

---

Alejandro Pisanty: Good morning. This is Alejandro Pisanty. This is the session for public interaction with the community by the Stability, Security & Resiliency Review Team of ICANN. We are going to start with a very quick introduction of people in the room since it's rather intimate here, and we'll find out as we start with the remote participation as well. So if we can have a very, very quick round of introductions starting on the far side of the table, far from me?

David Cake: David Cake, Alternate Frontiers SSR Team.

Hartmut Glaser: Hartmut from Brazil, ASO representative.

Ondrej Filip: Thank you. Ondrej Filip, .cz domain, SSR Team.

Xiaodong Lee: Xiadong Lee, .cn.

Alice Jansen: Alice Jansen, ICANN staff.

Olof Nordling: Olof Nordling, ICANN staff.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

Martin Hannigan: Martin Hannigan, SSR Team.

Jeff Brueggeman: Jeff Brueggeman, SSR Team.

Patrick Jones: Patrick Jones, ICANN Staff.

Rennie Fritchie: Rennie Fritchie, Chair of Nominet.

Simon McCalla: Simon McCalla, SSRT.

Alejandro Pisanty: For the other attendees who are not at this table, please, if you want to introduce yourselves. If you want to make your presence not known that's fine for us.

[background conversation]

Wilfried Woeber: Wilfried Woeber, on the RT4 on the WHOIS Policy Review Team, and just interested in your way of working.

Jim Prendergast: Jim Prendergast, Galway Strategy Group.

Jonathan Zuck: Jonathan Zuck, The Association for Competitive Technology.

Female: (inaudible), NCUC.

Alejandro Pisanty: Do we know, Alice, if there's people participating remotely? It's not that Alice's voice has changed; it's that Olof is going to take the mic.

Olof Nordling: We've got one remote participant – [Rosella Martiolo], excuse me.

Alejandro Pisanty: Thank you very much. So briefly what we plan to do in this meeting is to make a quick presentation of the status of the work of the SSRT to date. I will use a presentation that was crafted at the beginning of the week and update verbally on it. It's in many ways outdated because of the fast pace of the meetings here. So Alice, if you would be so kind...

As most of you will know, the SSR RT is a review team for the way that ICANN is fulfilling the function it has under the

---

Affirmation of Commitments to preserve and enhance the stability, security and resiliency of the global DNS. It was formed about a year ago. We first met personally in the meeting in Cartagena in December. We have had the meetings that are on the slide – San Francisco, Singapore and a drafting team, not a full team were meeting in Washington, D.C. a few months ago. That was July, I think.

In these meetings we have been advancing our work. We have been advancing a lot of our work between the meetings in gathering documents from ICANN and other sources, and we are doing analysis, interviews with people and a number of other tasks as I'll describe in more detail as we get there.

The first organization of the team was basically with the Chair and Vice-Chair and the flat membership. We then reorganized without the Vice-Chair and three functional teams following issues at three levels, which were the general rules – that would be governance; the implementation of those rules; and planning for contingency response for the three stability, security and resiliency aspects.

We are now organized in a different way, even more streamlined after that first effort of collecting information and the initial in-depth analysis was done. We have been working with core, draft research, and drafting teams formed by Simon McCalla, Jeff Brueggeman, Martin Hannigan and with significant contributions from David Cake, Anders Rafting and Xiaodong Lee. And now with that structure we have arrived at this meeting with a large collection of documents, some of them very recently obtained, and

---

in-depth analyses for a large part of the work. A lot is still ahead of us but we let's say, we have these milestones. Next slide.

What we have in hand is documents and analysis of those and input from interviews about the governance of the SSR function within ICANN and across ICANN, not only for the SSR RT but also how it goes across other parts of ICANN. We have divided the work, or we have divided the space and scope of the work as we believe the scope is to define those for ICANN in three different layers or circles or spheres.

