BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to SSR-2 Plenary Call #72 on the 30th of May 2019 at 14:00 UTC. Members joining the call today are Ram, Russ, Scott, Denise, Jabhera, and I do have a phone that just joined. Does that iPhone want to identify their name, please?
KC KLAFFY:	Sorry. It's KC. I clicked through too fast.
BRENDA BREWER:	Thank you so much, KC. From ICANN Org joining the call is Jennifer, Negar, Charla, Steve, and Brenda. We do have apologies from Norm, Boban, Kerry-Ann, Danko, and Eric. Today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record and kindly mute your audio when you're not speaking. With that, I'll turn the call over to Russ.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. So, the plan for today was to have all of the recommendations in the Google Doc. I see that we actually have very few there, but we do have a few that the team needs to discuss, so I would like to just go through them in the order there in the Google Doc and we'll discuss the ones where discussion is needed.

Jennifer has put the link to the Google Doc in the chatroom, so you won't have to search through your email to find it. I see that Angie is trying to organize them so that the recommendations are at the top and |

EN

suggestions are at the bottom. I think that's the reason for all the deleted text.

So, the first recommendation that's in here is recommendation 4 on budget transparency which is a follow-on to an SSR-1 recommendation. Is there anything that someone wants to talk to about that on that?

KC KLAFFY: I sent something to the list about that last week – at least I thought I did – which was I don't understand exactly what is meant here by the transparency and I'm trying to keep in mind how SSR-3 would decide that it was actually implemented, so I wanted a little more precision in the wording. But [I don't know how to write it].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, KC, my understanding of this one is they just want the budget to have a section that says these topics are SSR related so that people can see what portions of the budget are going to SSR-related topics. I don't think it's calling for anything more detailed than that.

KC KLAFFY: Okay. And the current budget is just … How much more vague than that is the current budget?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. It's been a long time since I looked at this, but for example, there are several things on OCTO that are SSR related but you can't figure out

EN

which part of the OCTO budget is for those SSR-related things. So, they could either move those to an SSR-related thing or mark some of the things within OCTO that are SSR related. I think either one is [required].

KC KLAFFY: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: With those few words, if you're able to improve the clarity of the recommendation, please do.

KC KLAFFY: Okay, I'll try. Who owns this one? I guess I'll go look at the [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't remember who owned the rewrite, but I think I might have been the one that put it in here, but I was not the one who did the original wording.

KC KLAFFY: I have a related question to ask Laurin. There used to be a document that went through the SSR recommendations and said whether they were implemented or not. Is that still in play?

RUSS HOUSLEY: This one came out of the SSR-1 recommendations review.

KC KLAFFY: I don't understand. So, is somebody going to be able to go look at the SSR recommendations and see which ones we believe were implemented? That whole … Was it implemented? Did it have the intended effect? That whole exercise we did, is that still getting published somewhere or is that just an internal exercise?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh no, there will be intro material that explains that. We're just trying to get this part done now so that we can put the briefing together for Marrakech.

KC KLAFFY: I just lost track of that document, so if somebody could send out the link again, I want to refresh my memory on it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Jennifer's a wizard at finding things in the Wiki. Maybe she can post that.

KC KLAFFY: Thanks.

DENISE: Hey, this is Denise.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi.   Yeah, KC, that SSR-1 related recommendation on budget transparency and accountability was found to not be fully implemented and in previous discussions what some of the team members had discussed was the importance of budget transparency.   Not only providing   more   detailed   information   and   providing   more comprehensive information.   Many of the work items that SSR-2 has been reviewing and working on touch on things outside of the OCTO delegated budget but it's impossible to track through ICANN's budget process what funds and resources are being allocated to those more cross-functional efforts that are linked to things that this team as prioritized as actions that need to be taken.   So, I'm happy to chat more about this offline.

KC KLAFFY: That helps.   Thanks, Denise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, is there anything further on recommendation 4?   Okay, turning to the next one.   This is 5.   This is one where we found that a document was started but never completed and we're just asking them to finish it. During the meeting in Brussels Danko asked whether the update to the bylaws had made this unnecessary, so I did the review of that and found that those portions of the bylaws only had one sentence change and it didn't resolve this question.   Okay, seeing no hands and not hearing

anyone speak, let's move to recommendation 7. Okay, I'm not hearing anyone speak and I'm not seeing any hands, so I'm assuming this one's fine.

DENISE MICHEL: Can we have the recommendations displayed on the screen instead of the agenda, as we look through them? I'm in transit so it's difficult to toggle and find [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Brenda, are you able to do that? Okay, we're on recommendation 7 right now. Here we go. Okay, I'm not hearing anything on this one. Let's move to the next one which I think is 13. Okay, again I'm not hearing anyone speak and I'm not hearing, seeing any hands, so let's move to the next one which is recommendation 28. Okay, so the things that are in here, I'm not hearing any problems with, so what we need to do is by next week get the rest of them in here. And KC, I know you wanted to talk through, based on the email you sent to the team, a couple of recommendations. Dropping one and making one more concrete. So, I'll turn it over to you.

KC KLAFFY: Okay, back on 28 because I'm a little behind you, reading. 28 is okay. I just feel like having watched this NCAP conversation for it feels like 10 years but it's probably fewer than that. I'm wondering about the context with respect to the other recommendations and the pushback that we saw CCT get for sending more recommendations that ICANN

felt it had resources to handle. And are we going to put this NCAP recommendation in the context of all the other in particular SSR-related CCT recommendations, of which were there were many? And I still don't know what the outcome of all of that was.

