the first place, is the [cross-modem] attacks that can happen when a route leak becomes a man in the middle attack so it can poison DNS root servers. So you can answer literally China did this for Facebook specifically in 2008 by hijacking a root in China and running it across the great firewall. That's

a very systemic threat that seems like it has nothing to do with the DNS, but it absolutely totally does.

DENISE MICHEL: It does.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I have – I'm just thinking that these two sub streams, like DNS SSR and ICANN SSR, are we taking their union or their intersection? If we take their union, it might be outside the ICANN, for example, remit. Like DNS SSR might be a broader topic that includes things that are beyond ICANN even, or if we are just taking their intersection, all DNS activities that are also within the ICANN remit, we are considering. So just –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So it might be worth going over why we named them that way, just because I'd hate for the name to confuse the objective. The reason we named them that way was we were looking at how the organization operates and what the SSR concerns are for that versus the resources that are under the ICANN organization and community umbrella. And that's why that one we called the DNS SSR, and as far as like how ICANN corporate, their network structure, segmentation and compliance frameworks, that was the ICANN SSR.

So one was basically, "How are you actually operating day to day?" And the other one is, "How are you managing the global resources?" That

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

was why we sort of split them, so I don't think we are looking for the intersection between those.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] related to the ICANN Org SSR activities that they have? Because now they are using this [inaudible] like ICANN Org just to separate from the community. And so maybe –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, we could rename that. Is what you're saying the name is confusing?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No. Just to make it clear, because people would again ask about the remit and things like that. There would be a business community, there would be some registrars [and the like.]

ZARKO KECIC: There are certain fields where ICANN [can impose] rules and best practices. There are certain areas where ICANN can [inaudible] people, and they are going to different areas. So our recommendation can be, "Okay, this is real threat, it is not directly connected to ICANN corporation, but ICANN should educate [inaudible]."

DENISE MICHEL: I would preempt –

ZARKO KECIC: That's a recommendation which is valid.

DENISE MICHEL: Valid, yeah. I would say the third – it's what ICANN actually does, educating people on relevant areas. I would say the third is facilitating discussion and addressing of issues, some of which are in the remit, others are tangential. Yeah?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I wouldn't want – [inaudible] said about ICANN versus ICANN Org is very confusing. It is. DNS is also a term that's very confusing, because there's DNS, that is t eh DNS system, the technical system. [Because DNS used to mean the whole ecosystem of] everything around it. And when I look here, I see DNS, but then I look at what has been reviewed, and [inaudible] root zone. So I'm getting confused [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Where are you looking? Sorry. On the slide up here?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. So I actually took this myself as saying this is [the] DNS system, it's not all of – it's not ecosystem. So I'm actually confused, I don't know which it is.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I'm confused by your question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You don't know which we're doing?

NORM RITCHIE: Is it the DNS, root zone DNS?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. I'm asking – does the slide confuse you, or what we're doing confuse you?

NORM RITCHIE: Both, actually.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, we never really [inaudible] long sort of stagnated – and I think [mine's the duty] to read out where that sub-stream group team got to. So it's not surprising that Norm's not sure where the group is going, because the overall team hasn't had a chance to really get our teeth into it. So that's fair. So my t wo cents is that I think focusing just on the root server system itself is probably necessarily too narrow, but if we wound up getting to that after doing some broader analysis, I wouldn't begrudge us. I just don't think we'll wind up getting there. I think we'll end up seeing there are more important things as well. I think the immediate pushback we got was like, "Well, what's ICANN supposed to do about that? We only do this." And I think you can't really decide

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

where you're going to wind up because of where you want to wind up and then expect to have sort of a high-fidelity result. We need to see what's relevant ,what's important and figure out what to do. If we say, "Here's the problems we care about, this is what we can bisect for ICANN," that's really useful. If we say "We could only ever get this far so we didn't look outside with the binders on," I think that really hurts [our core product.]

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. So I look at things – I worked in both security and abuse handling. So in security, it's what you do to protect yourself, your walls, right? On the abuse handling side, it's what you do to protect others from your customers. In this case, it's others from the domain side of things. So, are we looking at things on the domain side then that is domain abuse, or are we sticking just strictly to DNS?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's a good point, and we had some of these discussions previously, particularly when we first started, because the bylaws carried over some very general language that was initially used by NTIA to refer quite broadly to all of the activities and not [at the] direct definition of the DNS. And so we embraced a more broader –

NORM RITCHIE: The reason I'm saying that is if you're in some of those audiences, some people are going to [push back about abuse.] There's going to be some people there that are going to jump all up and down saying, "What are you guys doing? Doing abuse?" and they're going to get very defensive. You don't want that happening during this presentation. So I think we should be clear ourselves and clearly state, "Yes, we're doing it," "No, we're not."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So we –

DENISE MICHEL: If I may, in part, we have to do it, because SSR1 recommendations also address DNS abuse and threats. So by virtue of following the bylaws, we are assessing some of ICANN's work in this area.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think I understand. I think what Norm is saying is we're going to get filleted whether or not in this presentation, the reboot presentation – and whether we get to this or what it looks like is kind of separate from whether we want to just put a lightning rod on our heads today or this week. Is that what you're saying?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So we know we're going to get there. Like you just side, Denise, we don't have a choice. If nothing else, it's in the review of the implementation. But on the other hand, we don't want to ever be accused of bait and switch.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So what would we like to do here?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think just take away the sub-bullets altogether. Just take away all the darkened sub-bullets. Root zone, change, rolls, anything that we were just talking about, that could easily be just TMI for this presentation anyway. We're doing a high-level thing. if we don't want to get into the weeds, then let's just not open the door.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, if we're going to do that, the previous slide having all that data screams –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, maybe we take this one back too. Honestly, if we go and give presentation that people detach from, that's worse than if we go and give presentation where after, it's like, "Can I ask a quick follow-up question? Because I want to hear more."

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. We're documenting this, right? [inaudible] documenting it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That'd be my two cents. That's a good point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm just saying that having this much detail there –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That's all.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Sorry, I said that in my head. Didn't you hear that, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I would rather propose to squeeze at the – I had mentioned to remove all these details –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I remember.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: And rather present what we plan to do next with these sub-streams. Like an answer for that would be great. Because here, we are just presenting where we are. This is about a year ago. So can we have one bullet presenting, "Okay, this is the next start in this sub-stream?" Something like that.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Next steps?

ALAIN AINA: [Just show the following work stream and stuff.]

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Like one slide with all sub-streams.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Because this is supposed to be a backup slide. So here, we can go into detail.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 63
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] backup slide was included with the deck, then it's [documented.]

DENISE MICHEL: This is [inaudible] in the deck. I think the question's on the table now, do you want to just take out the backup slides on each work stream?

NORM RITCHIE: That's a good idea.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: You can have them somewhere else, but not as part of the presentation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Not as – okay.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] submit the presentation to [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand, they're going to get posted.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So then we're removing the four work stream slides. Yes.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So to recap –

NORM RITCHIE: Does all that make sense?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: I just don't want [this] to turn into another kerfuffle.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You guys have lived this once already. You know where the potholes are, let's not step in the same potholes again.

DENISE MICHEL: So just a quick recap –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm just thinking, Russ, if somebody asks you during the prestation, "Can you elaborate in each work stream where you are?" Do we have something prepared how we are going to answer for that? That's where the backup slides help, actually, so what I was thinking to put it there in

the back of slide – you may not post it later, but have that for your support, present where we are, and what we plan to do. Like two bullets, on where we are, like one bullet, and what we're going to do next. Only if somebody asks, that will help. If you can do it on top of your head, that's alright.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think I can. One of the engagement sessions is 15 minutes. I am not worried about that. They can't possibly – which is one of the reasons I'm worried about how deep we go. Right? The other engagement session, I think, is half an hour. Is that right?

JENNIFER BRYCE: You have an engagement session that you're owning [each session,] which is an hour, and then the other one, I think, is half an hour, you're right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. So –

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] you just mentioned that they can ask about [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly. They can ask anything. Who knows what they're going to ask? I'm comfortable that, first off, some of you will be in the room. We're just getting restarted here. And I can play [I'm] the new guy if I have to.

DENISE MICHEL: Many of us can speak in more detail to assessing SSR 1, Boban and Zarko.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. Oh, sure.

DENISE MICHEL: Others [inaudible] who are involved in the SSR Work Stream 2 can speak more specifically to that. I think Eric and others could speak to the DNS.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I think we'll be okay.

DENISE MICHEL: So, just to recap then to make sure that we've captured everyone, this is the main slide deck.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: So your input needed, the agenda that we agreed to for items – and I'll send these around the list too –where we are today, our scope and terms of reference.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can you back up one?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: One more. Thank you. Alright. I just went too fast.

DENISE MICHEL: That's fine. Scope and terms of reference.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Our work, which has sort of the four areas, and then the current timeline that's been updated to reflect our current work here. And then [I'll take these highlights] out and all the links will be updated. And that's it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good. It's got to be short.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

DENISE MICHEL: The backup slides, then we have the outreach plan, and our team. We all good?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that works nicely.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: And then – pardon?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think it works nicely, personally.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. And then I'll send these slides to Russ [inaudible] to have on hand in case he feels we need them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. If I have to [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Are we good?

NORM RITCHIE: I do have a side question.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

NORM RITCHIE: So, that beautiful picture of Barcelona that's on the first slide, I looked at my hotel room, doesn't look anything like that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, you don't have that?

DENISE MICHEL: True that.

NORM RITCHIE: So where is that? Because I kind of want to go there.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. It's at the top of a hill.

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's [inaudible]. I'm not sure where it is though in terms of –

NORM RITCHIE: Oh, ok.

JENNIFER BRYCE: But you should definitely go. It's beautiful.

ZARKO KECIC: It's [inaudible] park which is great.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, okay. Park [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: I think it's Geuell.

DENISE MICHEL: Alright. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: We're ready to get on.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Four minutes, we ran over.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What's the other one?

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: And that [Columbus] monument.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's near the – yeah.

ZARKO KECIC: Marina.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: [Yesterday, he asked some other people] [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [You worked close to them last time.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, take a 15-minute break. So when we come back, we're going to work from the workplan document.

Okay, let's try and get started again.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alright, so I'll start the recording.

RUSS HOUSLEY: See if the Adobe Connect dropped me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alright, we're recording.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Welcome back. This is the continued morning session of the SSR2 face-to-face. Russ? [inaudible]. Oh, and I know that was a kind of awkward discussion to keep your name tags and stating your name, but please try to remember to do that.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, right. We've done a bad job of that so far.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. No, it's alright.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Shame on somebody who tries to listen to that conversation after [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Apologies to the transcribers.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Adobe Connect. It's not happy with me because Wi-If went away [inaudible]. So I can't see the agenda because [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: So the next agenda item is to finalize the workplan. And what I would suggest doing is I've put the workplan that Denise shared in a Google doc, and so if we put a link into the Adobe Connect, then everybody can work [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Except for –

JENNIFER BRYCE: Except for Russ [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I guess I'm going to have to close it and come back. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [It happens.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Adobe Connect.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because it's Adobe Connect, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Better than Zoom.

RUSS HOUSLEY: They all have warts, but they're all different warts.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [Accepted you.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So put the link in. So my goal regarding where we [are – have] to get off this workplan is when we sent the scope and terms of reference to the board, they sent back a note that said, "When you have a workplan, we'll review the three together." So I want to have something coming out of this session we could send to the board. Okay? That's my goal. So basically want to be able to remove the draft from the top. Alright?

What do we need to do to get there is the question.

DENISE MICHEL: Make sure we didn't [inaudible]. So this has been on the list.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's been on the list a couple times.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, this past week. And it reflects some input we received. People seem broadly okay with it at this point. I think one of the things I wanted to mention that we also put on the list is that the track, the approach taken by other review teams, and that other review teams had an initial workplan, and then as they evolved their work and they simply updated their workplan. We don't have to take that approach, but I'm noting that – and I anticipate given our discussions of how we're going to probably change our approach on some of these work streams and activities, that's my suggestion, is that we approve this version of the workplan, continue with our work, and make sure that we periodically

stop and check and update this plan and post it, if people are comfortable with that approach. Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: I would like to say that this workplan is a high-level workplan.

DENISE MICHEL: It is high-level.

ZARKO KECIC: And we should look at that Wednesday, redo –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I completely agree with that, but we do have to get something to the board.

ZARKO KECIC: Today or at the end of meeting?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [I would prefer today.] I don't know what the board's schedule is, but –

ZARKO KECIC: I don't think that they're going to look during the ICANN meeting.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's probably the –

NEGAR FARZINNIA: That is correct, they will not be looking at it at the ICANN meeting, but we can – as soon as the documents are ready and submitted, we'll organize [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So what I'm –

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] Kaveh today later on during [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're saying move this topic to the beginning of Wednesday because they are interrelated?

ZARKO KECIC: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: So, perhaps [let's close this] agenda item right now. We received no further suggested changes to this high-level workplan. So we'll –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Except the Naveed comment, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Naveed has [– reflecting] Naveed's comment. So it's actually – so today, I think we're just scheduled to continue our work on SSR1 recommendations, and it will be Wednesday, according to our agenda, that we'll dive into and hopefully make some decisions about the other Work Streams that we should then feed into our workplan as appropriate. Perhaps we could have the goal of coming out of our Wednesday session with an updated workplan.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] because we still have IANA transition work here that's [hot topic.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So we're no longer presenting this as a Work Stream, it's not in our presentation, this workstream?

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, the workplan, you mean?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Workplan has this IANA transition Work Stream, but we are not presenting it in our engagement session.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's true.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: And I –

RUSS HOUSLEY: So that should be deleted.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. I remember KC had some comments –

RUSS HOUSLEY: About the metrics.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Of how are we going to assess the [time?] Did you read that, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: No. I think [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: How [will we measure the effort?]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Naveed? Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I have one small comment on the workplan. It pertains to the duration noted for the staff summary report of the public comment on the draft report. It's a standard process and it's a two-week process

to get the report generated, so right now, it notes one week [inaudible] supposed to be generated, and because of the internal reviews, we may not be able to meet that. So I wanted to highlight that so that we can adjust the timeline accordingly and reflect that in the workplan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What line is that on?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I'd have to open it up. It's towards the end where you have the [inaudible] scroll up a bit, please. [inaudible] on the draft report, scroll up some more.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [I think it's] 96.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Produce summary of public comment, line 96. That should be a two-week duration for this kind of process.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Other thing I noted, the number of days, the formula that we are putting it, it excludes one of the days that we [inaudible]. Unless this is for purpose, I think the formula of number of days that we're computing,

we need to do a last one. Because if it says from one to 14, it should be 14 days rather than 13. Subtracting 14 minus one gives 13, so just to – It's in the column of duration days.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Column of duration.

ZARKO KECIC: It's four days here, and what Negar is [inaudible] that's at least two weeks.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, I'm not saying that. I'm saying besides that, formula that we're putting in and subtracting the two values, actually. So if it is like 14, should be 14. It says 13 instead. Or any other. Because we are subtracting the days. It excludes one of them.

                         For example, something is 29 to 31, should be three days, not two days.

BOBAN KRSIC: And now it's at two, yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So the formula should be plus one, actually.

BOBAN KRSIC: [In this formula?]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It's the formula that is applied to the whole column, actually. If you go to the column, duration, it's F.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah. Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: We should do a D5-D5+1 actually [and apply two of them.]

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

ZARKO KECIC: So we'll add to your formula plus one.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Plus one. This is what I corrected for the Washington DC meeting myself, but it should be done for –

ZARKO KECIC: Is there any planning [inaudible]? Because what I see here is [inaudible] plans include Saturdays and Sundays, and probably –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. What's your point?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [The review team does not have holidays.]

NORM RITCHIE: You're volunteering.

ZARKO KECIC: We have international holidays.

BOBAN KRSIC: In December, you have. January.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anyone have a problem saving this until Wednesday morning? As long as we do this on Wednesday morning, because we have to ship something to the board coming out of this meeting.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, I think – wouldn't it be towards the end of our schedule on Wednesday if we're making some decisions [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. That's what I'm saying. We should make the decisions and then update this.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. That's a great idea.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Alright.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're going to put this off then. Alright, so the next thing on the agenda is, Alain, you missed the call, the last plenary call because of the root key rollover, and you sent two e-mails to the list regarding SSR1's recommendations. And none of the people on the call last week knew what you wanted us to do differently. So we're hoping in the face-to-face session we can understand what you meant communicating those e-mails. Can I turn over to you and explain?

ALAIN AINA: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ALAIN AINA: Now?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, please.

ALAIN AINA:

Okay, so what I was trying to say is to suggest we are effectively managing the SSR1 recommendation review, and the approach [suggestion was] I was suggesting that we do – first, we look at what are the documentation we need [inaudible] fully read the report. Because I think it's very important that everybody reads fully the report, not just only read the section of the recommendation maybe you're interested in, because if you read the report, [it'll] give you a sense of how the work was done, and for me, it can also impact or help us how we design our work. [It's important] because we're not starting from scratch, something has been done by the first team, and the [other] document, information, the strategic plan, [review work,] etc. [inaudible] I saw your response saying that, okay, you assume that everybody has read the document. [So for me, I think] that is okay, because at some point, we need to agree and say what are the document we use. So [inaudible] and we all know what.

Then the other thing I was - [interested in is] how do we address the assessment of the recommendation. So we'll try call and say then we had Doodle poll where people should select. And so I was saying that instead of doing this kind of randomly selection and people to – [so we look like we are] just going to a new briefing on how the recommendation has been implemented. Like we got from staff something, but if you look at the SSR1 report, the work was based on three focus areas.

One is the SSR remit, so this is where you saw [inaudible] of recommendation. The second one, focus area, was the effectiveness of the implementation of the SSR framework, and the third one was the risk landscape and future threat. So my suggestion was let's take these three focus areas, put the recommendation under each focus area together, and maybe assign to subgroup to look at them.

Okay? So we look at recommendation based on focus area one, recommendation under focus area two, recommendation under focus area three. Okay? Then we will evaluate the implementation and the impact. Because sometimes, it's difficult to just look at the implementation of one.

The way to look at – okay, they said we look at this, this was missing, missing. So to address this, we offer one, two recommendations. So it's best if you look at all the recommendations together, and at that section, it's going to help. And I think it'll also help us when we report on the assessment, but I don't think we'll be reporting on the recommendation randomly. We should attach the recommendation to the focus area. And that may be three focus area for me.

Also, much more [inaudible] our workstream. If you look at our workstream, we match at least, so that means we could also get – so some of the [pending] question would be what item for this review. So that's why I would then – my next point is some of these pending questions for me shouldn't be a stopping point. Okay? Because you're saying that some pending answers to some questions.

No. If we take that approach, we may come across some of the pending questions, and if we still don't have the answer, maybe this is something we put on the table for this review to do. So this is what I was trying to – I think is good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ALAIN AINA: So I missed the two calls. [inaudible] face-to-face in [Los Angeles.] [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just trying to understand what you're saying. Part of what is clear to me - [inaudible] to do that this morning. Okay. So you're suggesting that just reading the recommendation itself of SSR1 might not be enough to understand what was actually suggested and we should dig into the background, that all that recommendation, and that we can only understand [once we read the] report that gives us the relevant background of why that recommendation was suggested. And then we can actually evaluate whether the action plan was enough to implement that recommendation or not. Is that what you're saying? I'm just trying to rephrase it for my understanding.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, almost.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: The second is grouping them. This is the other part of it.

ALAIN AINA: [Yeah, grouping them together.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think the bylaws allow us to group them. I think it insists that we look at each recommendation and each recommendation be assessed as to whether it had the intended effect or not. So the way we present that is a completely different thing in terms of how we write it up in our report, but I think we have to look at each and every recommendation and make that assessment.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. I think we're doing the same thing. So we'll assess all the recommendations in a way, because what I'm saying, that if you group them, at the end of the day you're going to assess all of them anyway. Okay? So you end up assessing all of them. But my point is that we are assessing them in the context of the focus area, but not randomly. So I think we will, at the end of the day, we'll have to review all of them. So it's how do we approach the [enforcement.] S I think this is where –

RUSS HOUSLEY: And I hope the answer to that is today we're going to finish them all. Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. Negar, please, if you can help me, because we have now different grouping. [inaudible] during briefings, we got five groups, which is SSR framework, ICANN SSR role and remit within the [mission,] SSR relationship to support ICANN's work, SSR community outreach and info sharing, and the last one is compliance. And there are certain recommendations which are [for each of the updated] groups.

Why we need another grouping, and why are you proposing that? I agree partially with you because we did – I think if we wanted to do it the way we are doing now, SSR1 recommendations, it would be much better to do entire rest of the work and jump into SSR1 recommendations, because there's a lot of stuff which is [untrue to] ICANN SSR and should be DNS SSR. And we do not have to go through [inaudible] couple of times.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, are we proposing to do that or are you just acknowledging that?

ZARKO KECIC: No, we already started, so let's finish this and we'll jump back. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: In my head, I was hoping that we would be able to say – picking random numbers, if 15 and 16 were very closely related, that when we're

through discussing 15 and 16, we just say the same, or just one little thing is different.