The innermost one is the areas that ICANN controls directly. These areas under direct ICANN control are basically people on payroll – people who are working for ICANN under a contractual agreement as individuals, and they are the people who run the L-server, who run the security function. They're the Security Team, etc.; of course the Board which is not under contract but is a [remediance] part of ICANN's structure; and very few other parts.

Then the second circle is the spaces where ICANN has direct influence, though not command, and that would be supporting organizations, registries, registrars, root server operators, ccTLD managers which are included as registries and again a number of other parties.

And the third sphere would be one where ICANN has no actual control, no formal ways to exert and measure the results of its influence; so it's basically a very, very broad space where most of the things that happen to affect SSR – stability, security and

---

resiliency – have to be managed on a contingency basis. And of course I mean ICANN can try to shape that space collaboratively with other parties within the ICANN community by outreach education, induction, evangelizing and so forth.

There's the question of whether ICANN's scope and remit for SSR will define whether there is any creep and any extension, any desirable or against the rules extension of that scope and work; and whether the remit is clear for ICANN – let's say that the bylaws and the community make that remit clear for ICANN, and that ICANN sticks closely to that remit without overextending.

We looked and will continue to look at how the SSR tasks are documented, first with the SSR Team of ICANN and of course further out across the organization in order to see whether one can follow the way the function and the mission are being accomplished. We're forced to look a bit into managerial things, a lot into managerial things but they have to do inevitably with the way ICANN actually complies with the function of these. People do things; these people are on a payroll or on a contractual agreement, or on a structural agreement even though they're doing so on a voluntary basis and we have to follow how their work is shaped by the mission statement, the strategic plan, the operational plan and the security plan.

So that's been ongoing. The convergence of plans and the SSR Framework which is an even broader document than the SSR Plan of ICANN, how does that get converted into specific tasks; and then also whether the tasks are resourced properly, whether there's

---

balance and a good understanding of how the money is actually spent in these tests – again, with a very, very hard boundary of not going into micromanagement, not expecting management at the micro level which would be counterproductive.

We have learned about project management within the SSR Team. We have been working with IANA which is a key factor itself in looking at key factors for its evolution and risk management, including the notices of inquiry and open processes of the US government to assign or reassign the IANA function. We have a report framework in operation now; we're building up on it. Between now and 5:00 PM today we will have a much richer document and a plan to finish it up in a relatively brief time with known inputs and known pending information or analysis.

We have gone through a long, long cycle – we started discussing this in our first meeting – about the access to information that should not necessarily be publicly disclosed. When one does a security audit, one surely touches on materials, knowledge, procedures that are sensitive; whose publication or public knowledge would diminish the ability of the organization to react. Even though we're all in principle against security by obscurity, this is one of ours – the mantra in the security community. We know there's still a lot of information that's better kept away from prying eyes.

For our audit, which is for our review: our review is not exactly, in fact it's not in any way a technical or managerial security review. We are not the entity that's going to do a 27001 certification or

---

stuff like that, but we have to look at how this function has been managed. We first asked for documentation coming from certifications such as I've mentioned – [ISO 27001] or [ITIL Cobit] and several others which although they are not for SSR contribute by documenting the IT management, they contribute to document the function of preserving stability, etc.

So this discussion has taken a long time because there's been a lot of steps in it and finding out the ways to access information that can give a solid foundation to the recommendations we will make and the analysis behind them without getting ourselves into a bad place which is called ICANN – and I know what I cannot tell. I've been given this secret, I can't tell you these guys are holding the secret very well but I cannot tell you the secret. I cannot tell you where they keep it and certainly I am not going to give you the combination to the safe where they have it.

So we are trying to keep the review very much accountable and transparent. Rock-solid is an aspiration; I will not promise rock-solid although I'm sure the team is able to provide it. This is not about the team – it's just myself. But we want to have it as unassailable as possible, as compelling and convincing as possible because in the end it will be recommending ICANN to do some things but ICANN will have to go out to the community and evoke community support or participation to do them.

