
BRENDA BREWER:

Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR2 Review Team Plenary number 59 on the 31st of January 2019 at 15:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Ram, Russ, Norm, Eric, Noorul, Denise, and Scott. We have no observers at this moment. We do have apologies from Matogoro, Elaine, Boban, Kaveh, and Laurin. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to state your name before speaking, and Russ, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you. Looks like we've got a little bit of a light attendance, but I hope everyone had a safe and uneventful journey home after our face-to-face this past weekend.

I want to quickly go over the agenda. We have put together the approach and the topics and have names for leads in each of the work streams. We have a table that Jennifer sent out in a Google Doc for people to add their names to that. I think you will see the URL in the agenda under three. We also have gathered the questions we need to ask for the ICANN and future work streams.

The goal today was to get approval on those, make sure that there weren't any to add or edit, and then collect the DNS SSR work stream questions.

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.

Then the last thing is we edited the work plan, so we want to make sure that we approve that and get it posted so that it's out there well before the blog we write for the lead in to Kobe.

So, if there are no questions with that, we'll get started. The first one is the future challenges and ICANN SSR questions. Are there any edits that people want to propose for the questions we collected? I see that Jennifer just typed the URL into the chat. So, I see there is a couple of comments added to the document. Looks like they're just minor edits to the questions that are already there. Okay, let me change screens. I'm not seeing any hands. So, are people happy with these questions going out as they are now? All right.

So, the next thing is each of the topics in the workstreams. We have basically four tables – sorry, three tables, four workstreams, but the SRR one is behind us. The ICANN SRR has seven topics, and we have initials for people who are going to work on those, produce the text once we get the answers to the questions.

The DNS SSR, we have broken that down into some areas where there is six major topics with some subtopics under them, and we did the assignment at the subtopic level to divide the work as best we could. Okay.

Then in the future section. So, if you were not at the meeting, please add your initials if you think you can contribute. Do that real soon, like today, so that we can get on with that work. Not seeing any hands, so I think we can—

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE: Sorry. Yes. I'll be adding a couple of clarifications. The document doesn't quite capture a couple of the actions that we agreed to follow-up on, so I'll just add that into the document today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That'll happen today. Thank you. That's what I needed to know because we need to have the staff deliver those, and my goal was tomorrow.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, I absolutely do not want to delay that. I think given, especially breadth, the number of questions, clarifying a question on Monday would be fine. I'm traveling, so I will add a little bit of inflexibility. But, to be really clear, I don't at all want to delay the delivery of [these] questions.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. Okay. So, I'd like collect questions related to the DNS SSR. The table we just had up has people who [inaudible] look at the table to see what questions they had that they wanted to ask. I did not see much email on this topic. I'd really like to get those questions today

so that we can get this sent off to start the answering process. Could we have questions by the end of today? Is there a problem with that?

So, the bottom of the Google Doc that Jennifer put the link into the chatroom has a place for people to type them, and right now I only see six questions in there for the entire workstream. That seems surprising to me that we would have that few. Can we get them in there by today so we wouldn't have a problem with that deadline? Okay, so I miscounted. Eric sees 13 questions.

So, Denise asks can we deliver what we have tomorrow, and then if more surface, deliver them as well? Yes, we can do that, but my guess is that they will not be answered as promptly as the first group, but I could be wrong on that.

Okay. We're going to get those in as best we can by the end of the day. Jennifer, could you put up the work plan for people to see? Or Brenda? I'm not sure which one is [inaudible] to the screen. Denise, I see a hand. Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. Just to highlight my contribution in the chat. Are people comfortable – and I'm sorry, I'm in a noisy airport place. If people are comfortable sending questions that are ready this week, and then picking a date that seems reasonable next week to send another [tranche], I think that might work well. Personally, I just won't have time this week to, for example, to draft those questions on name collision is going to take a few days of work over the weekend – I mean a few hours of work over the weekend.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I'm glad it's hours, not days. Eric agrees. So, why don't we do this then? Why don't we send the ICANN SSR and the futures off today, and we can send the DNS-related ones off, say, Tuesday next week? Okay. Assuming that's an old hand from Denise, I'm not seeing any response. So, I'd be taking it. And I'm not sure when you typed that plus one, Eric. Plus one, again. Okay. So, we're going to do that. All right. So, can you adjust the action items to reflect that? Thank you. I see that being changed as I speak.