ZARKO KECIC: I have [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, which hone?

ZARKO KECIC: ICANN staff should assess [inaudible]. That's not good, I think. But there are some – yeah, risk management. ICANN should prioritize timely completion of risk management framework. ICANN risk management framework should be comprehensive within the scope, SSR remit and limited [inaudible]. And we have risk management in ICANN security. [We talked] about this, [finished it late last year,] and yeah. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're saying inevitably, we'd wind up discussing them together.

ZARKO KECIC: What do you mean together? No, what I'm saying, we – [inaudible] have to do or entire team, SSR1, and jump into it and [inaudible]. We should do rest and then SSR1 if you wanted to [inaudible] the entire team into that. So in that case, we will not have 28 recommendations, we'll have 15, 12, I don't know how many we will end up with.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

ZARKO KECIC: Now, we will go through 28 of them and [inaudible] some of them when [inaudible] ICANN security [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's right. But I still think the bylaws require that we do the assessment.

ZARKO KECIC: I'm not saying that –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand. And you're saying if we put it at the end, we will have covered some of them by –

ZARKO KECIC: Exactly. And we'll comment [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, so [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: Through there, and [if it's] barely implemented or not implemented or whatever.

NORM RITCHIE: That makes sense to me. That makes sense.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Russ, can I have –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Naveed, go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] just like any other review report, once it is written, it automatically groups the recommendations topic by topic. And this is what I see also in the SSR1 report. Like I think it's important – because for example the first of the category that – if I see that here as well in the SSR1 report, one, two and three were grouped together while they present the background what caused these recommendations. So once we address them, it's important that we address all three of them at the same time, not leaving any other, because they shouldn't be addressed, and see as a group automatically.

And same goes throughout the report. For example, 14, 15, 16 might be together with a background comment given as a whole. So unless we consider that background and assess them, I think we will not be doing the right thing, and that's why I don't think it's a good idea for people to choose a recommendation to work on. Because if I choose one recommendation, it might be related to two other recommendations somebody's working on. So if I choose a group, it should be all the group

that I choose to work on, and then I collaborate with the people who are working with the same.

So I think we should have done – and I did not realize it before, what should have done is we ask people to choose a group rather than to choose one recommendation individually. Like one, two, three, if you choose one, you have to work on one, two, three. And then if you choose five, you have to choose four, five, six, and then you collaborate together to work on them. That might be more [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: It is what I was saying. And Zarko, once again, I think if we – for sure, when we'll start to look at SSR implementation of SSR1, there are a lot of the – to be taken on our plate for SSR2 review. So on this one, we agree, anyway. So we will end up [inaudible] for example there's no data to assess the effectiveness, maybe we have to request the data.

So I'm saying this [inaudible] look like you were saying – maybe I got you wrong, but you were saying that we should push this later. No, I think we should do this now, because I think it will help, it will give us input and data of what we'll be doing. You gave the example of this risk management for example. Okay, there is a recommendation on the risk management, ICANN should bla bla.

So by looking at this, [inaudible] definitely give you some input, some data for the Work Stream 2 for example.

ZARKO KECIC: It is opposite. It is not that way. Here, I will read what is written in SSR framework. Reviewing ICANN security, I will talk to people who are risk and I know how they are doing is the correct way, and I'll have much more information than just looking at framework. So –

ALAIN AINA: No, we –

ZARKO KECIC: What no?

ALAIN AINA: I'm not saying – okay, maybe I need help here. So maybe we need a gateway. What I'm saying is that, okay, [inaudible] we have to review the SSR1 recommendation, and we all agree.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm agreeing.

ALAIN AINA: And then one of them said ICANN has [a] risk management framework. [We look at it,] and if we find out that [inaudible] we don't have – and we have to review this, we need – because for instance if you look at – just an example, if you look at the document you have, we have two pending, outstanding questions there. Has this recommendation implemented, have the intended effects? Not answered yet. So by trying to answer this, [inaudible] to what you just said, talking to people

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

to evaluate, etc., and this is the work for SSR2, because [inaudible] we do not right now have all the information. [inaudible] to go look for information, at least for me, is the work for SSR2. So I think we are mostly in [inaudible]. Let's start from here and [inaudible] give input to what you'll be doing [instead of the let's just go talk to people.] That is possible, but you have the SSR1 review as a must. [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: Everybody agree on that, that it is a must.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. Yeah.

ZARKO KECIC: But what I'm trying to say is that we'll reach much more information doing interview with people on some other subtopics, and we can get back and do this with much more confidence than just looking at framework. That's another thing.

And another question that I have, I saw that document, how would you measure effectiveness? There is no way of measuring effectiveness for most of this stuff.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah. So then –

ZARKO KECIC: [It is possible.]

ALAIN AINA: Then just say it. Then we say it, and let's say it and see what fall under the SSR2 or what is out of scope of SSR2.

BOBAN KRSIC: Okay. Zarko, come back to how to measure [inaudible]. So [inaudible] in L.A. last year and we talked about risk management with Xavier, how to measure [effectiveness.] Well, Xavier started with a point or we asked him, "Do you have a risk management policy?" And he said, "Yes, we have a risk management policy at ICANN, and here it is." And then we asked him, "Okay, how is the process? Do you have to identify risks to assess them and to identify controls to mitigate the risk and so on?" And he said, "Okay, here's my list of threats and here's my risk assessment and here are the controls that are in place." Okay, so that was the process. So we are able to say, okay, is this an effective way or not? Because –

ZARKO KECIC: I am not talking about risk management, because that can be measured.

BOBAN KRSIC: So, okay, but [inaudible] question, yes?

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] consistent statement of SSR. I mean, how you are going to measure effectiveness of that?

BOBAN KRSIC: It's a good question.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You can't. So at the end, you find that hat recommendation was not implemented, was not verifiable. That's part of –

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, those are different.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right, so that's what you say in there, you say we could not verify that this was implemented because we didn't find it to be verifiable.

ZARKO KECIC: [I don't know,] where do you find effectiveness? There is no question. Just check implementation of SSR1 recommendations. Not effectiveness.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I'm going to say something a little bit – maybe [inaudible] conflict that is going on, just continue to go on [inaudible] but I'm going to make it worse.

EN

ALAIN AINA: Okay, so [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, I'll wait, you go first.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. So [inaudible]?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So I'm trying to follow this –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: How's that working out for you?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Maybe I should [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: We are a smaller group though, so jump in yeah.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. I think when you are doing the evaluation or assessment, I think that the usual thing to do, like I said, you look at context. Why have this recommendation? So if the recommendation said, "Oh, because these SSR2 [people are nowhere in sight,]" so then said [inaudible]? So the implementation [should be that] maybe we have the policies [inaudible]. That has been implemented. [inaudible] we have to always

look at how it was implemented to why the recommendation is there. Okay, sometimes we don't have data for some of them, but for some of them, match the implementations to the context of why the recommendation is not –

ZARKO KECIC: Alain, may I interrupt?

ALAIN AINA: If we don't have [inaudible] we can just say that we cannot go [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: Alain [inaudible]. What? Okay, we are wearing tie. Are we smarter, is it effectiveness? What is effectiveness of wearing tie?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Can I say something?

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: First thing is I don't think even if when we write the recommendations, I don't think all our recommendations at the end of this review team are going to be measurable, because sometimes, you assess them through different meanings and they're not like [inaudible] just can't take

everything. I don't think we can do it. So I agree with the point that when assessing something, we can say, "Okay, this has been done but we are not sure or we cannot measure whether it was to what was recommended because the recommendation itself was not measurable." Not all recommendations are measurable, we can see it here. This is my point.

The second, [inaudible] detail about my earlier point, just saw where the groups lie. So I see that one, two, three are tied together in the report –

ZARKO KECIC: No, they're not.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, but one, two, three –

ZARKO KECIC: No, they're not.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. Just if I can finish my point, I have been with –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [You cannot.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [many review] teams, right? So what happens –

ZARKO KECIC: Smart people [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, I'm listening.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay.

ALAIN AINA: You're not listening. Zarko, I think maybe we need to [apply code of conduct.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So like the way we write reviews, when we put reviews, recommendations one after another, this is how I see things. When the recommendations in a report are put one after another right away, it means they are related to each other because they follow up with whatever background was presented in the report.

                         If they are not followed by one after another, then they are separate, because that means we are discussing another topic, and followed by the recommendation of the review team. Right? This is how generally the review reports are written. So this is just what I got and what I'm

saying, there are many recommendations that are written in the SSR1 report one after another. So I assume that they should be related. If they're not, then it's not the right way to have written that in that context, because if they are written one after another that you can see, it means they are related. This is how I've seen that.

For example, 17, 18, 19 one after another, so I'm assuming that they are all related to each other. There are some like 23, 26, 27, 28, they are not like maybe two pages after you get the other recommendation. Then it can be measured, it can be assessed separately from others. This is what I understand. And this is how the reports are written normally.

My point might be – what I'm saying is when we consider having a response to ten, we might also need to consider what is given in 11 because they are tied together in the report. And it's not a big group. I don't see more than three recommendations at the same time in the report.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] Eric, Negar, and Alain and [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] jump ahead of me in the queue. I don't want to disrupt [context.]

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So no? Okay, so then I'll go. So then – no, I'm not yielding because you don't want me to talk. I'm going to yield [to you] if you wanted to follow up Naveed. But no, so I'm definitely going to go. Alright, so let's be straight. We've iterated on this for a long time, and some of us longer than others. And at some point, the [inaudible]. So, is there an optimal way to proceed? Certainly. Is there a way to know if we're being optimal? Absolutely not. We could decide that we cannot accomplish our goal of doing a pas over this without iterating again, in which case we should iterate, or we can say we are able to do a review of these recommendations that were meant to be ingested. If it takes a review team a year and a half to assess whether the recommendation has been implemented, I'd argue that some of the fault my lie on the recommendation, which means we probably should review it with what we could do, because this is supposed to be done operationally anyway. It's not supposed to be done by us, we're just supposed to verify it's been done. So I propose that we spent quite a bit of time on this already, so it's not like we've been flippant with it, and we should go forward with the plan we have so that we can get through with this and get to the next set of things we have to do, because we could potentially cycle on this indefinitely. Certainly for a lot longer than we have now. And so I acknowledge that Alain has pointed out that if we were to group them in an optimal way, that we would probably have higher fidelity in review, but I don't know that we know that we know what the optimal way is, and it seems like we haven't gotten to that yet and we would have more work to do as opposed to just following

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

through with the work plan we already talked about. And in the spirit of making progress on our team, I propose we go forward noting that Alain probably pointed out that there is a more optimal path if we had the time to spend on it. That's my sense.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I just wanted to provide clarification regarding the grouping discussion. The grouping that we put together to provide briefings to the review team over the course of the review in the past year was based on the subject matter expertise that had to be involved in the implementation of that recommendation.

Within each of those groups, some recommendations are directly related together, some are almost duplicative of each other, and some are completely standalone recommendations. For what it's worth, even though Naveed, what you're saying is logical, I do not think we can assume that the previous review team took that logic into account when drafting their report. So I don't think we can just assume just because recommendations come in sequential numbers that they are directly related together. Some of them are clearly dependent, duplicative, sequential recommendations, but some are not.

I personally can completely agree with what Eric said. We're in the middle of assessing SSR1 recommendations. It might be good to just

continue the work as it is without having to relook at the categories they fall into and assess them as we're going forward.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. If I can just follow up, I see that they have used that logic because one, two and three are under heading 4.1.1. At the end of 4.1.1, we have recommendation one, recommendation two, recommendation three. So I get that impression that one, two and three are related to 4.1.1. And this is followed, again, 4.1.2 has four and five and so on. This pattern continues.

I'm not saying that we go back and do that. What I'm saying is that once we discuss and finalize one recommendation, we may need to see the smaller group together and then finalize it. This is all I was trying to say. I'm not saying that we regroup them and go back and just waste our time. Okay, we are following up [that] trend, but before we finalize a recommendation on our side or reviewing it, we might say, okay, we have what somebody has worked on 17, but 17, 18 and 19 seem related because they are under one heading in the report, so let's fist [discuss] 17, 18 and 19 and then finalize all three of them. This is what I was trying to say.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alain?

ALAIN AINA:

Okay, so I think Naveed is trying to help me, but I think [you're adding some] confusion. [inaudible] following each other, I think this is what – Negar's comment. What I was saying, if you look at the report, I said the report is based on three focus area. So for me, the recommendations are attached together to the focus area.

So I'm not talking about [inaudible] but if you look at them, first focus area is SSR remit. [Perhaps setting] background and some recommendation. The effectiveness of the implementation [has a set of, etc.] And then the risk management and the feature threat also is a different focus are with some recommendations. So for me is to look at them in that sense, not of the order by which they were listed.

So – and [Negar, you] said it. You as staff, you group them based on expertise. Okay? This is one way of doing it. The other way is grouping them based on the focus area as it is in the report. And maybe the compromise way – and I think Naveed will agree with me – is the first thing is that we're trying to find the best way to address them in the sense that – and the [best way we help] the SSR2 review.

You did it because of your internal arrangement. We should look at them in the sense of doing the SSR2, because – etc. So we should be looking at this in that sense. But yes, I think we have a consensus here, we should move on. But let's see how it goes, and I think we all keep this in mind and maybe we will adjust [inaudible]. But definitively, at some point, there has to be groups, either based on focus area or based on some internal structure inside ICANN or something. But I cannot be presented at the end of the day as some [isolated point.] So we'll end

up doing something here and there. So I think I'm done on this topic now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: I just want to say [the same what] Negar said. We already have grouping of SSR1. You probably forgot, you were not there when we [inaudible]. Is that good or not? We already started doing one by one. Number one, number two, number three, number 17 without grouping. So we should finish that and go on. We can group them later on because we will have to review and go in another iteration with some of the recommendations to have effectiveness of implementation if we can reach that. Just looking at documents, we cannot say how effective it is.

ALAIN AINA: I have to say something, of course, if you allow me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No one's stopping you.

ALAIN AINA: No, it depends on how we are managing time. So can I?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. But I said I'm done on this topic.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's what I was thinking.

ALAIN AINA: When I see Denise so quiet, [it worries me too.] Okay, so I think I'm turning it to general discussion on methodology. We got the recommendation based on certain grouping. Then the question one should ask is, why didn't we decide to follow the assessment based on that grouping and we decided to go one by one? So that could be one question we can ask ourselves. Because we've got the grouping, [we got the briefing from staff] based on that grouping. So one question could be maybe we follow the assessment based on that to ease our interaction to staff. This could be one approach, or we send a different approach. So just to say we definitely have to –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: This is last time I'm talking about this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I hope so.

ZARKO KECIC: During 2017, there is proposal how we'll approach SSR1, break it down into tasks for each recommendation and skillset needed to assess recommendation.

ALAIN AINA: You mean when we created the SSR1 subgroup?

ZARKO KECIC: No, it was beginning of June. Then SSR1 group come up with idea to hire external consultant to do review for us. We got paused, we got back in Washington, and I don't know how [it comes here,] how it comes that entire team should jump on this without looking at skillsets needed, without looking at groupings, whatever our grouping or grouping that is done by ICANN, without anything. Just pick some recommendation and do your work. [I didn't take any.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: But we didn't look at skillsets and what should be done. And this grouping that ICANN did is really good. I didn't understand it [inaudible] during the briefings. I was wondering why they [inaudible] one, two, three, four until seven looked to me the same thing, but it is broken

down. Number one is [then] seven, and two, three and four are in another group. No, two is in another group, four and five in SSR relationship and support. But it makes sense. It is a good grouping. And okay, we are doing this way and let's finish this work [inaudible].

But [inaudible] I hope that we'll sit down and talk about future work and how we'll approach, not to make the same mistakes as we did.

ALAIN AINA: Good thing is we finally agree. Finally, we end up agreeing.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just [my last –] I agree with you, Zarko, on this. But we have taken some approach. We should not have, I think – that's what I'm saying. Like picking one or two or three –

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, let's continue this way.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But what I'm trying to say is if I see for example 12 and 13 – and it's just an example that I have in front of me – both are talking about SSR-related best practices, both recommendations are saying that it's the job of the community to do. One is just saying community, the other is saying SOs and ACs. I don't know what is the difference between the two, because both are actually the ICANN community.

So these two are related. What I was saying when one is working on 12, the other is working on 13, for example, I chose 13 because I saw nobody chose 13. So I was just wondering when somebody was choosing 12, when you're working on 12, why not on 13? That's what I'm saying. So when we discussed that, what I'm saying, let's discuss those two or what are related together so as not to repeat the same things. This was my point.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]. That makes sense. And of course, people can work together when they have similar recommendations.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: The people in this room are going to have to finish these today even though we may not be the ones who [assign that] particular – to do the homework. Yes, sir.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I would propose that we do exactly what you just said. We go forward with that, and that those people that have a particular objective about making sure things are harmonized and [inaudible] maybe you two can take this as an initiative on your part to go and do the grouping, and see if the responses and assessments or reviews on our team are self-consistent.

So maybe after we've done the full review of the review, I can take them and say, "Oh my gosh, 14 and 16 are very similar, but completely different findings, not together." Or maybe you guys can help us with that since it seems like you have a very clear perspective on how you think it should be done. But we can get the meat of it done by crowdsourcing. That way we can sort of make good use of our time together. That's just a suggestion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: My suggestion is to look at briefings and to look and understand why certain recommendations are grouped that way. In that case, we'll understand –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible]

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] looking at this, I understand why it is done that way, but we all should understand that. And I agree, if you pick something, you have a small group of people who are doing that group of recommendations, [inaudible] chaos because if you need some, let's say, legal or policy skills and you are security engineer, you'll need a person who knows policy and legal stuff. And vice versa, if I'm policy and legal, I will need expertise in security or technical if there is requirement for that.

And if you just look – some recommendation, it looks like policy recommendation, but you will need policy and technical and security.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, the only way I know how to do this at this point is to go through them, and as we get to one that you guys think needs to be discussed together, let's flag that, because I think you have two different notions of grouping and they are probably both right in different ways. So let's just acknowledge the interdependence of some of the recommendations, flag it when we get to the first one that's dependent on another. We can add that to our table, our Google doc, but let's get her done is what we have – we spent an hour talking about how to do the work and spent no time doing it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's only been hours?

NORM RITCHIE: It's been an hour today talking about [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's my suggestion.

ZARKO KECIC: May I ask something?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. Sure.

ZARKO KECIC: Because we spent much more than an hour. We had a number of conference calls where nothing was decided.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm quite aware of that.

ZARKO KECIC: Do we have a single recommendation from SSR1 team which is done?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ZARKO KECIC: Which one? Number one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Let me pull up my notes from that. We don't have final text, but I believe the assessment part is done. Started – number one we did not do. Number two, we did. We said it did have the intended effect, we said unclear whether the review meant that the SSR Review Team was being tasked [for] someone else. The review team suggests changes but they cannot be adopted without community consensus. And then is this still relevant? We said we've got to have a community review whether the SSR framework is updated, and the SSR Review Team definition and

implementation going forward, that's what was done. Current definitions make it difficult for us or anyone else to assess the implementation. And we felt that's what we ought to write down as a response to this and then move on. We have similar – at that point, we did that. We were blocked on some of the other ones because we hadn't yet got answers to some questions, so we now have all of those, but on the subsequent call – which one is it? We got through number five. We said it's not written in a way we can measure, however, we want to point out that useful activities did take place and [inaudible] continue to report on how relationships meet the SSR goals if we were unable to determine if it was standard operating procedure, is it being used throughout ICANN in terms of the terminology. But we did not think it was worth us writing a further recommendation that built on five.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Are we just catching up on where we –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, I believe that was the point of his question.

ZARKO KECIC: My question was that we had a number of conference calls discussing – having discussions like this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ZARKO KECIC: And the result.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's right.

ZARKO KECIC: I wasn't on the last two conference calls, that's the reason why I asked, do we have a single one which is –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Two of them we've [nailed.]

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. Thank you. It doesn't matter, is it zero or two or –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Two is the answer. We've got 26 to go. That's my frustration. [inaudible] the right text.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I think we have to put to bed whether we feel comfortable doing a pass now with the current direction that we have and then potentially circling back to try and optimize later, or we need to reconstruct our approach before we do any further work and back up. So, should we put it to a vote, or what's the right way to do this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: We should continue this way, because it would be a waste of time if we go back and do whatever I'm proposing or Alain is proposing or somebody else. We are close to finish one part of this work. We'll come back for some things, but let's finish this the way we started.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I propose we put that to a vote right now.

DENISE MICHEL: [What are we voting?]