So they have to be compelling for everybody. People may think there's a better way; people may not want the task that comes onto them or the task that come onto ICANN, but it still has to be a

---

compelling case and we have to be able to argue it again and again; or ICANN will have to be able to argue it once the team is dissolved. And further, this is more of the [fulcrum] of the thing: several members of our team work in companies or other organizations and we've talked to their lawyers and the lawyers in their corporation have told them they should not sign these agreements without their intervention. Some of them will actually require mutual agreements between the company and ICANN, and we think by the time those are done our work will be done with open information.

And what we're doing about the information that could be confidential is to triangulate around it to build that compelling case. That's basically the theme right now. I'm mentioning this extensively because it's a significant point of our work and because it's actually meaningful for many other reviews and audits of ICANN that have to be made public.

ICANN staff, after we got to a mutual understanding of how to go about this, has been extremely helpful. I want to mention again in this audience the efforts of Patrick Jones, Jeff Moss, Denise Michele in providing this documentation; and of course the administrative support of Alice Jansen and Olof Nordling and many others for our work.

But coming back to the part with Patrick, Dennis and Jeff – let's say we went for an all-or-nothing approach: "You have to sign an NDA to see any of this" to "Okay, there's a lot you can see without the NDA." A lot of this has meant additional work for them either

---

in redacting documents that existed and stripping away the confidential parts, and keeping a large size very useful, publicly-discloseable part; or actually producing those documents. And in both cases we're very thankful for the effort. I think it's a very productive way to go forward.

I think that the review by its own process has already produced significant results like these – identifying lots of documents that give transparency to both sides' work, the Review Team's and ICANN's, for the future. And we'll also make a compelling case for keeping confidential the confidential parts. That's one of the added benefits of transparency – people should see that they can work a lot with the part that's being disclosed publicly, and they can be satisfied that only for special reasons, special people will have to look at the special parts. Next slide, thank you.

We perceive that our work has influenced the way that ICANN does a few of these things, at least the way it publishes them, like moving from a plan to a framework; moving from an avowed goal of 100% DNS availability which is very vague and in ways already achieved, in ways never achievable depending on what metric you look at. So we feel that our work is going along changes in the management of the SSR function.

There's some more things there. We have a lot of interviews of a very different nature than the audit-type interview with people who are looking far away into the future of the DNS, into trends, services who may want to use the DNS or evolutions that may threaten it by going into the Health of the DNS Workshop last

---

week in Rome – gleaning information and interviewing people there. And we will leave the field when our group finishes its work also with a good library of documentation and findings that can be useful for the future – it will help establish a baseline for studies further in time. Can I ask you for the next slide, please?

The plan for this week is that we have been having conversations like this, like the one we hope starts now. We are concerned about issues of the community’s perception of ICANN’s contribution – first tasks and then achievement of the contribution; scope and remit for SSR – whether tasks, ICANN’s perception of the tasks and the community’s perception are reasonably aligned, evolving along similar ways.

There was a big, big question at the start of our work. The Board took away from the SSAC, from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, one function which had been around but never really demanded or finished, which was that the SSAC was required to elaborate, to create a framework for stability, security and resiliency in ICANN for risk management. That task was removed from SSAC. The Board decided that they would form a Board structure plus a community group, which is called the DSSA.

We have been following the work of the DSSA and coordinating with them. We just had a coordination meeting with both teams in full. The result of all this work is that we know what they are doing – they are making good progress. They will make it public once they are in agreement procedurally to sign off on it as a

group. We see it as once we're at a large square we are filling, the square is the DSSA, the community part of the risk framework development is being done. For our purposes, that may be enough. We may not need to judge whether it's going well, also because the results will be done later and may be available after our timeframe. And also because of discussions this week, we may be wanting to add factors to that that will maybe not be solved by the DSSA, like a cost/benefit analysis and not only the description and prioritization of the risks.