All right, back to the work plan. This was sent out just at the end of the face-to-face session, and we just want to approve it and get it posted. Hopefully, people had the time to go over it quickly and see if we made any mistakes. If there are no problems, we will post it. Seeing no hands, so Jennifer, would you post that on the Wiki?

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, this is Denise. I'm sorry. I can't get my hand up quick enough.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry. Go ahead. Did you want to make a change to the work plan?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I do have a change to the workplan. I would suggest that for a workstream, in particular, three and four, we are not asking follow-up questions only. We're asking fundamental questions that need to be answered as part of the workflow. I should clarify that. I don't know that

anyone has plans for interviews, but it's certainly a possibility, so I'm going to say I'll suggest an edit in that email address. How's that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That would be fine. So, the discussion in the room when we talked about this was not to remove the interviews, even though we didn't have any plan now just in case we got the answers to the questions. We felt there needed to be some, but yeah, I can see where the follow-up questions should be changed – or just remove follow-up and just make it questions.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. We're on the same page here. Really minor change, I think, just to mark the clarification to reflect...

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Anything else someone wants to raise? Eric, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: How we're delivering these questions and our requests of staff that [inaudible] list of things to address.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. I have a question out regarding the best place to note. So, we'll talk about that in the any other business I was thinking about. But, Eric, you had a hand up.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. This is just really a minor thing. Just on line 45, we [inaudible] something at 90% that's going to expire before the team meets again, February 3rd. I don't know if that really matters, just something to point out. Basically, I think this is like do your homework before we get started, I think, if I read it right. But whether we want to change the percentage, or change the target date, or just make sure it gets posted before the 3rd, just because of it winds up getting posted on the 4th and we don't meet again till later, it looks like we're behind [inaudible]. Maybe it's not a big deal. That's the only thing I noticed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, you think we should make it the 7th for next week's call?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. If I read it right, it's basically saying do your homework before you get started on the workstream. We could basically just all be on the call and decide if we've done our homework, just because we put it at 90%, so I guess we didn't feel like we'd done that when we left the face-to-face, either that or [inaudible] either way.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Jennifer, would you just change that to the 7th.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Done. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you. Anything else? Okay. I was given an action at the face-to-face to reach out to make sure that people understood that these questions needed to be answered promptly, and the question was where should I send the note?

I've had several sides of the discussions, and I think what I'm going to do with the team's approval is to write an informal note to David Conrad since most of the questions seem to land in the OCTO group – and to say David wants to give you the heads up these questions are coming, really appreciate the prompt response. If you don't understand a question, please turn it around early so we can clarify and basically explain the consequences in terms of timeline on our workplan if it takes a long time to answer them. Is everyone happy with that? Okay, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

So, I think that's a good idea. Building on that, I would note that many of our questions span to multiple departments that is somewhere outside of Conrad's OCTO group. So, I think we need to elevate it and note that this touches several department, either the CEO or [inaudible] departments, but also because we've had a well-recognized and discussed problem in the past getting timely responses from staff – six, seven months to come back and ask for clarification, a question, or to answer with a couple of sentences.

So, I think just given our tight timeline ... I think our rebut also be more specific that within 10 days if any clarification is ... Please notify us if any

clarification is needed and then ask the organization to make replying to this priority noting our ... We're trying to make up time from the [inaudible] and the other tight timeline. It's simply not workable if we have to wait another seven or eight months for this information. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. I completely agree. Hi, Boban. Thanks for joining. I thought we saw regrets from you. I see he's having trouble connecting or at least getting audio. Okay. Denise, is that a new hand?

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry, old.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Are there any other topics to raise under any other business? Okay, Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, I don't have anything, but I had a hand up, so apologies.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry, I thought you took it down and put it back up. All right, fair enough. Then I think we're done. Thank you so much. We had a very productive face-to-face. Please keep the momentum up. Let's get 'er done. Please get those questions sorted for the ICANN SSR and the

future one in today, and early next week for the NS SSR. Thank you.
Bye-Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]