RUSS HOUSLEY: How about, does anyone disagree with just going through the list now that we have answers to all the questions and getting them done, flagging interdependence as we encounter it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Anybody object?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: The only problem I see is [inaudible] says we need to have a kind of review of whether what we wanted is achieved or not. Like how do we make sure that we have measured and did these recommendations,

whatever text we write? And I'm not sure whether we can have text of those 36 recommendations done today or by the end of this week. So how are we going to make sure that whatever is written is what was required or not? Because that's also –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] can I jump into that?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just last sentence. What I'm saying is when you work such things in a smaller group, it's easier to collaborate together and review the text that you write and all that. [But where] one sentence written by 15 different people, so it's very hard to see whether there was as consistent [inaudible] doing that or not.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Indeed. We're not going to fix that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And let us not also forget that the documents that staff prepared for us includes all of the questions and answers that we got as we did this over a protracted period with multiple parties involved from SMEs to everything else. And so for someone to go through and literally just read the questions and the answers to the recommendation, you could get the same kind of information that we got as a team. So what I propose is that this is essentially our "We have to get moving" moment, and again, perfect is the enemy of good. So it's not a perfect solution, but

Russ has even said that we can have the sort of flagging option of "It sounds familiar, I think we should flag this and come back to it because it sounds like recommendation 14 and 16 have a lot in common." So I think with [inaudible] we should really move forward on this. Because unless it isn't going to work, there is a whole "It won't work," like there is a critical problem, then we should address it, but otherwise, I think we're risking not being able to get to –

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. But anyway, the reason I brought that up was just to point out there is a whole bunch of questions and answers where we as a team proposed things and they went out into the wild and they got answered and came back. So maybe that provides some solace, that it's less of just a flippant response than you're summarizing.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Maybe I have an older document, but I see one or two are still not answered –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, yeah. I think there probably are some.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [So are outstanding.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I think there probably are some. So when we get to those, we may have to wait. Yeah, that's a fair point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, can you put the Google doc in the –

JENNIFER BRYCE: I've just put the link in the chat, yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can't see that for whatever – in the – [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: So just to clarify, we have all the 28 recommendation templates in the Google doc, and our intention is to go through this document, start adding text –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

DENISE MICHEL: And evolving our draft assessment of each recommendation. I think just by necessity, because there are several key members that aren't here,

we can look at our work today as a first draft of our assessment, and perhaps later or Wednesday, discuss what our timeline goal should be in finalizing this first stretch.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was what I was hoping –

DENISE MICHEL: Well, [level set on that.] Okay. And it's noon.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Is there any chance we can get through one before lunch?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Considering food hasn't arrived.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, considering food has not yet come. It's coming here, not out there, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Correct.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I think so.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Let's see.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, I don't recall who picked one in the Doodle.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Number one was lonely, it didn't have any volunteers.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: There's something about number one that [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: We didn't have the answers at the time. We now have the answers. So –

DENISE MICHEL: Do we all have write privileges on this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We all have write privileges.

DENISE MICHEL: I think rather than preforming it, it'd be faster if anybody has already gotten answers to two through and –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I know I had six and I proposed text. We'll see if others – oh, well, so Denise just [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [Just to] get the discussion started. And again, I'm intending this as just some initial thoughts, because I look at this [not – not the last.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do we really want to open that can of worms?

ZARKO KECIC: No.

DENISE MICHEL: Probably not, but I thought I'd throw it out there so people can talk about it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not saying you're wrong, I'm saying, how do we say that without going "You all shut us down [and therefore...]" Because I think the fact is they did publish the statement as part of the SSR framework. And they did go through a comment of the SSR framework, right? Is that correct?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Which- so [FY14] definitely did, and I think 15 did too. Others didn't have the formal comment process.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So further work is needed, but is that as part of updates to the SSR framework going forwards? Is that what you're suggesting, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Well, I think there are some inconsistencies in terms of the testing that they have on the websites, so I think clearly, their [inaudible] should be clarity, not to be SSR [inaudible] that they have posted. And clarity on the process they're using to get community input on it. They've got a couple of documents posted on the website that are a bit inconsistent in their content, so that, plus just he natural evolution of ICANN's work in this areas I think necessitates some more structured process that ICANN commit to seeking input on this and [resolving through] this input and posting at a regular [inaudible] one way to approach it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're calling for consistency and you're calling for, I think, as the SSR framework is updated, that that go through a public comment each time that happens.

DENISE MICHEL: Just some type of cadence of review and publication would seem to make sense to me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, but my understanding is the SSR framework is updated but not [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. It's not clear to me what process or schedule they're using, and they've got a couple of documents that [aren't] quite the same on the website. So I think personally, I'd like to see some recommendation that helps bring clarity to what this single clear and consistent statement is, where you can find it, how it's developed and how they're [keeping it] updated with community input, I think, would be a useful extension of this recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the answer we got to the question pointed us to [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: I think the only [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So that document that I just posted is, I believe, the thing that went through community review and –

ZARKO KECIC: [Are we recommending someone?]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ZARKO KECIC: Why not [inaudible]? There is a recommendation [inaudible] statement should be reviewed. And [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. Which it did.

ZARKO KECIC: So let's finish one and jump to two.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Zarko, I think the reason they're iterating on it is the last sentence in one says ICANN should elicit, gain public feedback, so they're [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. And here is Russ with a comment saying that it did receive public comment and –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And that's the link he just pointed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I was just pointing you to it. Right.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think what we're deliberating on is – so that's all the preamble, but then this is the response, [inaudible] trying to get the response.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, I [see] the response and I agree with the response, because [inaudible] ICANN should publish [inaudible] consistent statement of SSR remit [and compare it to their metric] [inaudible] missing clear data.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So we have multiple different versions of SSR. That's confusing. That's why the recommendation said there should only be one.

ZARKO KECIC: No. The next recommendation is review recommendation [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't have [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: I agree that, yes, it is posted, there is a document that satisfies this recommendation. However, [inaudible] anything at ICANN, including not [publication.] So if you just googled it, it'll pull up multiple ones.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Agree.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes, so the problem is it's not [inaudible] enough, that if the SSR is one of the foundation principles of ICANN, then certainly, that statement should have a more prominent presence.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Actually, so this conversation brings up an interesting point. It's a lot easier to prove something wasn't implemented properly if you can find evidence that it wasn't, then [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But for example if the goal is one clear, consistent direction for SSR and you find a second instance of anything that's not exactly the same, the

recommendation is not implemented. Now, just like – based on what you just pointed out, yeah, if you go look up SSR ICANN, you pretty much only have to find one, or else this recommendation hasn't been fulfilled.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Or some indication why whatever you found shouldn't be used in that thing that you found. So in fact, that's a really good point, and that's [inaudible] way to review these things, is unfortunately to take the negative perspective. That's how you disprove anything. You can't prove anything, you want to disprove it. So we can disprove these recommendations, and that'd be fine.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: You have the law and you have updates of the law. If you google, you'll find the old one. That doesn't mean that [if you] break a law that they are not going to arrest you because you find the old one. Since this is published in SSR framework, the last one is [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: There's no court here. There's a court for arbitration of the law. That's how you know you're looking at an old law or a new law, there's judges, there's statues, there's [inaudible]. Here, we don't have that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's the difference. I can find the old SSR whatever the heck and no judge will say, "You're looking at the wrong one."

ZARKO KECIC: You understand what I'm saying.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, I do, and I was just saying there's a [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: The last SSR framework is the one which is – you want to look.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: One way to flip that around – well, if that's why you're asking me –is like for example if you were worried about what we're just talking about, like, yeah, you can google and find the old SSR framework. You obviously should know better. One way to deal with that is [inaudible] organization to pull those [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, I agree, or not only that but to add to old framework that there is new one.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Exactly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: A pointer.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] supersede the old one.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] RFC.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. We're never going to pull the old one down.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So that's a really good point. And so just to sort of fully put a T on it, yeah, and then – so the documents, if they don't update that in situ, then someone could read [inaudible] like RFCs have it right at the top, "Obsoleted by…" You're reading the old RFC, it's basically in your face.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's only true when you look at the web version.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's the only way to do anything in the world today is [through the web.] Yeah, we should have magic paper that goes back and updates all the printouts.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, is there a recommendation coming from what you're saying?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, are we supposed to recommend, or are we –

NORM RITCHIE: Yes, I had the same question.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. There's absolutely got to be – if we find that it did not have the intended effect –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So can I make a proposal?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we can wind up going way down the rabbit hole if we try and do recommendations about recommendations.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But we're required to do our own recommendations, [the answer,] can we put it on like a working sheet that we'd like to put int our overall recommendations?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think we're going to have to collect them. And how we present them is different.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right? But if we can address everything about this topic as opposed to [inaudible]. You see what I'm saying? So if we just put a note in this Google doc that says we want to make this recommendation, and then later when we want to figure out how to logically present our recommendations, that's different.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm assuming that in the final report that we are going to have as SSR2 [inaudible] we are going to have the first [inaudible] structure, the first [stepper] would be about SSR1 review, for example. In there, we're going to have a table about this, what we are doing, and after that, we can have recommendation one, two, three, just like we have it here, and those recommendations from the team could be related to the review recommendations of the SSR1. So in that chapter – if you see what I mean.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I wouldn't propose that. I'd say that's an appendix at the end. I would imagine if we're going to go all the way to the end of this train, that what we do is we produce a report that says, "Here are the things that we found about SSR today at this time," [inaudible] sort of archivally. And I think at some point, we'll talk about meta lessons that we learned

from the SSR1 review, and I think we'll have to figure out what the structure is, what we learned from it and how we structured it. If somebody wants to go through a table and broadly see, one, two, three, four, how were they implemented, I think that's an appendix.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, sure. I'm just saying that in that chapter, we're going to refer to that table somehow, but the conclusion of that would be recommendation one, two, three, like X, and those will be the recommendations –

RUSS HOUSLEY: You mean our –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You mean these are –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Our report. Those will be the recommendations [inaudible] related to what has not [inaudible] because the review chapter will have some recommendations eventually, and that will be our recommendations about the review [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: That's what you don't want. [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, I thought he was saying we should take this table and have it like headlining in the report.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, I'm not saying that. I'm saying that –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm saying I'm not sure, but yeah, I could see it that way. I could also see it trying to [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, that would be too long. It's better to keep that [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: At some point, you're right, you want to have a table –

ALAIN AINA: Please. How we present is something different. Let me not go to how we present. Then your point was you do not want those to be put in recommendation [inaudible]. Right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That was one point, yeah.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, one point. But –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And I misread Naveed. [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just to clarify, I'm saying that recommendations that [inaudible] give are not related to recommendation X in particular. It will be a general recommendation, one, two, three, [inaudible] some point about overall whether the SSR1 was implemented or not.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Not one by one.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we're all in violent agreement. Would you like to restate agreement [inaudible] forcefully?

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible]. I want only to [inaudible]. Do we recommend something or not? That's the first one. So that was the question. And we discussed about how we [inaudible]. Let's go back to this one and let's try to finish it, and then I think it's time for lunch and then we can [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: But before you go there – No, please. Before you go over there, I think if you look at the table, look at [inaudible], we had the last question, is

this recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work can be done?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: So for me, if we find the recommendation implemented, everything's fine, that's all. If we find a recommendation where it's difficult to [inaudible] etc., I think we should go to that level. If the recommendation is still relevant, does it fall under SSR2 or not? So we should follow the process. Okay, let's follow this kind of process and we'll see where we get at the end.

BOBAN KRSIC: Okay. Agree to this. Yes.

ALAIN AINA: So we'll see. So some of them may fall under what we're supposed to do, some may not. And maybe this is where the recommendations come for further work to be done by a different group of [inaudible]. So I think it's good that we should look at the things, the [inaudible]. If we go piece by piece, it's always a kind of, well, we have this last thing [inaudible] address what we are discussing. [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Denise typed in before she had to run to her meeting that the agreements with contracted parties uses a different definition for SSR. And the recommendation calls for a single, clear, concise and constrained [statement.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So if they're using different definitions in the statement and the framework as they are from the contracted parties agreement, I think that it is a reasonable thing for us to recommend that consistency be achieved over the next couple years.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: What? I think it's great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So there could be a recommendation on the recommendation, is my point.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. So I feel like if Zarko felt like he was going to say anything, I'm going to channel you for a second so you can tell me I'm wrong. But we should be careful not to tell them how to do something. Like for

example we could point out the RFC obsoleted mechanism, but that would be telling them how to do something, and that might not be appreciated. But pointing out the deficiency and what we're worried about.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think the recommendation is a call for consistency.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's all. It's not "How."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And not beyond that where we set – and one way to do it that might [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible] similar impression when SSR3 comes out and saying what they meant by consistency and what they wanted ICANN to do and how to measure that. And a number of questions that we have [inaudible] SSR1.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand that, so let's work on the wording. Don't you think we should say that the agreements should point to the document rather than define it itself and differently? That would solve the inconsistency problem.

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right?

NORM RITCHIE: I think the issue one is a legal document with the contracted parties. Is that correct? Denise isn't here, but I think that's what is the issue. And where the other is done by a CTO office. So, could a legal document point to the CTO's definition of – I'm guess it's not reasonable. Because they have to have exact language.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so how do we end up with a smart – as in easy to access for SSR3 – answer to this yet achieve consistency? Yes.

ZARKO KECIC: No, I don't have answer, but I would suggest to write any wording to be understandable for us, and we can work on it.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Can we just state the problem and just say that it needs to be addressed without offering any solutions?

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah. Until [we've had] drafting final review.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So perhaps it's –

ALAIN AINA: This is also another example of [inaudible] scope of documentation. Otherwise, [as a recent] one example, some legal document to say something different from what we saw in the end [inaudible] and you say that you do not think that the legal should be pointing to the OCTO document.

NORM RITCHIE: I don't think that's a reasonable thing to ask someone to do.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible] then which one is the more relevant for this SSR? Should we only focus on strategy plan, operating plan, etc., and what we see there? Because maybe if we go to the legal, there are so many legal documents, so many legal agreements –

NORM RITCHIE: No, but Denise –unfortunately, she's not here, but that's an excellent point she raised [inaudible] SSR [inaudible] within the contract is not aligned with the SSR remit of ICANN, and there's an issue there. So I don't know what the wording is offhand, but I've done enough contracting stuff –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [I think she points to it.]

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, it's going to be very difficult to contractually lock down what people have to do regards to SSR.

RUSS HOUSLEY: She points to an approved – her reference one at the bottom of the table. She points to clause [seven point] – right.

NORM RITCHIE: Actually, I commend Denise for finding that. Good digging. Getting there. Got it. So and that came from the consensus policy.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's interesting, yeah. Well, this even says that they're allowed to change these definitions over time.

NORM RITCHIE: Through consensus policy.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So shouldn't that be aligned with the thing that already did achieve consensus?

NORM RITCHIE: That's kind of – that's the [inaudible] setting the rules.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know what you mean.

NORM RITCHIE: Well, if the registries and registrars are setting the definitions of what is security, stability, resiliency, [inaudible] and then they're going to set them loose enough that they never get in trouble.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

NORM RITCHIE: Whereas you have the CTO office and ICANN generally has a totally different view of SSR and they embrace it. So that's where we're finding the friction here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand that nobody wants legal accountability here, right?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: You're leaving [inaudible] when? Tomorrow morning?

ZARKO KECIC: Tomorrow, yeah.

BOBAN KRSIC: Can I see the document you're reading?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, wait, are we –

RUSS HOUSLEY: We have an engagement session.

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible] agreement and section.

NORM RITCHIE: It's at 7.3.

ALAIN AINA: 7.3.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. So the link there, I think Russ has highlighted [inaudible].

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: It's the defined terms.

BOBAN KRSIC: Defined terms, okay, got it.

NORM RITCHIE: And this is a registry agreement, not registrar. It's registry.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible] approved. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, should we be more focused and say contracted party agreements [instead of] other?

NORM RITCHIE: Yes, correct. Registry in particular. Yeah, I'm going to just give an example while they're reading here, and for security [inaudible] it talks about security of the registrations themselves, domain registrations, whereas I think [mostly] here, they talk about security in an organization. Like you lock your doors and you follow some best practices on protection of data, etc. I'm not sure that –

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: And then stability points to RFCs.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [Some RFCs are adhered to, other ones are kind of fluffy, and some you probably shouldn't adhere to all the terms.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Is there anything else to capture for number one? It's between us and lunch.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [I'm going to see what you've written here in a second.] Thank you for writing, by the way.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Somebody's got to do this. [We'll take turns.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: If you want, you can have my turn, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Thanks.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible] to the registry, registrars, this data, [inaudible]. So this would definitely be different from what you'll see – what's [inaudible] in the generic SSR definition. This is [inaudible] registry, registrar –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I'm not hearing any other changes.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm still reading it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're done with one, and then hit "save" as much as you can hit "save" in a Google doc.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I know, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, let's have some lunch and –

BOBAN KRSIC: Just one [inaudible] question here, because we discussed it [inaudible] here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

BOBAN KRSIC: This agreement is only focused on delegation of TLDs, yeah?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

BOBAN KRSIC: So it's an agreement between the registry and ICANN.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

BOBAN KRSIC: And there are two requirements regarding security and stability, but only with a focus on registry data.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah? So – and I think it's okay, and it should be, to define something different in this agreement, yeah? When it's the question of the integrity, the [inaudible] of registry data, instead of that we have a global definition of what does it mean to ICANN. So what I said is only, okay, you had to put any controls in place, you have to [fit] your requirements, and that's it. And for me, it's clear. Yes, so [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: If you look at the definition, the definition focus on protecting registry data.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: This is what they are calling security in that context, so protecting the registry data. This would definitely be different if we are defining what security means in general. This is – so we should [put in the context.] If you read the [inaudible] of registry data or unauthorized access or [disclosure] of information. So this is the definition of security in the context of the contract between registry and – so this must be different from the generic definition of security we had in the SSR framework.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I have two responses to that. One is that he recommendation is the recommendation. If it's shown to be a bad recommendation, then certainly, people shouldn't feel bad about not having implemented it. But the recommendation says what it says, right or wrong. So, is that true? It's not true.

Your comment about the definition of various things, including security, being nuanced is a really good one. And the canonical definition of security should leave room for polymorphic interpretation or the whole – so in a sense, both the thing pointed at should be elaborated, and the recommendation probably stinks. Nevertheless, our job is like lawyers in a court, to sort of take Zarko's thing. We don't interpret whether it's a good law or a bad law, what the spirit of the law is. We look at he letter of the law. The letter of the law – if this recommendation says, "do this," it's not doing that, we're done. That would be my response. Like if I were a lawyer in court, that's how you would do it. And if you said you don't like the law, go talk to your congressman. And we are [done with two.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: What you just said would argue that we should observe that these two are different but not necessarily argue for alignment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right. And we would say that the recommendation said there shouldn't be two, and there's two, the recommendation's not fulfilled. But I don't think it's our job to be partisan. We could make these observations. I think that that's anecdotal if we want to make them, but I don't think that's our job. Our job is to say, did the recommendation get implemented?

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible] agreement as –

RUSS HOUSLEY: So if you look at the Google doc now –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, so where I wrote RECOMMENDATION, which would be our –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You mean the bottom section? Where are you looking?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, no, the very top of the document.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, yeah, RECOMMENDATION, got it. Is it the RECOMMENDATION part? Got it. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you want that or not?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that that's a longer set of discussions that we may want to ballet, so I think maybe make – it sounds stupid, and maybe –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Or we can change it to a statement that says, "Full implementation would require ICANN's agreement with contracted parties to use this."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I wouldn't get into that, because I think at that point, we're trying to wrap our hands around water. It's like, "But what about this one other

thing? Is that really realistic? And I don't like the fact that you just said something about my –" I don't know, I just feel like that –

NORM RITCHIE: I think it's fine bringing it up, but maybe observation is the correct word, not recommendation. Observation that there are different definitions and the CTO's office and ICANN need to be cognizant of that. That's kind of it. Maybe they already are.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: I feel like we had a bigger team than this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: We start actually getting through one and everyone bailed.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I know.

NORM RITCHIE: I might be able to celebrate and go for beer now.

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, who's to say we don't make these [inaudible] to get through?

NORM RITCHIE: Exactly. This one is important because this kind of sets the ground rules for the others.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly why I wanted to spend some time on it.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so I think we've turned it into a paragraph.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I think it's – yes. I [don't] think it's a very unbiased, fair statement.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any –

NORM RITCHIE: On Naveed's [statement.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Naveed's moving his cursor and I don't know if he's going to type more.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Trying to understand actually whether the recommendation actually says something about the definition that ICANN has for other contracted parties or not. It just says the definition as such, and it says to get the public feedback for that definition. Public feedback might have a different perspective than what the contracted parties think about the actual definition of SSR.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think the whole point is my interpretation of the SSR1 recommendation is they wanted consistency, that's the reason [for their use] single, clear, is they really, I think, expected everything else to point to that as opposed to defining its own niche, or point to it and say, "And in this context, security means bla bla" would be fine. Right? When you're talking about registry data or whatever.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Like we can go deeper on that. Forever deeper, right? And say, "You know what? The SSR remit is not detailed enough, and therefore [inaudible] definitions have been created and bla bla." So it 's not serving all purposes. But –

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, because that tells them which direction to fix it.

NORM RITCHIE: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think that's right.