We'll do our organizing of course in the coming hours of today, and you should be informed that both the GAC and the ASO have postponed the meetings we have requested and agreed upon. The GAC have a number of other subjects particularly for the liaison, the member at the top of this group for the GAC, and they have offered to recover that time now. It's a bit touchy as many of you know because the GAC has to be very official with the inputs it receives before it starts a response and they have to go through procedures to be sure that they always give out a response that is equally official – even in draft form it has to be signed off on much more than ours.

So we are trying to shorten the cycle because otherwise this will take us you know, nothing from the GAC until March in Costa Rica and then start the cycle; and we wish to be much further down the road by then. And I think that's the last one, Alice, or do we have one more? Yep.

---

Thank you. Community time. What we're here for is not to present this but to present this in order to spark a conversation.

Jonathan Zuck:

Hi. Again for the record my name is Jonathan Zuck, The Association for Competitive Technology. I don't know if it falls squarely within the purview of this team, but I think an area of increasing exposure and risk for ICANN's stability, especially under the New gTLD Program, is its compliance efforts. I think that increasingly they're being overwhelmed by the number of requests which suggests a systemic problem with respect to compliance; and I think that their IT systems are nonexistent. They manage their incident database with a folder in Outlook, apparently, and so they just spent the last three months putting together a WHOIS analysis that should have taken five minutes to do.

If that's happening with 18 TLDs then in the context of 500 of them I think we have a really, really serious point of failure on our hands inside of ICANN if it isn't already. And the answer – there's been a lot of discussion via the budget process about whether or not they've gotten enough support and that hasn't been the case in the past. Maguy has assured us that she has the support of upper management now but my feeling on the matter is that we're out of time, and the visibility of this and the stakes of this are high enough that we really need to put it at the top of a lot of lists.

Alejandro Pisanty:

As you saw, Compliance was among the outstanding issues for further work. We have already attended, I personally attended some of the sessions on Compliance during this meeting. I have had a couple of substantive conversations with the new Head of Compliance, with Maguy. We hear and we'll make this more formal, that the whole Compliance effort is being stepped up. We heard a lot of input being given to the Compliance Team that seems likely to be taken up and we certainly have to analyze it in particular. As I said, it's not completely clear how that overlaps with our remit but there is a part of it that undoubtedly does.

This is my personal view: it is very likely that at least one recommendation from our team will be in favor of stepping up Compliance efforts, contract compliance efforts in all senses. Contract compliance – I mean this has to be very specific, which I mean ICANN cannot be a compliance vigilant for everything that happens in the world or on the internet. But it sure has a mandate to enforce compliance with its contracts, with the contracts signed with ICANN. And we'll certainly, I mean we'll most likely be supporting or recommending a step up with those efforts.

Jonathan Zuck:

Sorry. I guess my concern is that I'm hearing the same things and I'm not sure this is a linear problem at this point, that stepping up efforts is what's called for given the timeframes that we're facing. They literally don't have any systems in place to manage the

incidents that they have now – they’ve overwhelmed by thousands of these a month. And so again, I think that the entire confidence in the TLD system is at some level a function of how they enforce their contracts. And so as some recommendations come out it probably has to be some very specific – and I know you were talking about avoiding micromanagement, and no one would like to avoid that more than me – but some very specific parameters such as they need to come up with timelines for how they’re going to handle the new influx of TLDs, what kinds of systems they’re going to put in place and by when.

They have apparently 15 people that are reserved for in the budget and they’ve only got plans to hire 11 of them. There’s just not enough information even inside that office, I think, to do the job that they set out to do. So again, I don’t know what the overlap is specifically with this Review Team and I know that that’s going to be a struggle, but there’s so many eyes on this New gTLD Program that this is just a tremendous point of failure.

Alejandro Pisanty:

I’m thinking very carefully on what you said, Jon, and we’ll discuss it in detail and see – again, make sure that we don’t go into micromanagement and make sure that we keep any recommendation within the scope of the SSR review. But there’s definitely space for it, absolutely.

---

Jonathan Zuck:                   Somebody needs to go into micromanagement. It doesn't have to come from here but somebody has to do that.