NORM RITCHIE: Exactly, yes. So I'm agreeing. Just making a point, I guess. So [inaudible] stop. I think that's good what we have. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So this – all six of us are going to support this when the rest of the team reads it, right?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Well, I can certainly defend it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm going to say yes for me. [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: I will defend what's written.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Because there's more review team members not here than are here.

NORM RITCHIE: I think you need a gavel. Done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That gavel would have to be sledgehammer-sized. Alright. Let's grab some lunch. But I'll try and do something similar from what we said about recommendation two during lunch that we can look at, because I have my notes from that call.

JENNIFER BRYCE: What time would you like to reconvene?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Lunch is here, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can we do it in half an hour and get back to work?

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Works for me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Let's try to do that. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Alright.

Thanks. Welcome back, everybody, to the first day of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting at ICANN 63 in Barcelona. It's the 21st of October and we are about to commence the afternoon session. The meeting is being recorded. And just to note that Ramkrishna is in the remote room. Over to you, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't see that he has sound.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Has he commented?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, but there's no little –

JENNIFER BRYCE: I don't think he's been connected all day. He's been typing in his chat.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so you think he can hear us.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, he's typing right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But he can't speak.

JENNIFER BRYCE: He says he is listening.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I hear air. Yay. It's the refrigerator.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so during the lunch break, I typed some stuff at the top of recommendation [inaudible] Based on the discussion we had

[inaudible] phone calls. I believe it captures what we said. Please offer improvements if you [inaudible] in the Google doc too.

DENISE MICHEL: Got it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anyone have suggestions?

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] my first reading since coming back to it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I have a question. It's a meta question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Meta question?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Meta question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh no.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Procedural question?

RUSS HOUSLEY: You mean like how should we group these?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No. Okay, not that meta. Okay, we'll call that global meta. I have a local meta. So you put your responses in but didn't use the two little sections at the bottom that we were going to – [Did you do that on purpose?]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I didn't. I can copy the stuff from there from the discussion if you wish. Let's just try to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, I'll be glad to do it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Because when we get down to mine, I wrote mine for those sections, so I just want to make sure we're normalized one way or the other.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I can copy it from there. Just so we have it all in one place.

DENISE MICHEL: I have a comment at the end of –

ALAIN AINA: I wonder if – [can I say something here?] Russs?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure, go ahead.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, I wonder if the request we got – and I think Denise and Eric will remember [inaudible] some communication with board about this [inaudible] and board was saying they expect us to work on the definition [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that was a suggesetion.

ALAIN AINA: It was a suggestion, but to me, it looked like – because of maybe [inaudible] saying that this definition should be renewed in conjunction with the new [cycle of] SSR. Or maybe that's why board was saying that they're expecting SSR2 reviews revise the definition of [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [I think I was there,] but I can't remember enough to be sure. But I do remember thinking –

ALAIN AINA: But do you remember this thing in the definition with the board?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: They've put it back on us to say, "Shouldn't you define it?" But we spent a whole bunch of time up front saying, "You're going to get mad if we define it" and they said, "No, we have definitions and they were spread all over." And then we tried to canonicalize them, and it became this big thing. Like we didn't want to presume we could define it, so then we looked at other definitions, and then I do [vaguely] remember they said, "Why don't you guys define it?"

ALAIN AINA: And for me, my point is maybe board was asking us maybe by interpreting the [inaudible] saying that this revision should be done in conjunction with the [inaudible] cycle of the future SSR review maybe.

DENISE MICHEL: This was recommending that it be done on a similar cadence, though not that the review team should do it. The definitions were staff ran a process with the community to develop comments on update and post or finalize the definition. So in my mind, it's a staff community job. So just definitions and not a review team's job. We can look at definitions and say [looks] fine to us or we think needs another round of community staff work [inaudible] the consideration. I think that could be appropriate.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think it has to be that way because try to define what security is. It's like the only way you're going to get anywhere is if everyone's had their two cents. It's not a review team's job.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So Denise, the stuff you added there, are you [asking] for a recommendation that it's time for another round, or is the next time the SSR framework goes out that would create the opportunity for community comment? Which is kind of what I was thinking.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I think the latter, and I think it would be good to go back through several of these recommendations after we've had this process and maybe group together some of the key –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Absolutely.

DENISE MICHEL: – staff and community actions that we think should be taken in terms of updates.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So it's odd to have community review whenever the SSR framework is updated. As I see on their website, the framework is updating like yearly basis, so are we –

RUSS HOUSLEY: We asked that question. It's not yearly. It is when an update is needed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And so if you look back, the last two did go through community comment, but before that, they didn't. So I think that observation that they have been of late, which is good, and the recommendation is they always do it. Because otherwise, you don't get the opportunity to make the comments on an ongoing basis. Maybe not annual, but whenever that document is updated, it gives the opportunity for changes in the definition of security or whatever. Anyway, that's where we got to, I think, on the call in September.

ALAIN AINA: So there is no clear process in place to update the framework [inaudible] staff said. So that means if we interpret this, that [means] this recommendation has not been fully implemented.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think it means that it hasn't, because the last time, it did get community [inaudible]. So I don't think the first time it was written it was implemented, but it was later when you got community comment on the framework.

ALAIN AINA: But what's the next review planned for? Do we know?

RUSS HOUSLEY: My understanding is they are working on one and they told us that.

ALAIN AINA: [So it'd be good for me here,] I would like to see clear process on how [inaudible] the review and update.

DENISE MICHEL: I think that's appropriate. I would support that, Alain.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So ought o have community review whenever [inaudible] that follows a public process. Is that what you're suggesting? And that the SSR framework updates be the follow-up public process?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, exactly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: [Flexibility and community involvement].

RUSS HOUSLEY:

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, then I think this also is very important because there is a relationship between [inaudible] the framework [inaudible] framework, strategic plan, etc. So then ICANN has process for strategic [inaudible]. So that means we need to know also the process while reviewing the framework so that we match the strategic planning [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, that's a good point. Should we say that [inaudible] process should be in alignment with the strategic plan?

DENISE MICHEL: I think both strategic and operating plan. Sometimes I think of a strategic plan that's intended to be like a ten-year deal and then do like an annual or two-year operating plan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Does that's mean it can't be done anytime between them if needed?

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, make sure that any update, because any update may affect some [inaudible] program. That's why you need to make sure you update [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, I'm saying that the update itself can't be done between two planned [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: [Yeah. it can be.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It should be consistent between [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, it can be consisten.

NORM RITCHIE: So the strategic and operating plan are annual, correct? Yeah?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry?

NORM RITCHIE: The strategic and operating plan are annual, not [inaudible]?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This review is [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [The strategic plan isn't] annual.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No? Is it?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, it's five years typically.

NORM RITCHIE: Really? Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, the strategic plan right now is 2016 to 2020.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Four years.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So it's a four-year one.

NORM RITCHIE: I thought it would just be updated every year.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Including 16, it is five years, actually. [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Five years.

NORM RITCHIE: Inclusive, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's a five year, but it's [inaudible] a couple years? Is that what you're saying?

NORM RITCHIE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But I don't think we need to get into how those are as long as that creates a rhythm for it, right? Okay. Anything else you want to change on the recommendation two stuff?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, it's good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright.

NORM RITCHIE: We'll wordsmith them all later, right? So editorial pass [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just fix it. It's a Google doc. [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: You spot it, fix it.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: You are empowered. Any non-editorial changes? Any meta questions? Alright, moving on to three. We talked about three on the same phone call we talked about two. I will cut and paste the lower parts of the table

in now. But if you guys would look at the text up there, that's what we came to.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just a second. Doing the pasting [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And I'm not going to do any work until [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That's done. I see Denise just did some stuff I didn't remember. Can staff reach out to find out what the correct URL is? Since the one they [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Don't return a Let Me Google That For You because that'll go [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: Which link? Sorry. Oh, okay. I see.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You see the 100 key terms?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, the [inaudible]. I think that's one of the questions and answers, no?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it looks like a Steve Conte[inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sure does.

RUSS HOUSLEY: As opposed to one that is –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Not Steve Conte?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is in the [inaudible] you know, files or somewhere. Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Let me look into it. [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's in the SSR final report.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Loads for me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It does? Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think. I mean, I t's like [a PDF now.] Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Open in new tab, let's find out what happens. Actually, it opened for me
                       too. So [inaudible] that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The Steve Conte one does. I don't know what that link is. So yeah, there
                       could have been [issues with that one.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: But the one in the consistent terminology and describptions resolves.
                       So maybe I didn't understand which one doesn't resolve. Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So the bottom line is we can't be excpected to review every single ICANN document and don't intend to.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] stationary.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. But we do observe that there are not procedures that are in place to ensure that the terms in the glossary are used. So that pretty much is–

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Moving on to four.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: On three, yeah? I have a question that the example on the contractual document fit more in three [inaudible] the example of a constituency [inaudible] fit more in the three than one. So maybe we can repeat it, but because we gave one example that, okay, this is an example of –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. You want me to copy that text down here?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] three is where I say that you should use the same thing in [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] copy that from one.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So at least we have an example. Kind of we do [odd document,] but we had one example of a document where –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We'll copy that down.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Having an issue here.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: That a good place for it?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Would it be hard for for example ICANN Org to have a mechanism that allows them to have this consistently applicable throughout?

RUSS HOUSLEY: As far as –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I assume that it's all like hosted somewhere and the [inaudible] that is related to SSR, and whenever you get an update, you've got to make sure that you are using the right terminology everywhere. So I'm not sure if we can recommend something like this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is why I really wanted to decouple our recommendations from their recommendations, because we could come up with – like if you were a consultant, we paid you a bunch of money, you could build a scraper that would go through periodically, and that might be good enough for whatever. But that's not what we're doing. They said we will jump over this bar. And we're observing that bar's really high. Or I don't know, that's not a bar, that's a [inaudible]. So I sympathize, but I think if we stay focused, we can get through. So that'd be my two cents. Because yeah, it is pretty audacious to say an organization, a community this large will have a consistent application of a very common word like SSR. That's ridiculously ambitious, but that's what

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

it says. So maybe we'll be more nuanced in our recommendation. That's what I would say.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the best we can do is observe that it's impossible. And say "You don't [even have] procedures."

ALAIN AINA: Okay. And [have we confirmed this statement with staff] saying that we observed there's no procedure? How we officially confirmed from staff that they do not have a procedure? Because I respect ICANN as an organization as someone who's in charge of making sure –

RUSS HOUSLEY: But we're falling short in recommending they create such a procedure, and I think that's on purpose and what Eric's saying.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: So which means we are [calling] that there is no procedure right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're just pointing that out. They can decide if they want to create one. They, the board. Alright. Okay. Anything else on three?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Stick a fork in it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Moving to four. Okay, on the Doodle, Laurin took the lead on this one, who's sick. We're not going to get any input from Laurin. So in terms of the documenting the relationships, I just pasted the document that says where they are, so do we want to observe anything else? I want to point out that in response to our question number four about this, they said, yes, that document was created based on the SSR1 recommendation, do not have any plans to update it.

ALAIN AINA: Can I?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

ALAIN AINA: For me, this seems to be [inaudible] systemic problem, because defining this relationship for me must be part of security management or risk management anyway. So saying that there's no [inaudible] You have to maintain your risk management, which includes the relationships. And this involves, as any time you review your risk assessment [listing,] it includes relationships. It includes relationships.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: So I'm saying that there's no established – so to review this thing [inaudible] this relationship must be maintained at least part of the security policy, risk management [anyway.] Then you need to know people you are talking to, and the relationship.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So my question to you is, do we wait and talk about that when we talk about the ICANN SSR, or do we –

ALAIN AINA: Okay, I think we need to mark this and keep it in the pool. When we get to the SSR, then we'll – yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's what I'm thinking, because that's where we're going to deal with so many organizational issues, right?

ALAIN AINA: Okay. [And we mark this.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: We can – you know. Either that, or we're going to end up exploring the entire web.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay?

ALAIN AINA: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anything else to say here? Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: I have a question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: I see there's [an outstanding] question – or answer.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Which one? Number?

NORM RITCHIE: In the question and answer section, it says – yeah, I think it's the first one. Yeah, clarifications.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh. See, we asserted in our question that there were inconsistencies [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Really? Where? Okay. So – but I'm saying, are we moving on from that, are we striking that off now as an outstanding question, or –

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you want to dig deeper on this, you should.

NORM RITCHIE: I do not.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anyone else?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Ostensible, we would be doing this because [inaudible] the blurb. So it might also make sense as much as [inaudible] punt it until Laurin feels better. If we wind up just a couple of them that we punted on, that might not be so bad.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Because I'd hate to undo or redo any of the work that Laurin's done [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. So – okay, we have a note to ask him. And I can't spell "research" [I guess.] Okay. Anything else? Okay. Number five. We discussed this one on – we started to discuss it at the end of September, and then I missed the next call, and Laurin did that so I don't have those notes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I missed that call because I had a – there was a fire alarm in my building.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [Let me check my record.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, where was that captured? I hope the answer is we don't have to listen to it.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Well, we'll have the notes summary, but that is pretty high-level.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I don't have the details [inaudible] Laurin.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I've read that, I couldn't turn that into sentences. But [inaudible] capture this.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, could somebody who was on that call check their notes?

BOBAN KRSIC: I was on holiday, so I'm out.

NORM RITCHIE: I was on the call, I'm trying to remember. I believe it's a discussion centered around that you can't really measure the effectiveness of these. That's a difficult one to measure. How do you measure effectiveness of a [inaudible] relationship? [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: But it's a pointer to the same relationships document that we just talked about in four.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, but it doesn't tell you how effective they are, right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The Q&A below it even says we just talked about this in four a little bit. But yeah, to Norm's point, this is sort of saying, how well is it used, what's the sort of qualitative result from doing it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: What are you talking about?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Also, it says use – you know, the [relationships maintain effective working.] So as you come up with how do you measure effective – demonstrate how these relationships are utilized to achieve SSR. So some of the questions below maybe speak to the second part, how they're utilized. Well, there's this framework in these documents, that's how they're used. But we'd have to come up with what effective means. But we can do that in a very simple way – or not simple way, but streamlined way. We could say "effective is bla. Did that ever happen? Yes or no?"

RUSS HOUSLEY: Or you could turn it around, and is there a place where we can quickly, irrefutably point to a place where the relationship fails? Right? Don't go deep, just, you know – then that would be like – clearly, [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [That was the] response to GDPR.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh man. Now SSR is getting mad about GDPR too.

DENISE MICHEL: Name collision is probably another example. But I think failure kind of gets away from the basic recommendation of publishing a document that clearly outlines the roles and responsibilities and makes sure that the groups are agreed and they have appropriate resources. So online, you can find a draft document from 2015. There isn't an indication that it's finalized nor SSAC and RSSAC officially signed off on it. There's no documentation on how [resourcing would have] evolved and how they reached the decisions that they did in terms of making [inaudible] decisions. So I think that's also an issue. And then of course, there's been RSSAC and SSAC review. Presumably, those organizational reviews would have an impact on this recommendation, but there hasn't been any update to that 2015 document since those reviews were conducted.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Where's the 2015 document?

DENISE MICHEL: [I'll see where's the link to that.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's really interesting. I'm sorry if I'm completely having a brain fart here, but [inaudible]. Now I'm even more confused. What was I talking about? Oh, so maybe I'm totally missing something here, but when I read

recommendation 5 and it says that ICANN should use definition of its SSR relationship to maintain effective work [arrangement –]

DENISE MICHEL: I was on six.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh. Now I understand where you were.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm way ahead of you. I'm on six. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So five is done? Great.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Moving on. But is there any reason why we should have a notion of which organizations' relationships we're talking about with? So maybe it was like crossed wires, but that's a really good point. SSAC and RSSAC, are we talking about in recommendation five ICANN's interface with its own –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, that's what I was worried about. If you had to talk about the external relationships, which is what the document talks about, and then you had to also map the internal, I think it would get untenable.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, the fairly regular SSR reports that I found online actually do include an explanation of working arrangements and relationships that ICANN uses to deliver on their SSR goal. So I thought that was fairly straight forward and in line with sort of what seemed to be the objective in this one recommendation. And it seems to be something that we could reinforce and support moving forward. I don't recall they really delved into SSAC and RSSAC specifically, but –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. So I added notes to this recommendation five and [inaudible] getting ahead.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That thing you're copying, Norm, is a massive table.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. I was just double checking. I think I saw before but there's a whole list of organizations, right? Yeah, so the trouble is, yes, this is a nice list of organizations, but it really doesn't say anything.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, which gets to the recommendation four. Yeah, and the notes that are reflected there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, the same links a from –

DENISE MICHEL: So for five, I was suggesting – and Laurin might have some additional input on this later that we should reinforce the work that the staff is doing now and validate that it's still useful and to continue to do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But this is the same file they said they're not going to update, they had no plans to update.

DENISE MICHEL: Which one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the link that is common to four and five, that big table. The question four to recommendation four says they don't have any intentions to

update that docket. And it seemed to me that to implement five, you'd have to have some kind of a process to say, "Is this working?"

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	My [inaudible] I think tried to say before is that I think the most help we can be here is to be clear about why we can't give a clean bill of health. Not to propose what to do to get it, just to say like –

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Exactly.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Like you just said, this document lists a whole bunch of organizations and no intention to update it. But we don't know how they're actually ingesting this [inaudible]. That's it. Someone who's [past the implementation can be –]

DENISE MICHEL:	And that's for four.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Five.

DENISE MICHEL:	Okay. Yeah, Norm was referring to the long list of organizations.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Eric, [what's] some words?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You want me to do it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Alright.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Put it up onto the [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You want it in the answer section, or somewhere else?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right in here.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Up there? Oh, okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right there.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Alright. Cool. I'll use stars and [inaudible]. Alright. Where's my [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're killing me, man.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, exactly. Yeah, like that's all you need to say.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's all I was going to say, because that's –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, that's it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Just so you know, KC has joined the AC room.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: You're welcome.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I was going to reach for it. I told you not to hit any buttons.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]. I know. [inaudible] Eric, I knew you were going for it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I was getting there. You're really fast. You're faster than me. I was right here and [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so what do you want me to hit now? Red hang up?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You know, I think we're good. But thanks for the help.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Has the host left the meeting? We haven't heard that [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That is an annoying line, isn't it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Russ, you've got a really good one with number six. I can't wait to see what you have to say about number six.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are you ready?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I am ready.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is there anything more to say about five?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Everyone seemed to think that my [inaudible] slash terse slash [inaudible] response was –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Was totally cool. Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: You need to say that not clearly measurable or clearly not measurable. [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It is not clearly measurable, but it was clearly not clearly measurable, to be perfectly frank. I mean, basically, could be – the mean way to say this is that recommendation was not met. And a slightly more illustrative is there was no way to meet that. So this one's sort of like in-between. Sort of like there was no way to measure whether that was meetable. So I though that was like a nice middle ground.

NORM RITCHIE: A freebie.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That was just my take though, by the way, so I mean I'm not married to that perspective.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Or you can say this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Nice. You wonder if –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] worried about is [inaudible] clearly modified. Okay. Are we done? Yes? No?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we're done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, so I have six, and when the questions got answered, I tried to do my homework, and I think the [inaudible] there was this document from March 2015, captured the roles and responsibilities of RSSAC and SSAC. However, the document is still marked draft under review. If consensus was achieved, a final document could not be located. So, do they have the intended effect? I say no.

The recommendation calls for a consensus document, and documentation related to the consensus process is not available, so, is this still relevant today? I think so, and [I think] at least two recommendations. The first one being finish the public comment on that [inaudible] document, and I don't want to dig in and figure out whether that means that the public comment was done or not done,

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

but somebody else can do that. If public comment was done, use the results of that public comment, finish the document. If it wasn't, do the public comment and get it done. Anyway, the point is finish the process.

And the second thing is it should not be this hard to find whether a public comment was done or not. There was no archive of this. Once it falls off that webpage, it's gone forever. So I was suggesting a mail list as a way, as a mechanism of fixing that, and you can read the text that I proposed. Anyway, that's my thought.

DENISE MICHEL: I think that's useful, and I would add that there should be an attempt at consensus building, validation across RSSAC and SSAC.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, isn't that what the public comment would do?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Public comment would just [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: I think everyone can weigh in, so –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, exactly.

DENISE MICHEL: Perhaps before everyone weighs in, it would be good to get RSSAC and SSAC to look at it and agree on it [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that forces us to go figure out where they were in the development, and I'm just trying to stay above that.

DENISE MICHEL: No, I'm saying going forward, like a recommendation going forward is –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm saying finish the document. I don't want to dig into – let somebody else figure out what the statement was, and if that means they need to talk, RSSAC, SSAC first, then do public comment, that's up to them to figure out.

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. You see what I'm saying? I don't want to –

DENISE MICHEL: Get [inaudible] doing it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Own having to figure out where they were in their process to write our recommendation.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. I see your point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. You didn't finish, that's all I'm trying to say.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Recommendation finished.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, just want to make sure that – yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The air conditioning went off.