Alejandro Pisanty:           As anyone who has managed anything knows, stay away from micromanagement. It's nice in theory and it has the same relationship with practice as theory and practice, which is in theory they are the same but in practice, not. So you have to do it but not us. We have to be as you said specific in the recommendations and in the demands, but specific for me does not mean necessarily that level of detail. It's a stark statement, a metric and a deadline.

Jonathan Zuck:                Agreed. They need to set their own objectives so that they can be held accountable to those. It's not about setting the objectives, I think.

Alejandro Pisanty:           Yes, and further I mean without again trying to go into much detail, and without preempting the results so there's no bias in this sense, but we also know that compliance is an extremely complex issue. The same people who will want to sack a registrar the same day are the people who the next day are going to demand due process, fairness, time enough for people to respond to. There's those complexities – you know them well, you've been there.

You may want to impose requirements that help the Compliance effort – things I've heard, this is conversation, let's say an informal

statement of things I've heard. People want, for example, to see established patterns so that you can step up the Compliance effort by saying that someone has not been something for a couple of years. That sounds very nice. We all want long time series, bunches of data and then you run into data retention policies and laws. So we can't be too specific in this sense except for asking these things to be developed in the right way, to a right measure.

But as I said, I'm not taking any final position on this. Simon McCalla, please?

Simon McCalla:

I think we certainly bear those comments very much in mind. I think one of the things that we've tried to do in our approach is we've had a lot of opinion and we've heard a lot of people saying that as a review team, people come to you and say "Oh, I'm really concerned about this, I'm really worried about this and I think they're really valid and important." I think our approach is very much to take a careful and considerate evidence-based approach in everything we do.

So where somebody suggested that there may not be enough reporting and there may not be so forth, we've been working with the ICANN staff who have been to a man and woman fantastic in re-sharing and being very open and honest, and trying to look for those processes and say "Okay, how can we help improve that?" And because there was a danger with these review teams that you can get into worrying about all the little crises that people believe

---

are coming up, and I think that's not... It's our role to try to be steady and careful and considerate of how we go there but I take that onboard definitely.

That's something that we've already seen an issue in the level of staffing required for Compliance and that's one of our recommendations, to make sure ICANN reviews that properly. So but thank you, we take it onboard.

Jonathan Zuck: Maybe it's just the geek in me freaking out, but they're managing their incident database in Outlook.

Simon McCalla: Which in itself doesn't have to necessarily be a problem. If it's managed well and it's handled – and I agree with you, I'm a geek too. And I completely appreciate-

Alejandro Pisanty: I'm a "non-Outlook" person if you want.

Jonathan Zuck: It in and of itself represents a problem without question.

Simon McCalla: But I don't think it's the job of a review team to recommend a specific technology for ICANN to manage. Now, if they're managing that process well through Outlook then great and all

---

power to them – I think that’s the important thing, and that’s why I say about taking a careful and considerate approach. If as a result of using a tool like Outlook incidents are being dropped and not handled then you’re right – absolutely there’s an issue. So I think for us it’s about making sure we take a very measured and evidence-based approach, that’s all.

Male: And of course we have to not just be thinking about managing it well now but whether ICANN and staff are prepared for it to scale into the future with the expected expansion.

Jonathan Zuck: Right, and given that they’re not managing it well now they’re not prepared to scale. That’s the bottom line. Sorry, I didn’t mean to monopolize the time.

Alejandro Pisanty: No, Jonathan, would you be willing to provide that comment in writing as well?

Jonathan Zuck: I’m happy to do that and I’m working... I spent all day with the team yesterday so I’m happy to work on that, but for an evidence-based approach you’re going to need evidence from them and they don’t have any to give you. I mean that’s part of the problem. It’s

---

not an unwillingness to report – there’s no malice of intent here. It’s literally they don’t have the data.

Alejandro Pisanty: Thanks.

Jim Prendergast: Jim Prendergast, Galway Strategy Group. I’m pleased to have fellow members of the community participating unlike in Singapore where I think I was the community.

Alejandro Pisanty: We are one hour later than then.