DENISE MICHEL: We really need more [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] it was on for –

RUSS HOUSLEY: It was on for – I don't know.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think the heater came on.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] through the door [inaudible]. Anyway, it's hot.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] all the machines over here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I might just be going delusional. Heatstroke.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [It happens, that's the thing.] It'll make these recommendations more fun to read tomorrow. Are we in Canada?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, there are going to be a lot of conferences in Canada now.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Alright, I think – does anyone object to anything in six right now?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Alright, I think we should roll seven.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Well, I will come back to this and make bold text at the top.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, I just find the recommendation fairly detailed, and I thought –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. At the same time, it's –

NORM RITCHIE: No, I'm not saying it's bad, I just find it detailed and the other ones are high level.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The recommendation is also – it's touching a nerve. Like that's something that's sort of like, "You two should be friends and you should work together and stop stepping on each other's toes."

RUSS HOUSLEY: But that was what the SSR1 recommendation was.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I know.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think the reason it's very specific is because it's kind of the same.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm sorry, I was referring to the recommendation about the –

DENISE MICHEL: About the public comment [that we've been talking about.]

NORM RITCHIE: About the public comment notification, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: He's talking about my text.

DENISE MICHEL: There is an archive of public comments. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So there were comments on this?

DENISE MICHEL: No, I thought you were [inaudible] process for archiving public comments.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can't find them.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. [That's fair.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, the public comments are archived.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But finding –

DENISE MICHEL: This specific one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, that's really hard.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's why –

DENISE MICHEL: [I'm there,] Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. No, [so if] my text doesn't make that clear –

DENISE MICHEL: I got it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. It's like –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I'm there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Find the comments on the last SSR framework public comment period.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's actually really easy to do if you know the exact strings [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, exactly. But if you don't know those strings –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's magic. That's my [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Also, KC has a comment.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [I heard her type it.]

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Can folks hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Okay. I'm sorry to jump into the middle of this. So pardon me if I lack context, but I just caught you talking about advising ICANN to go finish

this comment and then Denise stepping in and suggesting they also get RSSAC and SSAC input. I agree with Russ that it sort of – we don't want to micromanage the process, but I just want to make the observation that this most recent, shall I say, trajectory with the KSK roll, one of the things that really I think caused a lot of angst was that ICANN had some also unclear public comment processing with that, and then they asked RSSAC and SSAC at the end of the process, because I guess their public comment maybe wasn't as definitive, and neither RSSAC nor SSAC participated in the public comment. So it ended up that we were – SSAC we, we were asked at the 11th hour about this whole KSK stuff, and we really were not comfortable being asked at that point. Now, you could be – the argument could be made that we should have participated in the public comment or we should have participated even before that, and we've participated a year ago but not with the new plan. So when I heard Denise say make sure they ask SSAC and RSSAC maybe even before the public comment, I thought, yes, please, let's do it that way. But I understand Russ' point that let's not micromanage the process. I just want to highlight that maybe this fits into another recommendation somewhere else, because there does seem to be some broken – and I don't want to say that it's ICANN's, because like it's SSAC and RSSAC's responsibility too to be participating in the process at the right time, but clearly, something has gone wrong recently, and it was a problem. So that's just what I want to mention.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're happy with not updating it, or you're –

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: I don't know the answer yet. I think definitely the thing isn't finished, but – and again, maybe it doesn't belong in this recommendation, but I just want to caution that the public comment process might be itself not sufficient if there isn't some guarantee that certain constituency holders are not participating in that public comment process. And so that's why I think Denise's comment was well founded, like make sure they get input from these people that are heavily involved in this recommendation. If we think that'll happen, if we're not worried about that happening, then we can leave it, not specify it as you suggest. I'm just saying that I got hit really close to my face this year with it not happening.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. So we could just add some text in there on continuing to – on implementing this recommendation to ensure that RSSAC has strong engagement, [so] RSSAC and SSAC throughout this process.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yeah. I don't know, again, maybe it goes somewhere else. I'm just trying to raise a flag. I don't know that we saw the right [balance]. I don't mean to derail this thread.

DENISE MICHEL: No, it's on point for this recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So there's two possible ways to think about what you said, KC, and one is that we observe that not all constituencies are participating in the public comment and that that needs to be dealt with, or we say when you know RSSAC and SSAC have interest in a particular [inaudible] make sure that they are consulted. Which one are you suggesting?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: I think Denise's wording covers either.

DENISE MICHEL: So I just [inaudible].

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yeah. If you want to not micromanage, would you just articulate the goal and not the mechanism?

DENISE MICHEL: So in the last section for recommendation six, I wrote – I updated it to say in the recommendation "Confirm agreement by RSSAC and SSAC and initiate the public comment for this document that describes the roles and responsibilities of SSAC and RSSAC."

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: "If consensus is reached, produce a final document [inaudible]."

RUSS HOUSLEY: That works for me. [It does.]

DENISE MICHEL: Does that work for you, KC?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: I meant her oral comment about robust participation or something, but either way is fine with me. I don't care.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Yes, so I think we codified that [inaudible] recommendation there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Cool. Okay. Anything else on six? Seven? This is Alain. Got to guide us through this one, man.

ALAIN AINA: I've not done my homework, but –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Shame on you.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: But I [noticed that] someone has touched on it and provided some data here. [That also for] implementation, not implemented though. There have been some – I don't know who did that though. Okay, so basically, as I said – okay, I apologize for not [inaudible] last-minute. So basically, what is done here is that the SSR activity planning are now part of the SOP, and all of these things are seen under the objective in the strategic plan on – what should I call them? Healthy, secure and resilient ecosystem. So that [inaudible] under the strategic plan. So now all the SSR activity or priority now should be seen in the strategic plan under the objective of the healthy – [inaudible] and coordinated, healthy and secure, stable, resilient identifier ecosystem.

If you look at it, you have some portfolio there with some activities. Okay, so my point is, you see like the SSR planning are part of the SOP [running] under these objectives. That means something has been done on this thing, and so what –

RUSS HOUSLEY: So there, you're talking about the bullet that says the revamped process for establishing updated SSR priorities and objectives? Is that what that comment was about, or was it the second bullet where it talks about the SOP?

EN

ALAIN AINA: Yeah. What I was saying [is] that – no, the update [inaudible] done part of the SOP, so they're not done as a standalone part of the strategic planning.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

ALAIN AINA: And under the – so that means if we want to now see the effectiveness [inaudible] then we have to look at the SOP and the objective 2.1 of the strategic plan, [inaudible] portfolio. So that means we will not be able to see process in place where the SSR program update [has been – is not] standalone. If I understood [inaudible] it's now done part of the SOP. On my [inaudible] All the activity for the SSR are now done inside the strategic planning under the objective 2.1 on fostering a healthy, secure, resilient, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. [inaudible] part of ICANN's overall mission. It falls int other overall strategic planning. I don't know that there's necessarily a particular element of the strategic planning that calls out [inaudible] specifically, but there are elements or strategic elements of the plan that could be attributed or could have it as an umbrella over the SSR itself. If that helps answer your question. I believe one of the briefings that we did last year too when we were going over the strategic planning, we were highlighting the elements of the strategic plan that pertained to SSR,

and that more than [inaudible] the way it's done for the future strategic plan.

NORM RITCHIE: Well, I'm just reading this and I'm not totally familiar with it all, but the gist I'm getting is that the work started and the objective was achieved but has not remained current. That's kind of the gist I'm getting out of all this.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I'm not sure. I agree that it was started. In reviewing this material, [I've come to the conclusion] that they didn't actually provide or maintain a clear set of objectives and priorities at the initiative and activity level. High-level issues identified in this plan and framework, but you can't – and it's also linked to other recommendations regarding transparency and accountability for the SSR expenditures at ICANN. Still really difficult for the community to understand what the priorities are, what activities they're engaging in, how they're prioritizing their work, what their budgets are for SSR-related activities, which I think goes to the heart of this recommendation.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. [inaudible] brings that in, [the comment, objectives and prioritization and issues,] so yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What I hear you saying is we do believe that they take the SSR stuff into account when they're drafting the SOP. But you can't go look at the SSR framework and figure out what part of the SOP is driven by it.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. You can't, and –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Which is what this calls for.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, and then in the strategic plan, the operating plan and the budget, we cannot determine what our SSR expenditures are, what their priorities are and what their key activities are across the board. And I think one of the messages we should take away from [inaudible] investigating these 28 recommendations is that there are many inflection points for SSR throughout the ICANN Organization, only some of which are under OCTO. But nevertheless, they're very critical, and I think part of what is emerging for me as a key recommendation that affects several of these is how ICANN [inaudible] the community on identifying its SSR activities and prioritizing them, and then providing the community with an accounting of what they're doing, how much they're spending, what resources they're bringing to bear.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. So based on what you said, if you look at what we have here, now it's clear like the SSR, the SSR framework [inaudible] from the SOP, and

if we want to look at in the SOP, we should be looking at the objective to support a healthy, stable, resilient [inaudible] and this has three sub-objectives. 2.1, foster and coordinate a healthy, secure, etc. 2.2, proactively plan for change in the use of bla bla, and 2.3, support he evolution of domain names. So [inaudible] the SSR impact in the SOP should be sent through this –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] the numbers you're reading off are from our Q&A with them.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. I'm reading from Q&A [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: So if we want now – for me, if we want to see how this [inaudible] been mentioned, this is so that means we have to look at the SOP planning and see how the objective 2.1 has evolved during the process. Because the SSR1 seemed to have impact 2.1, 2.2, and this – to the 2.2, 2.3. So for me, my point is it looks like these things are no longer maintained as SSR activities by standalone but is now part of the strategy SOP planning under [inaudible] these objectives.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. But at 10,000 feet. And it's very typical to see [inaudible] follows through on that, and fulfilling this recommendation actually provided a clear set of objectives and priorities on [inaudible] activities involving SSR.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can I –

ALAIN AINA: So one way of looking at this for example is to look at the strategic planning and see how the SSR comes in in the strategy planning.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So the 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, I think that's a little bit of sort of like a confirmation bias, that's sort of like given these things that are here, we can go backwards engineer the general recommendation, which I think is kind of the reverse. I think if you look at the recommendation, what I read out of it is it says in any given moment, I should be able to point at an initiative that purports to be involved with SSR and know exactly how it's involved in SSR, or point at an initiative and say it's obviously not part of SSR because it's not clearly delineated as accomplishing this SSR objective. That's what the recommendation says. "Should build on this SSR framework by establishing clear set of objectives and prioritize [inaudible] objectives." These are SSR objectives in general, and prioritizing its initiatives, the things that they're doing, is saying we have to do ITHI first, because it meets this SSR objective so now I know it's an SSR thing and I know it comes before – I don't know, just pick

ICANN 63 ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

another one, like DAAR or something like that. And so that sort of framework of basically any operating initiative that has an SSR component needs to be transparently part of a preference hierarchy. These things come first, those things come next, and they all relate to SSR in the following ways. That's just my understanding having read it. So if I then take that and sort of tip that onto 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, they seem a little bit constrictive. Like they're talking about kind of like "If you only look at it this way." But I think what we have to do is take a step back and say, "Can we look at [an] initiative, OCTO or not, and say, is that an SSR initiative? If so, what order does it go?" That's kind of what their recommendation is asking us to do.

ALAIN AINA: So yeah, it wants – okay, I think from the SOP, [inaudible] to what they call portfolio. Each activity has a portfolio with a list of [inaudible]. Maybe we have to review the portfolio and see how they match the SSR2.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I guess so. If they [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, does the text I typed there at the top of recommendation seven capture what you just said?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that seems [alright.] So you actually listened to what I said and made coherent thought out of it. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I tried.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm trying to understand last paragraph written here as part of –

RUSS HOUSLEY: The last paragraph of what?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: The seventh recommendation.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: What Russ just wrote, you mean?

RUSS HOUSLEY: What I just wrote?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, the last paragraph here on the next page. It says the ICANN staff report on this recommendation note that the recommendation was made before ICANN's current planning. So this recommendation was

like in 2011, and now we are well into to the next strategic planning year, like we started from 2015.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So I don't think this is any more relevant, this text, because now we should have – if this recommendation has been taken care of the next strategic planning year, which is '16 to '20, then we should have an indication of that these are the objectives that were made clearly SSR-related as part of the strategic plan '16 to '20. Because this text does not go well with that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So just to kind of pile on to that but add a little bit, so in reading this, sort of the last sentence from whomever penned it, [inaudible] says that the page has not been updated since summer of 2014. So even if we asked for and we saw exactly what we were saying this recommendation needed, it could be without a date. So first, there needs to be sort of the illustration of what he recommendations require, and then there also needs to be some freshness to it that's not here.

DENISE MICHEL: And specificity.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, for sure.

DENISE MICHEL: I think there's a big leap between very high-level texts and objectives in the strategic plan and what the actual SSR activities and priorities are and how they're being carried out.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. For sure.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just saying that this could have been an excuse while the recommendation was made, because [inaudible] the ongoing –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Like the fiscal budgeting or –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I was totally piling on, because in addition to what you just said, like, "Oh, but now it should be good enough," it also even said back then it still wasn't being [made.] Even if it showed up or if it hasn't shown, there's still a freshness issue. So just saying.

NORM RITCHIE: We seem to be doing part of this on the fly right now. Do you feel confident enough?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The sad part about these recommendations is if you can find that they're not implemented, you're kind of done, versus if you can't find [inaudible] –

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think it's a lot harder to prove that something has been accomplished than it is to find an example where it hasn't. So if we go fast because we find a problem – I don't know if this is the right way to do it or not, it's like it's an unfortunate part of doing a proof. All I have to do is disprove your proof and I can say you're wrong. But to prove you're right, we have to have consensus and everyone has to [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, I think – so beyond that, we've also committed to addressing whether the recommendation is still relevant today, what additional work is needed. That really gets [inaudible] much more substantive and qualitative –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yeah, that's a good point.

DENISE MICHEL: "Here's why I think that's worthwhile and should continue.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: And if I may, keep in mind that the strategic planning for next five years is even worse right now, so by the time the recommendations from this review team comes out, there is a good possibility that a similar statement will be made that this strategic plan is already done. So for the next five years, how do we now fit this in again?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well – so, [inaudible] one of our recommendations, next time, wait for the recommendations to show up and be like, "Great, so ten years after [inaudible] totally able to get on that."

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So just something to keep in mind, that there's a planning, right? Because the process for strategic planning is in the works now. I don't quite know what the timeline is or when it's going to be finalized for the next five years, but we are on a three- or five-year cycle now. Actually, I think they're switching to a three-year strategic plan cycle, which makes it a little bit better, but by the time final recommendations come

out, it's very likely that the strategic plan has already been done for the next, let's say, three years.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, this is still relevant, because the strategic plan of course is that extremely high [inverted] general level, and part of what our assessment and recommendations are going toward is to carry through with the SSR objectives and activities and gauge the community, document it as an activity level, provide the transparency into the resources and spending against those, how [inaudible] a lot of work that is separate from the strategic plan.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: I think that goes to the heart of this recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I was clicking the link in two, my ICANN.org planned projects, and that was updated this year, and then the SSR link within that page was updated this year. So maybe [we've gone] clicking the wrong thing? What did you mean when you typed "The staff also points to an SSR quarterly report page?" Which link were you thinking? Because it's not [2]. That is all I'm saying. [inaudible].

Now I know where you were pointing, these SSR quarterly reports in the third bullet of the first response stuff. Yeah, that was second – that was not updated since 2014.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Great. Now I know where it was. Thank you. Okay, so does adding that note address your – the point I think that Naveed was raising? Does that additional sentence at the top of recommendation 17 resolve what you were trying to say, capture?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [The board –]

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Without that.] Can you [inaudible]?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [Yeah, actually, what we're] concluding here I see is that this has not been implemented to its [value.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's right.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But we're not saying we're going to write a recommendation here. We're just pointing out it wasn't done.

NORM RITCHIE: It could be the work was done, it wasn't documented. We don't know that, right? Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, you can't go –

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This calls for you being able to look at an activity and know if it's SSR-related. That's [not true.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, I'm reading the recommendation. I've read it now three or four times, and it seems to be saying that, yes, as our framework informs the strategic plan –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

NORM RITCHIE: And the strategic plan informs the SSR framework. [inaudible] here. Which is fine, that's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, I just wanted to make sure [inaudible]. Then we talked about –

RUSS HOUSLEY: But it also says – and in that second informing, the SSR framework informing the strategic plan –

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That you nee to be able to find out which things in the plan are SSR-related. And that's the parts [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible]. Wouldn't that be nice?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That'd be nice.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Like if you were doing all this work as an organization, you wouldn't want to have to do this. But because you have to do this, it's like, "Okay, well, then [once you have to do this,] this is really cool to see."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: If I was fighting for budget, I'd be all over doing that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's right.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Okay, if you go to the reporting, there is a reporting on the operating plan [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] reporting.

ALAIN AINA: No, in the text. I'm showing that the organization has [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: And we have some portfolio, and one of them here is security and stability.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: I want you to click on that [inaudible] to join.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: There we have something [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. That claims it was updated this – I went through that. It claims it was updatrd this year.

ALAIN AINA: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Okay, so where's [DAAR,] I guess?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Is DAAR – is that SSR in particular?]

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, it seems to be the portfolio related to security [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] but the point is [inaudible] anything to do with SSR, it should be listed [in] priority order.

ALAIN AINA: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's not there, so I guess we're assuming it's not SSR. Like that's the point, but –

ALAIN AINA: Okay. [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] things we're doing. [inaudible] I don't know the project that's called that [inaudible] ITHI? Yeah, know that one. KSK rollover, [inaudible]. But like those are [inaudible] objectives [inaudible] ITHI.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: For ITHI or in general?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: In general. [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, these are [inaudible] different level.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Technical services.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So it's more complicated than that, Eric, because the recommendation itself actually –

ALAIN AINA: If you look at the portfolio –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Confuses initiatives and activities.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So first of all, that doesn't [inaudible] so this is not going to fulfill this thing's need. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Initiatives – well, that's what I mean. So it's actually calling for the union.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So basically when you're doing an initiative or you're doing an activity, it needs to be like itemized or annotated [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I see two parts. One is they want it to be part of the framework itself, like your objective, and the second is to keep on reviewing or implementing or seeing the actual different activities [at once.] So I see two different parts. Like one is the ongoing, which is – or should be continuous in terms of activities to achieve those goals, and the process to frame those objectives. Well, I don't see the objectives being framed as they are in the framework itself and [inaudible] the strategic plan. So one has to be in the strategic plan, the other has to be in yearly reports. These are the activities we did to meet these objectives.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah. As Denise said, [inaudible] framework from the strategic plan, the strategic plan lead to the operating plan. If you look at the operating plan, the operating plan has this [under] portfolio, and the portfolio also lead to some [inaudible] activity.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so then just to illustrate the point that – the disconnect I think we're having, show me where it shows what the priority and relationship of DAAR to the SSR strategic plan is. Show me where it says that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [I'm seeing here.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The problem is that like [inaudible] we have situations where that doesn't work, and so it's easier to see the recommendations not been fulfilled because we can show evidence that it hasn't been fulfilled than to say it's universally always been fulfilled because I can find now evidence when it wasn't. So it is easier to say – this looks like good reporting work, and I imagine this had something to do with end-of-year assessment, but nevertheless, it doesn't help us with this recommendation. That's just my [inaudible]

ALAIN AINA: Okay. If we look at it on that, on [inaudible], yes. But if we go back [inaudible] that the SSR framework has informed the strategic plan, and then – so that means, for me at this point if we want to look at the priority, that's what we should look at, how the priority is managed inside [inaudible] and the strategic plan.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's not what it says. I mean you're making a point about what would be good to do –

ALAIN AINA: No [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And I agree. I'm just saying for like rec seven.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I think what you're describing sounds like a healthy activity that would be useful, but recommendation seven's asking for something specific.

ALAIN AINA: And – okay. [inaudible] normal organization, so what you see most of the time, you understand the objective, the priority, the activity, [inaudible]. Okay? This is where you see them. This is where you see them and you evaluate them anyway. [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Not sure what you're trying to say.

ALAIN AINA:	What I'm trying to say is that – okay, back to this ICANN thing, then you can have the framework and you define the framework [inaudible]. The framework [inaudible]. Your objective has to fit in in the global – the organization objectives and priorities.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	I find that to be orthogonal. If you'd go to that level of structure, that's fine, but if I've needed you to come up with a hierarchy and you said the way I've fulfilled your hierarchy is I've done it a different way but it's still there, cool, box checked. But if you said, "I didn't think I needed to do that because I have a different way of doing it and my organization's healthy and strong," it's like, yeah, you could have a healthy and strong organization, it's just this recommendation was just saying to do something very specific.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:	I think it will help us understand the recommendation itself if we just read the three paragraphs in the SSR1 report that is just before this recommendation, because they're there elaborating what this actually means. If you want, I can read it to you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Yes, please do.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:	For example, they say, "And additionally, [inaudible] by changing the format of the SSR framework from year to year, ICANN has made it more

difficult to monitor progress in implementing the plan and identify what has changed. ICANN should seek to maintain a consistent structure for its SSR framework to facilitate a greater focus on how ICANN's projects and activities relate to its overall remit, SSR remit and responsibilities."

This is paragraph one. Then they move on and say, "Going forward, ICANN should consider ways to provide a clear and consistent organizational structure for the SSR framework. Specifically, ICANN should organize all projects within its three spheres of responsibilities." And I don't know what they are three [spheres].

"Throughout the framework, it should prioritize initiatives that consider utilizing subsections as it did in the fiscal year 11 SSR framework, which helps to group projects into even more discreet categories according to the type of activities." That's paragraph two.

And final paragraph, "ICANN should consider in all its [inaudible] SSR activities a pragmatic cost and benefit analysis, at the same time ensuring that activities for developing regions are fully encompassed and are not ruled out on a cost basis. Working together with the broader community, ICANN may seek to identify technological contributions that are affordable to parties with scarce resources and help development."

So I think by the initiatives, what they mean is what new initiatives you are doing to approach those developing regions and what activities you're doing to meet those objectives. So this is what [inaudible] but I

read it for you. Maybe that makes it clear what they mean by these two [aligned] statements recommendation seven.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think that changes the statement that we understand the SOP was informed by the framework but we still can't tell what things in the SOP are SSR-related.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I agree, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: What I'm saying is – do we have something out of this that we think is still relevant and has not been what ICANN should do in the future? Like as part of the SSR framework, what kind of objectives do we seek to be there? Like [it just says] clear set of objectives. Does not guide actually how those objectives should be found. And because the initiatives and activities are based on those objectives –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Let me ask a question that's going to maybe cause me to [propose something] to the group. Just to be clear, is it your perspective that we are taking recommendation seven out of context because we don't

have that – we haven't used those leading three paragraphs in our discussion, like we're taking it out of context?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm just saying that there was a discussion here that the statement of recommendation seven is ambiguous and we don't really understand and they're mixing initiatives. So I just read this so as to clarify what I meant.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sure. No, that's helpful. I just wonder if part of what you're saying is also sort of like not just we were not able to understand what they meant by initiatives and activities, but more like we were going down the wrong path because they had a different context in mind. Is that what you think was going on? Just clarifying the wording. Because if we do have this problem of the recommendations that stand as their own, as recommendation seven is a recommendation, but if its context changes its meaning, then we have a much bigger problem because that's not how we've been proceeding, and I don't think that that's a reasonable expectation of us to go and try and [inaudible] for every recommendation [when they're standalone,] but as a team we'll have to figure that out, probably sooner rather than later.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: To me, in order to understand the recommendation, the text that immediately follows the – precedes the recommendation must be kept

in mind, because that is important to keep the context in which the recommendation was made.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's okay. And I'll defer to the group for sure because I'm just one voice, but just to make that clear, that can mean that somebody can say recommendation X was or was not implemented based on text that is not evident in that recommendation. In other words, our archival report will say, "We found that recommendation not implemented" and vice versa. And someone will have to go through the whole like, "Why did SSR2 say recommendation N was or wasn't implemented?" It really looks to me like it was clearly not and we have to spend a lot of time saying, "What they really meant was this."

If this was a legal document, that wouldn't pass muster. If this was a legal document, it'd be like "Rec seven said this. That is what you will assess, I don't care what the spirit was." And that's because this is a bit of a rabbit hole, and I just want to make sure that if we go down it, we're all cognizant of the depths that this rabbit hole can go to.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. So, Russ –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Not that – it's a very good point that you brought that up.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah. I agree with Naveed, I agree [inaudible] framework inform SOP, and [inaudible] strategic plan to look at the operating plan, we see some updating, some portfolio, some activities. But the issue here is we can't really tell which one is SSR-elected and how they've been prioritized. [Did I get that right?]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: And it may be they totally fit it but we can't see it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's it. I think that's all we've got to say. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jeff –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Did you call me Jeff?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jeff [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I've been insulted a couple times by this group, but man, that was –

NEGAR FARZINNIA: [inaudible] on you, Eric. [inaudible] for us now.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That cuts deep.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We've beaten seven to death.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This horse has not [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So recommendation eight. Laurin who's not here and Alain.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, and Alain. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: So, eight and two are – so seven and eight are related to [inaudible] strategic objectives and clear alignment of framework and strategic plan. Same thing applies anyway. So [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: It's the same anyway. So it's about aligning the framework and the strategy plan and operating plan based on what we just said. So it happens, but alignment may be the process of keeping this alignment so we don't see a process how – otherwise, they maybe – if we want to do [that] right now, we pull up the [inaudible] look at the plan [inaudible] operating plan get updated, how the SSR priorities are being factored in so [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I don't really understand what they mean when they say, "Continue to refine the strategic plan objectives." Once the strategic plan is made, I don't think we can modify or revise its objectives.

ALAIN AINA: Maybe every five years when you do that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's a very long-term recommendation then. Because you assume that the next review [we'll do in] five years again. So I don't know whether it means something else here or this is exactly what – like the alignment of framework with the strategic plan makes sense, because you can have three times refining the framework within a strategic plan. But refining the objective in the strategic plan itself does not make any sense.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, at the time this report was written and previously, ICANN had a much shorter timeframe for their strategic plan.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: So I think perhaps that was the context for it. Then they subsequently went to a much longer strategic plan [I think as we see now.] So I think –

ALAIN AINA: [It was three years, right? Three years for the strategic plan?]

DENISE MICHEL: Was it? Yeah, I'm trying to remember. But again, I see the big value in terms of relevancy and additional work as in engaging a community and making decisions about – at the actual activity level, prioritizing things, keeping it up to date.

NORM RITCHIE: This report was done last – SSR1 was –

ALAIN AINA: 2012. They started 2010 and the report was out.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, so this predates the expansion of the L-root [inaudible]. Is that right?

DENISE MICHEL: Well, they had L-root.

NORM RITCHIE: But –

DENISE MICHEL: But you mean the buildup?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. [inaudible] quite a bit.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: And there if you look at the response, they are saying that now if you are looking for SSR – if you are looking at the point three, what was done, point three said progress on SSR-related work update [inaudible] activity are reported on regularly as part of SOP, including ICANN, so it's no longer something you – so I think we can, as we did for the last several, say that [then.]

NORM RITCHIE: This is again referring to the quarterly reports. That seems a little vague.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Is it possible to do a bio break?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] feel free.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Good luck with those [inaudible]. I'll be back [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. He comes back in the room, we say, "Okay, number 22."

ALAIN AINA: 27. Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I wish.

ALAIN AINA: Okay, [work stream] number two.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We can all hide somewhere so he comes to an empty room [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: I like both of those [inaudible]. So that's a problem. Okay, so where are we?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm trying to figure out how to put the last thing you typed in there into response. Because like seven, the SOP is informed by the SSR framework, however, you can't tell which things are SSR-related, which I don't think is – I think that part about [– goes away.] And you say the mechanisms envisioned by SSR1 for achieving this have been [inaudible]. This is achieving this recommendation or achieving this goal? Achieving the goals. Maybe we just say "Have been replaced by others, organizational and processes," which is not necessarily a bad thing. But then this part where it doesn't – this recommendation doesn't actually call for review of the prioritization of the comment, right? Recommendation eight does not call for public comment.

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It calls for alignment of the strategic plan objectives and the SSR framework.

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the last thing you typed –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Via public community input process.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm trying to figure out how that actually – not agreeing or disagreeing with it, I'm trying to figure out how it relates to this recommendation.

DENISE MICHEL: So I don't think that we should be constrained, and thinking about [is it] relevant, and what further work is needed. In my view, this should be something that's done with community engagement.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree with that.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But I don't think that's recommendation eight. Now, there could be a follow-on recommendation that we make.

DENISE MICHEL: I was sort of getting into the – when we talk about further future work, I think that's what I was thinking about.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is more related to ICANN Org rather than the community.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, [I mean A,] so, it's a very public process, the development of the strategic plan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. [Finalizing it.] And similarly, they seek input form the community on the framework as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. Well, they have been, and we already got their recommendation from earlier that they develop a procedure that makes sure that is used going forward.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. it's kind of hard to parse this little set of recommendations. They sort of flow into each other. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, exactly. I'm aware of that.

DENISE MICHEL: Or at least they're really strongly connected. So I'm happy to address the community element of the process somewhere else if you feel like [it doesn't] fit. And I think at some point in the future, we should get to writing the draft [inaudible] way of grouping them together and [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I'm trying to capture enough of these thoughts that when we go to do the writing, we don't –

DENISE MICHEL: Remember what we said.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We don't have to have the discussion again. That's what I'm trying to do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] say that?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Because it came back [inaudible]. It's terrible, you wouldn't like it.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No. I wish, actually. I'd have brought [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: So Russ –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: If you look at the ICANN strategic planning process, it does say that three [inaudible] three phases. One, trend identification. Phase two, trend analysis [inaudible] impact, and [it says that] the board assess the [inaudible] priority [inaudible] and share a proposal with the ICANN community for consultation. [inaudible] the board define objectives and goals that will serve as a foundation for [inaudible] public consultation. Maybe we should refine the text. I'm talking about what you add into the recommendation about doing more public –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I'm trying to capture Denise's idea, which is going forward, I think, that the public process used to develop the SOP [inaudible] include the community in establishing the objectives and the prioritization at a more detailed level than is done today.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is what I heard. Is that correct?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: What are you talking about?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Trying to make sure everybody hates me.

NORM RITCHIE: [You can achieve that a lot.] Just kidding. But you set yourself up well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I know. I'm good at that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We can make that more measurable [inaudible] if we actually keep it in the report when we're done. But I didn't want to lose it and have the discussion again. Okay, anything else to say on recommendation eight? Alright. Now, do you want to take a break, Eric?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: And [inaudible] like five minutes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Seriously.] I would have done that really funny [inaudible] thing that I do. [inaudible] would have missed that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Let's take a final break, get a snack, drinks, [inaudible].

                            Let's start the recording, please.

ALAIN AINA: And I think we –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Wait a second please. Wait for the recording, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, so the session is being recorded and this is the second afternoon session of the SSR2 meeting.

ALAIN AINA: Okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you.

ALAIN AINA: I think I just want to call for [inaudible] if we look at recommendation [it seems that] certification for operational responsibility, but if you look at– maybe the answer is not here, but I think in the briefing, we were told – and I know this because I'm one of the key rollover security officers that they have certifications, KSK, KSK system, for the IANA functions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible] They have certification [inaudible] something called [sub 2, sub 3] for the root system, and for the IANA services. So again, we have

to go into those things. There's no certification at all, maybe we have to –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, that's –

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's not – those are audits. They're not certifications.

BOBAN KRSIC: And that's different, Alain.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah?

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And they are very different.

BOBAN KRSIC: Are only audits.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's right.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah. These [inaudible] operational audits, and they are [provided] every year, and here, the recommendation certificate anything, [inaudible]. Yeah? So –

NORM RITCHIE: I agree. I think that the recommendation is fairly specific.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, it is very specific.

NORM RITCHIE: It is. So –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: And they talked about all of these things that they did, but none of them are certifications.

BOBAN KRSIC: That's a fact. Yeah, and we talked [inaudible] people in LA and they said, okay, we have no certification.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'd say that that's worth putting in our response, that [we note] the existence of audit trails and past audits, but – I mean, just put it in there because even we got a little bit sidetracked by that.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Plus it does not mean that they are not following the correct practices and procedures, but the certification will take a minimum of a year, right?

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. So it's not likely they've actually achieved it, [so there's nothing a year ago.]

BOBAN KRSIC: So it's also highlighted that any other such audits that are carried out, it was only a single company four years in a row, so – and then they published an RFP and awarded it to a new company for 2018 [inaudible] audit. There is improvement on the process, yeah, but it's on the audit part and nothing certification-specific. And is it still relevant? I would say yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: It would certainly make these reviews much simpler.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So we do have a recommendation. Do this.

BOBAN KRSIC: Do this recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

BOBAN KRSIC: Do it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Maybe that's how [inaudible] it. Do it.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just do it.

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible]. Yes. Okay. Recommendation number ten. So, of course –
                         this was nine. Yes.

NORM RITCHIE: That was nine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right? Okay. So basically, figure out which certification you're going to
                         do, go do it.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Moving forward.

NORM RITCHIE: Swallow the pill.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just one thing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just one thing. The recommendation that I'm reading, it says, "Should assess certification options.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] –

BOBAN KRSIC: No.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: You're saying that even the assessment is not–

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is correct.

BOBAN KRSIC: There is no documentation of the assessment.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's absolutely to be done, yeah.

BOBAN KRSIC: If they had decided, okay, [show me the documentation,] and then –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Then the board can say, "We're not going to do it."

BOBAN KRSIC: Yes. That's it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That isn't what happened, right?

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible] foundation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Can we do number ten as quickly, please?

DENISE MICHEL: You like to sit on that one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, which one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ten. It's the one you and Scott –

NORM RITCHIE: Contract compliance. Just a little one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: A little one.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Enforcement.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This one will not be done as fast as the last one.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, there's a fair amount of text for people to read if people have comments on it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There is? I'm not seeing any in the Google doc.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, it's not in there?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No?

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. [inaudible]. I'll put it back in.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see – no, those are staff's comments.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just wondering, is this related to stability or [inaudible]?

DENISE MICHEL: Definitely security.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Security? Stability?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I guess. What would you say, DDoS attacks are –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Having leaky seals on your registrars is not a good thing for your registry
                       for example. So – I mean I wasn't going to [inaudible] Denise's writing
                       might be on there, but yeah, [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: You should add that. I haven't written that, but yeah. Yeah, and I think Scott wanted to [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [Sorry, there are new] text in there which I highlighted.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [It seems] they're already up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Wait a minute, something – oh, I see it. [Pushed it.]

DENISE MICHEL: I need to touch base with Scott [inaudible] I don't know if he wanted to weigh in on that. [Then you recall some had a] chance to put in writing [inaudible] accuracy of several compliance reports that they do have posted.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: When we say partially implemented, do we have a clear view of what is left, like what would have made it fully implemented for example?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

DENISE MICHEL: And then also, we don't really have any data on the resources that were provided – the current resourcing of it. And I think that's something else [that we] needed to look at.

NORM RITCHIE: I think comparison to 2012, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Definitely increase – but [they provided, actually. We don't have a real accounting resource.] Yeah, I think it's worthwhile adding more specifics on what we found evidence, things that weren't done but should be.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] implementation is measurable from like checking [inaudible] continue its efforts, so how [can we] measure and assess that those efforts are made and to what extent they're – how to assess that. Because people would have different standpoints in that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I totally sympathize. I feel like I keep [running into] the same thing. I think it's a slippery slope, because I think what I would do if I were to implement this one thing is I'd build a framework where things like events were published and you could go and measure them over time. But I don't know that we're in a position to suggest how these things should be implemented. Not just one idea. It might have reasons it's not a good idea, someone might do it different – so on the one hand, we can

say this isn't measurable because we can come up with ways [inaudible] measurable, but we may not want to be in a position [inaudible] to do, because then we run into a really –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So when we say that something is partially implemented, it means [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible]. [Please stop.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You need to get back in? [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [Self-proclaimed because the issues I had this month.] Here's the intrusion that I had this month [that we're starting to report.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Can't be reported in most cases.]

NORM RITCHIE: Yes. So it's a really tough one. And the other thing is that compliance, I find, is a very closed system here. Like the meetings with the registrars are closed, you cannot attend them. And I'm not a registry, I'm not a registrar, so a lot of stuff that goes on with compliance, I have no idea, whereas almost everything else is done openly. So I find that unusual.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

NORM RITCHIE: The reporting also on a lot of the metrics are based on registries, not on registrars.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: So the abuse actually occurs at the registrar, not the registry, and they're the ones in position to do something about it.

DENISE MICHEL: All the registries have some compliance obligations as well.

NORM RITCHIE: They do have compliance, but –

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: But if you really want – where the rubber hits the road, it's the registrars.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Actually, so this is a really good thing we could put in there, is we could point out the ambiguity of this recommendation delineating registries versus registrars. And then [inaudible] implied as we start to describe what we can observe in registries and that registrars have a separate set of problems we have no visibility. We just leave that hanging, it's like,

"You need to do some remediation there too," but we don't have to say how, we don't have to say explicitly – we can just say, "We're aware that there's nonpublic communications about compliance issues amongst the registry ecosystem. We are unable to evaluate this recommendation as a result and we're unaware of a similar analogous processes for registrars, though we note the same set of problems exist without compliance –"

RUSS HOUSLEY: Now say that in a sentence instead of a paragraph.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: How about I [inaudible] talking. I know [that's] what's going to come next [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's all recorded.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Can we see if the transcript [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But you didn't mention your name.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Who?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Only if you've got the URL for it.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, my name's Zarko. Let's see. [inaudible]. Thank you. [Nothing too nuanced.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I worry about verification verification, but –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, sorry. Yeah, I haven't even re-read it yet. Sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because what you want to do to be able to measure this in the future is your point.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. For the future.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Second part of this recommendation is about the structure process. This is something that can be directly measured, whether there's a structure process or not, but what I see in the response from ICANN is there are many efforts but that does not seem to be under one umbrella.

For example, I see the individual projects being launched as platform, but I'm not sure whether they're under one umbrella versus something that – I don't know if you can comment on – because this is the second part of the recommendation. It talks about the structure and to develop and implement a structure process –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And monitoring.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So whether there was an effort to develop that, because it says many things –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Like abou7t complaint tool launched, also implemented something automated, complaints migrated, WHOIS inaccuracy, qualities, [check launch,] so these seem to be individual or separate entities. But I wonder whether this is what we call a structure process.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So should we be saying anything about the text that Denise put in here about greater than 80% of the complaints against registrars were related to WHOIS inaccuracy? It's not –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Canonical citation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I mean, do we expect to have fixed that? That is my question.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is where it sort of – again, it [goes a little] disingenuous, because without it saying what it did do, we can come with lots of things it didn't do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, exactly.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] to say that. So it's not unfair to say that. If it had said, "We implemented this recommendation by doing something separate" we're like, "Okay, well, they did something." But if we can't find evidence that they've done something, [inaudible] reasonable, like, "You should at least do this then."

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. And frankly, I know a lot of the compliance issues are handled with a phone call, right? Kind of like, "This is going wrong," we're not going to – don't want to take down the registry. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's like –

NORM RITCHIE: Yes, but [inaudible] texts, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] on the phone.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, and if there is an incident, you're not going to put on a webpage that so and so had an incident, because that's – you have to [file an AK] or something like that in some cases.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: To [inaudible] certain things. So making measurable a bunch of things you've taken remediation for is tricky. So it's not an easy problem, but that's why we talk about indicators [instead of] incidents sometimes, right? [Didn't happen?] What were the indicators? I can tell you what [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: And me, [like other] people, I also have to keep remembering this is contractual compliance, not about abuse.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Good point.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. So it can only address, from this – for the SSR, it's only contractual compliance of SSR-specific terms without the contract that we're talking about.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But is WHOIS accuracy related to the contract?

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Then that's a good one to point out.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right?

NORM RITCHIE: I have no way of knowing anymore.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You have no way of knowing, but you do know.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, you request access then they give it to you, then you can measure it.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So we're all done then, right? Got through all the SSR1 recommendations.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Alright, so we have two paragraphs here. First one is they have stepped it up but there's not clarity as to which [things] in the compliance process are SSR issues, and that point that 80% of the complaints in August were related to WHOIS inaccuracy, and then we

have Eric's text that we just went through. Wait a minute, somebody added to it. Oh, okay. Anything else to say here?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Denise, can you point Scott to this so that he can –

DENISE MICHEL: Absolutely.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you. 11, Norm, your turn.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. So I have obviously not written anything on this yet, but I will talk about what I'd like to write now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can only say—

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, [inaudible] for me. So, if you look at what's there, there's obviously a lot of work done on this already, and there's a bunch of questions that were asked with still outstanding responses. So for the most part, there has been a [inaudible] improvement, I think, in the

metrics for new gTLDs, and plus there's more stringent requirements within the registry agreements for new gTLDs. So I'll itemize some of those. There's a lot of reference here to APWG, which there's nothing wrong with that, except that it's only about phishing, and it's also … You have to be a member of that organization which you have to pay them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Wait a minute, that's part of our Q&A.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So we asked about APWG.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But they answered, right?

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. I'm just going on what is here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, but that's in the question and answer section. Their response was implementation report slides 31 through 33, and briefing slides four and five.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. So we asked – somebody asked about it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

NORM RITCHIE: So I don't understand why that was asked, because that's one organization we addressed as phishing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: And it's also member-driven. Now, if I look at – there are members of SSAC who are closely tied to APWG, so I don't know if that's what's behind this. I guess overall [– and I also agree –] there's a reference here somewhere back to a comment that a consultant made saying that there is no clear measurement of what success is, and I totally agree with that. That's not clear, that's not defined anywhere. So that either needs to be done, so we somehow define those measurements of success – so that'd be all the different metrics that have to be in place for the different types of abuse and mitigation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're saying metrics for success have never been defined?