Jim Prendergast: Exactly. I don’t think you covered it but as far as the process from here going forward, I know there’s still some things to be wrapped up but getting to a final report, do you have a sense on when we might see something like that? And do you plan to issue sort of that interim final report, sort of like the ATRT? I don’t want to compare you to the ATRT but it seemed like they floated their near-final report for comment and feedback and then went final.

Alejandro Pisanty: That’s the plan.

---

Jim Prendergast: And the timing?

Alejandro Pisanty: Well as I said, we have a few uncertainties about the significant inputs from particularly the GAC. Other than that we intend to have a draft that we can, let's say a complete draft that we cannot discuss internally and polish what's left of this year – that means November because December is a hard time to get work done.

We are trying to avoid the big bump of boreal winter and austral summer but it will be before Costa Rica for sure. Before the ICANN meeting in Costa Rica we expect to have something out, maybe not complete but the parts that are there will be for consultation.

Jim Prendergast: And then just to pick up on something you just said, can you do into a little more detail about the concerns of the GAC and the inputs you're getting? Is it lack of inputs or...

Alejandro Pisanty: It's just a timing issue. It's mostly a timing issue. Again, we are triangulating around what we don't have to still start penning it down. What we'll do and what we're mostly likely to do is to send the GAC a version of the report that's already consensus if not final and that's for their reactions, instead of sending them questions on whatever issues we find that are still outstanding

---

because we didn't get their input before the summer. So we'll do it this other way – ask by statement instead of ask by question.

Sorry, the attitude is of total cooperation – I don't want to imply any other thing except the cycles.

Jim Prendergast: It's a bandwidth issue I guess.

Alejandro Pisanty: Cycles. Olof Nordling, please.

Olof Nordling: Yes, Olof Nordling here but just to relay comments from a remote participant, in this case [Rosella Matiolo] asks “Since you have divided work in three teams are you going to deliver an output from each team? The SSR review fieldwork planning is pretty detailed – will it be updated after the Dakar meeting?”

Alejandro Pisanty: The first division, we did it in three teams for governance, implementation and contingency – it has now been obsoleted. It was obsoleted since the middle of the year when we decided to go into a drafting core, a research and drafting team and participation available for other members in different timing. It's still, I mean the work is still informed by this but we're not organizing the work along the lines of the three teams anymore. And yes, we will have a very likely total reorganization at the end of today.

---

By the way, this meeting we are having right now from 9:00 to 10:00 Senegal time is a meeting meant to obtain input from the community. The rest of the day we will be meeting in a different room, that will be room B56... No, C1 – sorry, B56 is the only room I can find with some predictability.

Jonathan Zuck: No, you found the hardest room to find – we’re sitting in it.

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes, I think there’s some breadcrumbs of mine along the way to B56 – not out of there by the way. So we’ll be meeting in C1.

The meeting we have is a non-participatory but open meeting, so if anyone wants to see how we [tear] ourselves to find the ways to do our work you’re welcome.

Jonathan Zuck: Just one final comment for myself – thank you. I know the work from these review teams takes place at odd hours in the night, a lot of work on top of your day job and also ICANN staff supporting you. I hearten to hear that they’ve been very cooperative and forthcoming and I did know there was an NDA issue that everybody worked through, so that’s great to hear, thanks.

Alejandro Pisanty: Thank you. Let me add to your comment that we, let’s go back to the very beginning. We take this work very seriously for many

reasons: first, because the members of this team – and I’ll speak in third person, not trying to glorify myself on the shoulders of others – the members of this team are superb. They are well-known, experienced professionals with a good name who have worked very hard and they are working very hard for the team, providing extremely high quality analysis; as you said, working at the weirdest hours, putting in amazing amounts of work on top of well-known jobs, jobs that are very well known to be hard.

There’s travel requirements for some of them, being on top of operations and contingencies for others or both things for many; and their continued evolutions as managers and leaders in their spaces. So it’s a top-class membership in the team, so that’s one reason why we take this work very seriously.