EN

NORM RITCHIE: [Let's look at –] so how many phishing domains are you going to allow –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, quote, analyze and implement measures of success.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes. My understanding that's – there has been some work there, but it's not done. For instance, how many phishing domains per day are acceptable? That would be my idea of what a measurement might be, and then you'll also have to make sure that you do not rely on one organization such as APWG to report it all, because they don't have the full set. No one has the full set. So you have to have multiple – dealing with multiple organizations, multiple feeds, Spamhaus, APWG. Even Spamhaus, although they're probably the leader from [a] spam point of view, you shouldn't just rely on Spamhaus. So yes, bottom line of all this is that, yes, there has been some improvement. There's still a ways to go.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I see that –something in [the bold] that says some answers are outstanding. [That's of course from the staff.]

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But then it says clarification from RT requested. So just I need to make sure whether some official request from the ICANN staff was made to the review team for some clarification of some of these questions. Because it shows that the ball is in our court to first clarify what we want to have as these questions, and then the answer would be provided.

NORM RITCHIE: Which one do you see that requires clarification?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: There are many that are outstanding.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, there's a lot.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, but [inaudible] 20, it says "clarification sought." But I was just talking about the main heading, it says "clarification required from –"

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can I maybe just [inaudible] If anybody agrees, I sort of dovetail a couple things faster. One, just real quick about APWG, if you look at the briefing slides, we got briefed on a bunch of things ,and the next recommendation has APWG in it and I think there's probably just some bleed over in the questions that were presented at the same time. But regardless, this one, just taking it atomically by itself, is asking for something very difficult that I don't think is addressed by any of the

work that I know of. It's basically saying finalize and implement measures. Measures are a big deal. [It says like,] "How would you measure whether something's good?" You'd have to come up with a good idea of what is the thing, how would you measure it. Come up and impellent measures of success for new gTLDs and IDN fast track that expressly relate to SSR-related program objectives. So unless there's like a community-approved definition of what a measure of success for these are, which would be really, really hard and nuanced, I don't think there's anything to talk about. I think it's just not done.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. And I'm pretty sure [inaudible] and they talked about the mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse. In the new gTLDs application, you actually have to specify what you're doing over and above what your requirements are to combat abuse proactivels.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: So my guess is that's what that was about.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Makes sense.

NORM RITCHIE: And I don't know if there's been any follow-up on those, but that is a requirement.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. And honestly, I don't actually have a lot of religion on this, but just looking at it empirically, I look at that as a sort of subordinate claim to the first one. The first one is there's a measure that it's succeeded, and what you're basically saying is that new gTLDs have to specify how they're going to do a good job.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, [they set a higher bar].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That you'll then be able to measure if we had to measure, but we're not going to measure.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We can't do it.

NORM RITCHIE: So they set the higher bar for new gTLDs.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's just my interpretation, so happy to –

NORM RITCHIE: So that's [in] the application process, so for the applications to be granted, you have to specify what you're doing to combat abuse, and so all those ones that were granted, I don't know if there's been any follow-up.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Based on the incidence of –

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, you said you'd do this or improve, have you done it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: So there's a lot of unanswered questions here, but –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can I wordsmith real quick, Russ, while you're [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just one thing real quick.

NORM RITCHIE: My –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Say no measure.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right, but I was wanting to change it to "measure" instead of "measurement" because –

NORM RITCHIE: So do we need to wait of responses for all these questions, or can we just –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No. No, [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] move on?

DENISE MICHEL: No, I think [inaudible] should be on there. But [if it's] appropriate [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, we should decide specifically if we want to [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Questions were answered, information wasn't provided based on the [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: None of [inaudible]. So we pressed on.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, and because of –

RUSS HOUSLEY: How do we – we need to say something about the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate abuse.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You have to be able to measure what success for the gTLDs are first, get a measure first, and then you can go and use that, and that's how [you craft it] in such a way so you can measure that element because it seems to be important.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So no measure, including measures of the effectiveness, have been –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: If I combat abuse in my domain, I do it fantastically, does that mean that my gTLD has succeeded?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You can't tell without a measurement for what success is.

NORM RITCHIE: You'll actually have to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Maybe success is just number of registrations, and that's orthogonal. I feel like just being [inaudible] just really hard to look at that and get the first statement.

NORM RITCHIE: And this question seems to be referring to registries as opposed to registrars.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Yeah. Totally.]

NORM RITCHIE: So again, we'll respond to it because that's the way it's stated, but the real control of combating domain name abuse is with the registrars.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, but at the same time, there is Specification 11, every gTLD registry contract [inaudible] that contains obligations that relate to security.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I paused.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: The problem is now we have to [phone] the other end of the line and they're not going to like it if you hang up on them.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's right. But how come it's doing that then?

NORM RITCHIE:	Yes, but there is a DAAR system as well, which is good. I think that should be mentioned on this. I don't see any mention of it, but I think that it should be measured.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	So [inaudible] what I want to do is I want to propose something, and I'm not going to – but just as a strawman to illustrate why I think this is so difficult.

NORM RITCHIE:	I don't –

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	If we were saying one measure for success of gTLDs is a certain level of year-over-year growth in registrants that are not found to be malicious by any authoritative body where you define them over here, you could measure that. Now, your community would obviously have to – would come up with a different definition, but if that was a measure, you could then say, "Okay, you've to this year-over-year growth which is great, but it's undercut by this other measure of badness," or it's not ,and that's how we can say you're successful enough, because you reached 80% or something. That's your measure, and you can go and get a metric out of that. We don't have any of that, we can't get started.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, but there's a whole bunch of stuff going on, like registering domains, waiting a really long time before you use them in any malicious way. Right? So there's some incubation, which would make that the thing you described extremely difficult to even count.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: True.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [If I were to say the] success of my registry is based on year-over-year revenue, including subtracting litigation for example, it would not account for what you just said.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But I could still say it was a successful endeavor and people would probably say, "Yeah, until the big one comes."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, but it's not [inaudible]. Let me point out, we could sit there and we could come up with measures, multiple measures. That's just missing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But the point is there is no consensus on what's successful. It's difficult.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so does that sentence capture – yeah, go ahead, Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: One thing I see here, not sure in which context it is, but this is under the question eight. The answer to that say that the links dated in the board [inaudible] as an answer to question number eight, it says that the work has been deferred to SSR2 review team and the work cannot progress any further until the SSR review team makes some recommendation on this. So I just wanted everybody to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I think that's interesting. You can't really kick the can down the road with your own recommendation to the next team, but to be fair, we haven't gotten to the point where we've done our own investigations yet. We did the ICANN SSR mostly, but not completely. We haven't done the DNS SSR, which is where this would fall. So in a sense, if we're going

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

to get there, the conversation we just had, we might actually get to have that. We just can't do it right now. So point of fact is if someone said, "Was this recommendation implemented after SSR1," I'd say it would be impossible to do so, so no. But if we then propose something new and it is implementable, I don't [inaudible] people get a gold star. That's not really – that's above my pay grade. How much am I getting paid?

RUSS HOUSLEY: You get gold stars.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I'd like to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Only they're faux gold.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, [inaudible] it's almost impossible to measure [inaudible] very difficult task. You have to break it down by types of abuse, etc. The other thing is – but you can have things like the Public Safety Group was formed through the GAC. That's a good thing to combat abuse and work on it.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's true.

NORM RITCHIE: Some of that stuff is worth noting. So I want to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Here or somewhere else?].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Some right here in the – observing something did happen.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: Like I don't want it to sound like nothing's happened.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Type –

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: It's mine. It's my item.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're still empowered.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, yeah, you totally empowered him.

NORM RITCHIE: I'll just make a note [inaudible] GAC – is it working group?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, Public Safety Working Group, PSWG.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's the Bobby Flaim [inaudible]. Yeah, okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, yeah. And it's a credit to the GAC, actually, that created that.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, exactly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I got two of the digits. Just need one more. It's good that that happened but [it won't need] anything to do with SSR1.

NORM RITCHIE: Probably not.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So what good thing [came of that?]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can I do a lead-in since you're writing [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, DAAR [inaudible] exist, but they can't share the details of it with anyone because they don't have permission to do so.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, but it [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, it does show trends.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: OKAY.

NORM RITCHIE: But there still is what is good, what is bad. It all boils down to "This one's better than that one." Sorry, I'm just trying to stop myself. I'd like to say something to the registrars, but that's not what the recommendation's about, so I'm going to stay away from it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think all the good stuff we'll have to say [inaudible] our work.

NORM RITCHIE: I'll keep working on this as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So is there [any other] thought, or are we ready to move on?

NORM RITCHIE: I'm going to think more about it because I believe that it deserves some recognition of the work that's been done since 2012 and now, and

although it's not measurable, there are still things that have happened, and I want to look up some reports to see what the trends are as well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: There's an interesting meta point here to that, that I don't think is worth putting in here, so I'm not proposing text, but just since you brought it up, there's a lot of good work being done to help people do a lot of manual, heavy lifting to clean things up or to address abuse, and [one thing like] a measure like this thing is looking for [we give you is a verbal] way in which to actually know how to go and do a direct remediation that makes somebody's life better. In other words, it puts a little science behind all the heavy lifting that people are already doing. And generally speaking, I like the general approach of saying, "Here's some measures. If you can address the measures and change them, then you know what you're doing is good and you can automate it better."

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. There's also the abuse study done by the CCT, which is quite extensive. I was actually involved in that.

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

NORM RITCHIE: Can we [go over] that one and give them a nod?

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, yeah. Yes. Sure.

NORM RITCHIE: I won't look up the recommendation because it is a strong one. They're actually recommending penalizing abusive registrars and rewarding ones that are less abusive.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] lead in on –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I agree with that. And they actually –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Some of these measures don't exist. However, some good things have happened, including –

DENISE MICHEL: Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And by putting the "including," we don't have to be exhaustive.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, what the CCT review did in its data collection is highlight a small number of new gTLD registries that have extremely high levels of abuse, which is good.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Your lead-in is [inaudible] my lead-in is going to [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [The bad] on that was when that data was provided to ICANN Compliance, they declined to take any action on those most abusive registries.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes, because they didn't collect the data themselves.

DENISE MICHEL: Nor were they willing to.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. So there's a high – there's actually some correlation. If you've never seen that report and you're interested in abuse, it's really worth the read. It's quite well done.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's the same report that they briefed us on in Copenhagen?

DENISE MICHEL: No.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The TLD abuse?

DENISE MICHEL: They did a couple [inaudible]

NORM RITCHIE: It was Delft University.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, so you're going to go back to that.

NORM RITCHIE: [I'll let you –] I need the actual recommendation from the CCT report.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Now I've got homework. More.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, 12. Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Sorry, I had minor questions about 11, the text in 11 that I've put in the text chat room.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry, we're all staring at the Google doc. I apologize, KC.

JENNIFER BRYCE: KC, I don't know, are you still in the Adobe Connect? [inaudible] provide some answers. I can read out what you said if you would like.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Should I read KC's comment? Is everyone reading it?

NORM RITCHIE: Sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: KC, do you want to say your comment or do you want me to read it to you? [inaudible].

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: I can say it. I just wondered, I was reading through all the text after recommendation 11 wondering who actually wrote that consultant – this is recommendation 11, right? Who actually wrote that consultancy report. Hold on, that was recommendation 10. I was on recommendation 10, I guess. God, now I'm losing track of text, it's changing fast.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] report above. Is that the one?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: It's referring to the –

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: There's one text that says a consultant – that ICANN hired a consultant. Now I can't find the text, of course. I'm pretty sure [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, I think –

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Maybe this text changed and it's not here anymore.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, that wouldn't happen.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: So yeah, I'm questioning on –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [Two of] recommendation ten.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's in 11 too.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: It's in 11 also.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. [inaudible] 11. Yeah, down below.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: An independent consultant was hired to implement this recommendation.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yeah, who was that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] says that was Lyman Chapin.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Okay. And then the second thing was one of the documents linked [from] here talks about something that'll be done by the end of the year, by October, and I wonder what the status of that one was.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: In which October?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: This October now.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Well, actually, no, I take it back. That was something [inaudible]. "Working group plans to publish information on ICANN.org in May 2017 following its request for information regarding compliance matters related to vertical integration. Targeted completion is July 17." And then I never – I didn't see a follow-up after that, but there was so many documents linked to us, I might have missed it. Okay, Jennifer says they're going to check.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, we're going to check on that and get back to you, because I don't know, we don't know the answer off the top of our heads, so we've sent an e-mail to our colleagues to get a response. And I've put that in the Google doc too.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Okay. Thanks.

NORM RITCHIE: I could go on and on –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are you happy with the wording of the response that we've gotten so far though, KC?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yes, I think so. I need to go read this text now that it's changed so much, but yeah, for now I think we should move on.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I [do want to ask this group too] because the one thing I thought about mentioning is the current systems seem to be based more on self-reporting as far as [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Oh ,yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: As opposed to – and that seems unusual to me, especially areas like a registrar being hacked or something, registry being hacked, as we talked about, [inaudible]. But if you wait for – any numbers that ICANN is using are simply based on what the registry or registrar's chosen to tell them.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are you talking about 12 or 11?

NORM RITCHIE: No, 11.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Really?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I just have to say again that I think that – the subpoint, because seems to me the recommendation is trying to talk about how [inaudible] new gTLD program is successful. [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: As it relates to SSR.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right, okay. So [inaudible] my opinion.

DENISE MICHEL: SSR-related objectives.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right, so that means like are they global? Do they have EBERO working properly? Are they global? Is their footprint proper for their load? It's on and on. So I'm not minimizing what you're suggesting, Norm, I'm saying if you're going to do a metric, it's actually going to have to be multiple metrics, to be perfectly frank. There's not going to be one metric that

comes out, [zero to one,] you're good. So I mean this is a huge amount of work, especially considering there's a consensus element.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, so I was assuming this was talking about abuse [inaudible] second part. The reason I thought that, because the other part [inaudible] contractual compliance.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It is, but it's also an issue for SSR. Why is it contractual compliance? Why is it required by a contract? Because if you go down, we need to get you back up. That's resiliency. So I mean –

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, that's a good point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And stability.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And stability. So I'm not saying I know what was in their heads, but as I read it, I look at sort of the [inaudible] claim as just being like a subpoint. And maybe that's my reading is wrong or maybe it's not worded right, whatever, but –

NORM RITCHIE: That's a good point. There's two ways of dealing with that. One is to actually add in the other element, the other thing to say this is our interpretation of what this was [inaudible] only.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that there is no measure that they proposed for any of it. So that's why I thought just leave it at like, "You have no measure." And if later on they come back and say, "We measured chickens," then we say, "It doesn't ask about chickens," or, "Yeah, chickens have the SSR component, so good enough." Just –

NORM RITCHIE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you have measures for success, what does failing to succeed mean? Take it out?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's a really good question. [inaudible] because I know there are a lot of discussions about is the program a good one, what do we do now going forward, did we do it right the last time? That's a really good discussion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So it's possible there are other thoughts around what does success mean.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: So, what is our answer to this, whether this recommendation was implemented?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So right now, we're sort of starting to put our answers right up at the top of the section below the recommendation.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: At the top, okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: In the bold.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: And the answer's basically we don't have any way to measure whether it's implemented or not.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. But we're trying to say something though, right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We need a way to measure something good, but we're not going to tell you how to measure it. So, did we measure it? The answer is no.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We seem to be able to talk a lot about things we can't measure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, but we do seem to know that we need to measure things.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's a good first step in my book.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is there anything else to say about number 11?

NORM RITCHIE: I'll finish it up.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: [Well, this – okay, yeah, the whole talk about CCT,] because it seems to me most of the CCT report was about this issue, and that's like 100 pages of stuff.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's why Norm wants to reference it.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yeah, indeed, but probably more than that. Probably, we should cite the part that we think is most relevant, or just say the entire – yeah, all the recommendations, I guess.

NORM RITCHIE: Well, there are some specific recommendations in there I want to cite.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: By the way, the recommendation 10, we didn't answer the last question. Is that just because we – I don't know the protocol of when we're answering that. Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work is needed? Are we leaving that blank on purpose?

DENISE MICHEL: Oversight. Sorry, I think I have text to drop in.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] doing a lot of the work [inaudible] and whatnot would be really relevant when we start getting together parts from sub-streams or whatever [inaudible] or whatever.

NORM RITCHIE: And it just so happens my good buddy, Drew, is on – or was on the CCT team.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NORM RITCHIE: Have we moved on?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yes. Sorry, I'm done with my question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Moving to 12. Denise, would you walk us through it?

DENISE MICHEL: ICANN should work with the community to identify SSR-related best practices and support implementation of those practices [inaudible] answers to our questions that are still outstanding. [inaudible]. So, the information is sketchy [in part what faculty is going to] [inaudible] implementation of this. So some of the activities that they have posted, such as identifier system attack mitigation methodology, doesn't

actually link to best practices or agreements that ICANN has entered into, so how this proposal translates into a best practice [inaudible] documented. There's no evidence provided that staff is periodically informing the SOs and ACs of the best practices or [inaudible] them to identify additional best practices, which seems pretty fundamental to me.

Another deliverable was related to SSR [inaudible] and best practices and regional engagement strategies. Again, if you look through those strategies, there's a couple of minor mentions of SSR in there, but again, they're limited and not clear what he policy was. They reference an anti-phishing working group. Recommendation – that was [done before] SSR1 issued its recommendations. They were approved. Doesn't seem to be follow-up work on that either. So as we've seen and noted previously, Specification 11, which is the registry agreement for new gTLDs, contained many SSR obligations on the registries and the staff report [inaudible] indicates that the new registry agreement is an example of a deliverable that meets the requirement of this recommendation. However, the obligations in this registry agreement have been part of the standard registry agreement since applications opened in 2012. And between 2012 and '17, ICANN has [not] used these provisions as a baseline for assessing how effective they are in meeting the goals that are articulated in 12. I suggest that this recommendation was only partially implemented. And in terms of whether the implementation has had the intended effect and how the assessment was conducted, I'd say the implementations partially have the intended effect, but not fully. The assessment was conducted by reviewing the

briefing materials provided by [inaudible] information available on the ICANN website. Is the recommendation still relevant and is further work needed? [inaudible] the recommendation [certainly would] remain relevant today, probably more so that cybersecurity threats are becoming more [acute.] Several countries are now adopting very specific cybersecurity strategies, maintaining and improving the security, stability, resilience of the DNS as a limited but essential part in ensuring security and stability of the entire network. Further work is needed to fulfill the objectives of this recommendation and bring ICANN forward to a proactive position and working through the community to improve SSR.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Wow. [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: How about that? Just for [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hey, how are you doing?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Should I go back now?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Denise, is there any indication that the ICANN actually worked with the community through these – in the identification process, best practices? So, do we have a way to assess whether they worked together to identify these practices?

DENISE MICHEL: No, not really. I think what you have is indemnification of some reports or activities in different parts of the organization that staff has pulled together as an indication that they've been active in the best practice area. There's no evidence that there was an organized, comprehensive, directed effort to identify and propagate best practices throughout the specific ICANN community. If I understand your question correctly.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Because it says that implementation of such practices through contracts [inaudible] MoUs. So how can we include something that is not inclusive [inaudible]? And evidence that it was actually a community-driven or collaborative work between ICANN and the community to identify those majors and best practices before thy can actually be part of any contracts and MoU. See what I mean?

DENISE MICHEL: No, [inaudible] what you mean.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is what he recommendation actually said. And evidence of that the ICANN has worked with the community to identify the best practices. Because it says, "And support the implementation of such practices through contract, through MoUs, to [inaudible]." So if we need evidence that they have worked together, the second part becomes irrelevant in that case when we're going to assess it, for example. Like when you said it's partially implemented, what do we mean by that? Which part of this recommendation was actually implemented?

DENISE MICHEL: I think I was really more acknowledging that some of the work that has been done over the last five years is relevant to best practices and was carried out.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But there was no targeted effort in this regard, yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So that's what we should –

DENISE MICHEL: Do you think that should sort of –

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's what we should include in this.

DENISE MICHEL: That really, that's the only thing we should look at, that there wasn't a
                           –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: A consolidated, targeted effort, yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: A consolidated undertaking to do this though?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, which I don't see in the text that you added.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I guess my thought was to give them partial credit that there was
                           overlap with some of the other things they were doing ,that if you step
                           back and say –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: What we can say for example is that we find some relevant material
                           related to best practices –

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But there was no consolidated effort made in this regard.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Can you write down what he just said? I think that's an elegant and correct way of saying it. Yes, I agree with that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Can I just mention? So KC had a question on Recommendation 11. We got the answer from our colleagues and they said, yes, it has been done, and I posted the information and some links into the Google document under Recommendation [11,] question 21.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Sure.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: I assume the SSR2 mention above in the parentheses meant SSR1.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I was referring to – I think as Naveed has suggested that in the course of our due diligence, we – our team saw that over the last five

years, different activities occurred that could fit within SSR best practices. However, they did not have a concerted and directed effort to work with the community to identify and implement –

RUSS HOUSLEY: To create the best practices. Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And basically –

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: I see.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because first, you have to have the best practices, then you implement them through the agreements and the contracts and so on.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, first describe –

RUSS HOUSLEY: And we didn't get the first part, so you can't [inaudible].

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Got it. Sorry. Thanks for the clarification.

DENISE MICHEL: I was just trying to add a quick note and thought I would come back later and add some more fulsome text here. I just didn't want to forget Naveed's comment. Getting tired.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Jetlagged.

DENISE MICHEL: [That could be it, yeah.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought you were doing council stuff.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, the council. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We were giving you the benefit.

DENISE MICHEL: And so Naveed, then we answer the explicit questions about did the implementation have its intended effect and how the assessment conducted. I sense that – I assume that your perspective is that it didn't have the intended effect, that it was not implemented.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Because they're –

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's not implemented, right.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: We've not identified anything.

RUSS HOUSLEY: He's saying the first part is develop best practices, then implement them through contracts and agreements and so on. So if you didn't develop the best practices, how could you –

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay? You're going to make up some [inaudible] for that, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I think [we're good. I –] unless anyone has any comments on the last part, that the recommendation remains relevant and further work is needed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree with that.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we start by establishing those best practices. Right, okay.

NORM RITCHIE: If we can make it to 14, we're halfway through.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [What is the cutoff time?]

DENISE MICHEL: When did we schedule our stop time?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: 5:30 today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So 5:30 is the plan.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: But we really were going to get to all 28.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: It'd be awesome if we at least got half done. Okay. Anything else someone wants to say about 12? Alright. 13. Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. This is actually something very related to the recommendation 12 [inaudible] the recommendation asks the ICANN to encourage the SOs – and I assume ACs as well, but it says only SOs – to publish their own best practices for the members. The text only says "encourage," so it's not measurable in that perspective, because as a response, I see the implementation says that we have contacted the SOs and ACs chairs to do that. So I'm not sure if when you have contacted it once or twice or three times, that you're done with your part of [encouragement.] Or like how do we assess that? This is for others maybe to comment on. How

do we measure encouragement as mentioned in the recommendation itself? Like they say that they have contacted – but it certainly did not have the intended effect, because only one of the SOs actually published their – ccNSO, I'm assuming – best practices. No other SOs or ACs had published their best practices for SSR-related best practices for their members. So certainly, it did not have the intended effect. Certainly, it has to be done and it's still relevant, but I'm not sure how do we assess or measure this recommendation. Like it's encourage – where do we stop? Like, okay, we have encouraged enough times or –

RUSS HOUSLEY: So when you click that link that they say ccNSO did this, it takes you to a cybercrime and security resources page. I'm not sure what there on that page they think is a best practice. Looks like a collection of resources to me.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, it's a resource locator. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think ccNSO did it, is my assessment. So, I agree we don't know how to measure encouragement, but I thought we were going to be able to say they did encouragement and one of them did it. But I don't think they did it.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, well, [inaudible]. Are we talking ICANN or ICANN Org?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But this was actually part of our question when we made this question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: See question two, it says – part of it says, "Is the 2012 information on ccTLD website the most recent example of SSR-related information published by an SO?" So that means we as a review team have already accepted [inaudible] something the ccNSO did related to SSR-related activities or best practices. But you're right, we're not sure whether this is what the recommendation is intended for. [I'm not sure nothing has been done. So I'm quite sure about it.]

NORM RITCHIE: This may be one where we just say we have no way of assessing this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that's fair. Just don't say it hasn't been done. Say we have no way to see that it's been done.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] recommendation.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. And it did not certainly have the intended effect, so –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [At the end,] just leave it at that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: Like contracted parties deal with contracts.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Wait, so it's no way to measure or it was not done?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No evidence that it has been done.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yeah, okay. Got it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So just going to make that statement, we have no way to assess whether this was done or not.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: How about we have no evidence –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Evidence is crime.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: To suggest whether this was done or not.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry, didn't mean to –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm fine with that. You're empowered too.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Let's do the next one that fast.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Next one's mine. "ICANN should ensure that its SSR-related outreach activities continuously evolve to remain relevant, timely and appropriate." So I've put my answers back down [inaudible]. So I said with regard to, "Did the implementation have the intended effect, bla bla," I said no. The reported implementation of this recommendation

did not directly address how the outreach activities evolved to remain relevant. Implementation focused instead on reporting what is being done at any given time. And for "Is it still relevant today?" I said yes, the SSR communities are a nonstationary [inaudible] critical having some machinery in place that tracks communities and sets the relevance to ICANN SSR is an important ongoing activity. It does not appear [inaudible]. I just want you all to know how hard I worked on that. I even put it in the [inaudible]. I did my homework.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] paid.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I get paid in gold stars.

NORM RITCHIE: And a rose on your [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: My mom is so proud of me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, when you say the reported implementation –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're talking about the engagement interface there?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Basically, I looked at this as though there was a recommendation, and our dialog with staff and SMEs in the organization was basically, "Here's what we did to implement it." So I just looked at that, and in there it says, "Engagement interface." And I guess I didn't give enough props that it's a good engagement interface, it's very useful, helps you visualize regionality and timings, stuff like that, but it's a different problem, I thought.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So what I see in the implementation slide deck, ICANN says outreach activities have been expanded and are reviewed annually as part of the [inaudible]. So, is that what the recommendation was about? Like to review annually so that we have an evidence that this review was done and countermeasures were taken as part of the SOP.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm happy to go with what the group wants on this, so I can just tell you my perspective on that, and it's just saying that we agreed we're going to go and do something. I'm just looking for the evidence that there was sort of this outreach, that there was an involving sort of assessment of the field. And that doesn't mean there wasn't because I don't see it, I

just didn't see it. And like I said, we had a whole bunch of back-and-forths over the long time. So could we have gotten more informative [inaudible]? I'm sure, but this is what we had. So that's all. If the group feels like there's a different answer, I'm totally okay with that. I just took the lead, I don't have to –

NORM RITCHIE: I just wonder if John Crain's group had any input on this one, because the guy I know – he

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Goes all over the place all the time?

NORM RITCHIE: And he keeps up on things and he spreads the word to the regional groups as well. I know he's doing that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah. And [inaudible] also using the GSE [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: At the risk of saying something very highly in politics, I'll say that I think there is a lot of outreach that – a lot more breadth that is needed in our

outreach. I was personally staggered by how few people had any idea what a KSK roll was as it was being rolled over. In all technical walks.

NORM RITCHIE: I know.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Except for [inaudible]. Well, it's about time you learned, [my friend.] In the books.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But it's sort of like I understand that we're – I think more effort could probably be expended on finding communities that should know what ICANN –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Wasn't there – in their implementation slide deck, they mentioned that there was an engagement interface used by ICANN and it has updated information about [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] That tells you what they're doing. That tells you what's known about. Doesn't tell you – so like I said, I was trying to give credit where credit was due, but maybe I didn't so – said, "Should ensure its

SSR-related outreach activities continually evolve." That interface is nice, it doesn't have anything to do with evolution. Just like, you wanna know a region and a date, what's going on there? It'll tell you, and it's cool. But I'm open to suggestions, so I'll take a backseat so that I don't suck all the oxygen.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Eric, I think I took your ideas and plugged them into words at the top here. Does – most of them are your words. So [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: But did I screw it up when I [inaudible] stuff?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Looks good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's good?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I especially like the way you made them all bold. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're killing me, man.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] upper case.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anything to add from anyone?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Did you all want to do something with John Crain's group, make a comment or something like that?

NORM RITCHIE: At some point –

RUSS HOUSLEY: John Crain's groups is great, but – [inaudible] what you want to say?

NORM RITCHIE: Well, there was some comment that John does spend a lot of time and energy and resources staying plugged in with many [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, he's just not good at reporting it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, maybe [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: So, are we – I mean it seems like we should use the information provided by staff in their fully implemented report indicating fully implemented.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: There's no evidence that it's –

DENISE MICHEL: [For our] assessment. Or I guess we could note that [we consider] not clear this activity is occurring but was not in the implementation report.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm just going to say that there's no evidence that it is a continuous and ever-evolving process. They don't have any such thing.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. [I agree.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It should involve like a CQI kind of thing, which is – you'd call it continuous quality improvement .so they need to have measures that they assess what was done previously, whether it was done right way, what are the new demands from the community, where's the target and all that? Then they do the next step. So no evidence of any such thing is available.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I like your comment, especially the use of the word like if [inaudible] one extra thing in there, I would say the development and publication of measures to assess the evolution of this would be helpful. [Something like that.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I've got to do it visible in front of the machinery. Because it was only going on in John's head, no one cares, right? [inaudible] the tracks, the SSR communities and assesses their relevance. Where di you want to add the –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's probably fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Those were your words, I didn't change those.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Whoever wrote those words really [inaudible]. I can tell from reading.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, no, where did you want to add the reporting or measuring part?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Some visible machinery measures –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, okay. How about [and?]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Why is it [inaudible]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I'm empowered too.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Number 14.

NORM RITCHIE: Finally.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, sorry, I thought you meant we had more to do on [inaudible]. Like, no, that's all [inaudible]. Yes, we're halfway. Hey.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Can we stop tape?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Are we stopping recording? [inaudible].

	Alright, thanks. We're [back on record.] Do you want me to summarize, or –
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Yeah, you can go summarize this.
JENNIFER BRYCE:	Okay, thanks. So just to summarize a quick discussion that we had off the record there. Scott is going to send some questions regarding recommendation 15 following up on [inaudible] before the review team can assess the recommendation. So we're moving on, I believe, to recommendation 16.
DENISE MICHEL:	I'm writing some additional notes [inaudible] preparation later. Okay.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. 16, Eric.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	I have to go again?
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Yeah.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	I do all the work here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But you have all these awesome answers.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I did my homework on this one too, but it was mostly by doing my homework on the last one because they're related. So, "ICANN should continue its outreach efforts to expand community participation and input into SSR framework development process. ICANN should also establish a process for obtaining more systematic input, other ecosystem [inaudible]."

So I said –as far as, "Was it implemented?" I said in part. Seems the ongoing involvement in related communities has accomplished the participation objective but it's not fair how the information is "systematically" incorporated. Is it still relevant? I said, "Yes, very much. [inaudible] stationary, needs to be kept up with and interacted with."

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Do you summarize that the process was [inaudible] by ICANN to get the output from the external [inaudible]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I didn't see –

RUSS HOUSLEY: The second part of the recommendation.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, input into the SSR framework [inaudible]? No, you're right, I flubbed that one. You're right. I didn't see where that was there, but I guess I kind of read right past that. So, I don't know, open to the group's perspective on that. Can't quite [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: From what?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So Naveed pointed out that I didn't address in the first sentence – the last part of it is outreach is important and we love it, and it says input into the SSR framework development process.

DENISE MICHEL: More systemic input from other ecosystems [inaudible]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, that second sentence I did think I addressed that. I didn't see evidence of a systemic relationship.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. The notes I have for myself – and this is that – I mean it seems to me that 16 is clearly about expanding community participation, engagement into SSR [inaudible] development process, and it specifically asks for a more systemic process for getting input from the

ecosystem participants. And this makes that final deliverable that they document [seems just out of place] because the implementation report says that that would, quote, support a variety of capability building initiatives by the [security team.] It's not evident how capability building initiatives would affect a greater engagement in the actual development of, say, the SSR frameworks or annual reports. And it's also not obvious from the public record what those actual capability building missions, where or when they were conducted or how that relates back to the actual recommendation. I'll drop that in so you guys can read that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: We don't have any evidence of any such established process or any effort towards that.

DENISE MICHEL: I did not [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: You know, once again, this gets back to formality and [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: And I did not refer –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I didn't refer to the SSR1 report [but to this specify the –] when they say other participants of ecosystem, what they mean actually, like which participants ecosystem, or is it something too obvious?

DENISE MICHEL: I have to go back and look at it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If I gathered what I heard from the two thoughts together, I think it turns into there's ongoing involvement [inaudible] related – should that be SSR communities? That tying back to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is tying back to my view that there is a wealth of people who could participate and help in things like SSR that are specifically not within the narrow set of communities that I see over and over again. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So there's ongoing involvement by ICANN in related communities, right? Is what you're saying.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, no.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Okay.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And this is my perspective, so I absolutely insist that people override me if you disagree. But when I read a recommendation that says, "ICANN should continue its outreach efforts," I consider the outreach effort to be not just talking to those that you know, it's talking to those that you don't necessarily know. So I would necessarily think some reasonable amount of growing of communities that are spoken to is important, especially something like SSR [where it's] multimodal. So like talking to – "We've never been to this group before, so we went, we talked with them. We brought these to her people in." The growth, I think, is what's really important here. And what worries me a lot is like the responses we got are like, "Went to CaribNOG" and went to all these other NOGs, and I think those are important and I don't have any problem with going to CaribNOG because it's a [less] beaten path, but it's a little bit of like kind of part of the echo chamber still. And it'd be nice to see some different places [inaudible] and I think [we already talked] about how John spends a huge amount of energy going places all the time, so they may very well be a lot of places there, and some of them may not want it mentioned, or some who may. But it needs to be clear that the outreach is growing, or at least not stationary. Went to there this time, went somewhere else [some other time.] I mean, even if you just went

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

to university sometimes, that would be really useful. So I don't know if that makes it clear, Russ.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] document [inaudible] keep mentioning the ecosystem to be composed of ISOC and TLDs and local Internet [companies.] That's what they refer to. [inaudible] input they assume to be from this community. [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't – do you agree?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's not the ecosystem communities, actually. That's only a subset of [them.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, that – I moved it around, Eric, to try and make [inaudible] see if I achieved that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Can I ask one question for clarification?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Is this SSR framework a community-driven process?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. Well, the community –

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] I think driven.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Community-driven, or –

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] to some extent, they involve the community, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's community – correct.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Staff-driven community [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] if it is like what you said, Russ, there's less margin of getting the participation and input from the community [inaudible] the recommendation phase. If you see the first part of this recommendation, "To expand community participation and input into the SSR framework." So how do we expand it this way?

RUSS HOUSLEY: What?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It is just made and then shared with the community, or reviewed by the community. Like are we expanding into that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. So, if that input is only going [inaudible] from the expanded community participation, and he's putting it into the framework, that's not [possible.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, that's –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, and I guess that's a really – it makes me want to say, yeah, I think that's a good point, and I would add to it I think what really augments

all of the SSR stuff is people from other communities that we haven't talked to coming here and talking to us. Not as speakers, just like getting involved because, their perspective is what you can't quantify until it shows up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. That's right.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And that's missing. And so even if one person is running around and they're being diligent about bringing stuff back, if you're not bringing the people back, if they're not becoming part of our community, that's the loss, and that's what I was really – I think, whether I realized it or not, that's what I think really matters here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. What we find in the IETF context is when we established liaison relationships with the groups, they don't really work. Throwing messages at each other doesn't help. What works is having a couple people going to both meetings and carrying context and, "This is what's going on. That could really help us." Or, "This is what's going on, that's going to screw us." Right? That's what –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right. "Oh, you guys are wrestling with this problem? Well, these are the things we do."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] wouldn't have said that if I had to sit in here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, exactly. Yeah, one-time visit doesn't create that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, no. But the one-time visit gets you started, so –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so Naveed, is there any words we need to add to what's here based on what you just said? Because I agree with what you said, but I'm not sure how to capture it in these words.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I [believe] that participation is not achieved through outreach, actually. Outreach is the first step to get [somebody participated in there.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you want to write "and participation."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, I mean that's a really good point right there. It's sort of – that's in the recommendation. It's just like, "You should do outreach because that'll give you expanded participation."

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So like –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Because participation is the result of outreach, you know? But they can't be [inaudible]. Just because you are doing outreach does not mean that you're successful and people are part [of your team.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: [I get that.]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: And I see no way of people participating into the SSR framework as of now. It's not what's happening.

NORM RITCHIE: The goal needs to be participation, not just reaching [inaudible] awareness.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: The outreach. More outreach is being done without –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So if I want to give the recommendation full credit, it might be proposing we want to expand participation, we'd propose you start by trying outreach, but that's the goal of the outreach, is to expand participation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, is the goal outreach or is the goal expanded participation?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think it said to expand participation, so that's the goal.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So what we then should observed, there's no evidence that existing outreach efforts have resulted in expanded participation.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is that the point?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, the recommendation's not – it's too prescriptive. Should not have said "Do outreach," it should have just said, "Expand participation."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, but that's not what they wrote.

NORM RITCHIE: I know. I know.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: [Playing with your cards.]

NEGAR FARZINIA: As you're thinking about how you will be providing any recommendations as a result of this or any other session, might want to consider the measurability of the new recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, yes.

NEGAR FARZINIA: For example, expanding outreach. How would the next review team be able to measure that? Are we counting people [inaudible]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, yeah, [inaudible] paper on here that most of the recommendations are going to get bludgeoned until they're at least a little bit [inaudible] measurable. Totally.

NEGAR FARZINIA: Yeah. So that was just a [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Because – and I think it's outright outreach or outright increase in participation could be a bad thing for an organization. I was thinking of this while we were talking, it's like if we give 100% churn into the organization by bringing in new blood all the time, it could fracture the organization. So it's not like bigger is always better.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Exactly.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But you probably want to define what you want and aim at it, and I think that's what you do.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, the participation does not even mean that you are expanding the community, but because there are many community members or whatever we called them who are not participating who are there, who are not participating, so actually, the effort needs to be made in that direction, you know. And that is, again, part of the SSR, how we actually construct the SSR framework.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: If the SSR framework is not inclusive and not including those community at the right time and right place, then we are not expanding in that direction.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, in the IETF, we call those tourists, people that just come to the meeting, sit there, say nothing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Typing on their laptop, you don't know if they're taking notes for their company or reading their e-mail, but –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But they're [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: They never speak. They're not participating.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And then one day, some of them do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. That's right. Some of them do, because –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [You certainly don't kick them out, so it's the cost of doing business.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's a lot of cultures where you learn how things work before you speak, and that's okay. So you don't throw them out of a thing, just stop coming and you never know why.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible] systematic processes [inaudible]. And I don't see the systematic process being there.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great point. Totally agree.

DENISE MICHEL: Good point for sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. We are one minute from our end time, but it's [Scott on 17] and his last one only took a minute. Maybe we can do this one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: We can let Scott be here for more time, because he's –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible] agenda, because I know [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Yes, we're going to have to read this.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, so I think on Wednesday, we really need to finish these.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Let's not lose the momentum we've gotten. But I do want to have that workplan discussion. So, I'd like your thoughts on [inaudible]. Second, because [inaudible], talking about methodology, again, that seems to be a –

DENISE MICHEL: So I thought [inaudible] I thought where we left things this morning is that we wanted to have some time to dig into some of the other workstreams, at least to the point where we can identify at least from a

high-level [inaudible] and make sure that that was adequately reflected in the workplan before we wrapped it up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's correct.

DENISE MICHEL: Which seems to be that [inaudible] finished the initial the SSR1 writing, jump into the other Work Stream kind of at a high level to take the temperature of the room and put it a direction we should go, reflect any changes in the workplan and then approve the [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, that is correct. That was the point. So that digging in, I'm afraid, would take [the day] as opposed to the half day that we have.

DENISE MICHEL: That we have.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is my fear.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: My proposal is that we were very productive face-to-face-ing SSR1 stuff, but this other stuff, throughout all of our review items, we want to get to the stuff [where] we're going to do [inaudible] and that has to be face-to-face. It has to be.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So I propose that everyone who has an outstanding recommendation from now to the end of the full list, go do your homework between now and Wednesday and let's [timebomb] this. Let's do it between the beginning, everyone here, if you're on time for the first break, let's get through as many of those SSR1s as we can, and after that, we have to take this to the phone calls. We have to take [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [There are two hours left,] so I think it can be done in two hours.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, and I have no phone, [inaudible] add them to Google Doc by tomorrow, so I think we'll have things to look at online as well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [What do you think of that?]

DENISE MICHEL: Potential.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's a real nail-driving [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: It is.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But I think we've got to do it.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] get to testing on the Google doc, reading it.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Guys, I'm unlikely to be up in the middle of the night Wednesday. I may come in around the same time that I came in here, which was afternoon for you guys. I have 23 and 24 on my plate, so I'm putting a bunch of notes in the Google doc, and you can either just go without me based on the notes, or wait until the afternoon and do things out of order. Because I'm assuming you'll get to 23 before the afternoon.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. And this is like – if we ever have to circle back, I think we can. This is just to do like a sort of first pass.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So this'll be our low pass filter, and then we'll go back later if there's any reason to. [But] I think that looks great.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you all. We really need to get these done, so please do your homework so there can be an extremely productive Wednesday morning.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just tell people [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: And knock these out five, ten minutes per.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And then we can focus on the discussion that's needed to finish the [workload.]

DENISE MICHEL: [And the workday.] [inaudible].

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you all, and I'm going to turn it over to staff to tell us about dinner.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. So, I think we can [inaudible] stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]