And the other one is the meaning of being an AOC Review Team. The meaning of being an AOC Review Team is fundamental for ICANN and for the multi-stakeholder model of the internet and its internationalization. We are substituting for the function that the US government has of putting checkmarks very critically and with a very heavy hand and critical eye, on a checklist that arrived from a contract with ICANN. That was substituted when the MOUs and JPAs and all the other bilateral instruments were substituted by the Affirmation of Commitments.

The Affirmation of Commitments is singular in that it takes the form of two unilateral statements to each other party – there is no cross obligations. So the fact that it’s not the US government supervising ICANN but the world in a way has a meaning that’s

---

far more than just vague philosophy. It's very concrete. We have to prove that the set of people coming from ccTLD managers, gTLD managers, large company users, individual at-large users, commercial or non-commercial users, governments themselves... Everybody in this space, put us together and we'll shape the internet right, at least in our case.

I mean we are not trying to shape the internet but we are trying to improve the concept globally for the very specific remit of ICANN. So we take this very seriously; it's a high-stakes mission.

Olof, to ask again if there are remote comments, remote responses to my reply to Rosanne I'd be very happy to follow up on that.

Olof Nordling:

Well, there is a "Thank you" from Rosella who is by the way a DSSA member.

Alejandro Pisanty:

Very happy to hear both things, and to have the name corrected. I said it's Roseanna and you said it's Rosella, so I stand corrected. Are there any other comments from team members? ICANN staff, you've taken a swipe in a very lightly way. I don't know what a word in English is for [calbaieros]. Would you like to make a comment on John's comment or we'll just work on it? You tell me.

---

Patrick Jones: It's Patrick Jones for the record. The Review Team has been working very hard and from the staff side we've also been trying to be as accommodating as possible in providing documents and information, and we'll continue to do so. I'd rather not comment on the public comments that were raised, so I'll leave it at that.

Alejandro Pisanty: We'll follow the process. I mean we are obliged and gladly to take a critical look into anything with as sharp a tool as we can that takes us to find out about as much as needed of what needs to be solved, again without finding if you are keeping the right number of digits in the columns. But we'll ask you these questions from many sides and when we come out with something we'll be sure that it's based on the best fact and opinion possible.

Denise Michele: This is Denise Michele with ICANN staff. I just wanted to note for the record and the audience that the WHOIS Review Team is also actually spending a lot of time on Compliance-related issues as part of their mandate in looking at and improving the WHOIS policy. And so we'll make sure that we put representatives for the two teams in touch with each other so they're really aware of how their respective draft reports and recommendations are progressing.

Alejandro Pisanty: Thank you, Denise Michele. Any comment back there? I'm leaving the room silent for a few seconds to see if any of the many

---

gear grindings here or remotely remind someone of anything else they have to say. Yes, Patrick?

Patrick Jones:

So I would add that you have been going around throughout the week, engaging with different stakeholder groups and the SOs and ACs. And you have, in addition to this particular open session you've had a variety of other sessions to interact with the community in different venues. So this hasn't been your only opportunity to talk to people at this meeting.

Alejandro Pisanty:

Thank you, Patrick. That is true and in fact, as I mentioned while I read the presentation I added stuff that has come up as recently as 8:30 AM today in our meeting with the DSSA. I mean we really are absorbing all we can and our draft has changed by the hour as we stay here, and it'll be updated during the day in particular to the best knowledge and opinion that we have available. And I insist not only on knowledge but also on opinion, because community input comes to us through fact as well as through opinion.

We assume in this community that every opinion is informed in its own space and it's a goodwill opinion trying to improve things for all. One of the well-known opinions is that no one has ever been criticized for ending a meeting early. If there's no further we can adjourn.

---

Thanks all, community members in particular for being here and for being so forthcoming in your views, not that you're not known for that, Jon. But thanks for doing it for us.

Team, we meet in C1 at 10:00. There may be a chance for a round of coffee, right?

[End of Transcript]