I guess my understanding is that a board is going to have a conversation with the CCT review team in Marrakech, but nothing is happening until then. And at that time there's going to be some meeting of the minds about how to prioritize these CCT recommendations, of which one, by the way, was NCAP related. But many more of them were SSR-2 related. CCT did try to put the normal high, medium, low priority to the recommendations, I think.

So I don't have a comment on this as written now. I just personally don't think it's as important a recommendation as all of the other consumer trust-related recommendations. So, my comment would be related to, I guess, how we couch all this later on. Okay, so that's my comment on 28. Now I wanted to … Does anybody have anything to say about that one?

DENISE MICHEL: So, it might be … We may want to think about grouping the relevant CCT recommendations together. I think we've started the discussion in Brussels about organizing recommendations and synthesized [inaudible]. There aren't as many numbered recommendations, but they're grouped in ways that make sense for implementation. And one of the ways of grouping them is to pull out the SSR-related recommendations from CCT and make those a recommendation

grouping for ours as well. So, I'll take another look at that and put some additional text in this particular Google Doc.

But on recommendation 28, I think we also had a discussion that's still open on name collision and that is how to be most impactful here and is it a priority that binds us to the level of a recommendation. Part of my concern is was that ICANN lacked a more systemic way of addressing name collision issues that affect all – for example, those affect all TLDs and don't have a process, and clear process in place to address that. This recommendation is geared more towards noting that SSAC is doing something and that ICANN should pay attention to it. I don't find that as impactful as making more specific recommendations so I think I'd welcome an opportunity to discuss this recommendation further with those that are knowledgeable in this space.

KC KLAFFY:
Yes, I agree. I just read it more carefully and I missed a line, I think I said this in a comment to some other version of it but I don't see it on this one, which is there's a sentence in here that says, by independent, SSR-2 means that the team is free any of participants with a financial interest [in a TLD, essentially].

That was definitely a point on the SSAC – and now I'm speaking with SSAC hat on because I guess I know this and maybe others don't. Although it's public – what is public? What SSAC proposed to the board to the contours of the NCAP by ICANN when SSAC was recommending a certain approach and budget associated with it, which was over a year ago, I think. Explicitly they did not say this. They did not require, no

EN

conflict of interest. No financial conflict of interest. And when I pushed back on it, or questioned it, the response was that's going to be impossible to do. There's not enough people you could get to do the work but don't have a [financial] conflict of interest which I find a bit problematic but maybe not surprising. I believe that is still the case meaning there's not a requirement for [inaudible] in the work party or the people who end up doing the work, which is not the work party. Or the people that evaluate the work, which I think is the work party. I'm not sure [inaudible].

So, I'm worrying about our sentence in here, recommending something that already is not … Has already been decided to not be the case. It just feels like we're a bit behind the curve here.   Or ahead of the curve or something. So that needs to … We need to go follow up on that somehow. But I agree with everything that Denise says. Who wrote this one, by the way? Is this Denise and Eric? Who are we following up with? Okay, we'll find out [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand the reason why this is desirable but I also think it's SSAC's decision about how to staff the work party.

KC KLAFFY: Fair enough. Maybe the recommendation should include transparency about whether the team is free of … About whether this is the case instead of us saying this should be the case. Okay, so we'll put a [inaudible] on that later.

Okay, now I'm going down to suggestions now, so I guess Russ wants me to talk about 18 and 19. So 18, we killed and I think we decided last week to kill it so I don't think we need to talk about that. Somebody can jump on the list if they want to [read] about it.

19, I don't remember writing 19. I don't know where or how it got written but it made me nervous, again, [inaudible] to the document in the context of how an SSR-3 might evaluate that it was done and also on whether it would have the impact that we desired. So my feeling on this, ICANN's responsibility with respect to research is – matched the last sentence of the old version of 19 which is we want to make sure the community is aware of these research happenings but it's not clear to me that having somebody to go speak at an ICANN meeting about all the research things that might be happening is going to have that effect. I think I would rather see some document on ICANN's website that carefully went through the recent developments in the research community and did a bit of an analysis on what are the implications for ICANN policy issues. So, I tried to reword the recommendation in that context. Obviously, ICANN [Org didn't] necessarily have to do it itself. But nobody does this right now and I think it is a gap and the research community is obviously not incented to do it on its own so I think ICANN could certainly help in that space.

DENISE MICHEL: Could you please display the recommendation we're talking about?

KC KLAFFY:	I can read it to you. Here, let me read it. The first part is the same as the [inaudible]. To address strategic objectives 1, 3, and 4 is specifically strategic goal 3.2. ICANN should track developments in the peer review research community, focusing on networking and security research conferences. For example, AC and CCS, INC, [inaudible] CCR and [inaudible] And publish a response to any publications that include recommendations for SSR impacting changes to contracted parties in other ICANN community stakeholders. ICANN should reach out to steering committees of such conferences and encourage inclusion of pending empirical technical questions into the [inaudible]. ICANN should also summarize potential harms to individual consumers, business, or the infrastructure described in work presented at DNS workshops that it hosts or co-hosts, e.g. DNS Symposium. [inaudible] three separate recommendations but related to this, the goal of trying to translate what the research community is doing into policy language which I do think is important and I think it was the spirit of the old recommendation 19. I just wasn't convinced that, either it was easily evaluate-able by SSR-3 or that it would have the intended impact. Okay, it got really quiet. I hope I didn't shut the conversation down.
DENISE MICHEL:	That makes sense to me.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	So, does anyone disagree with these suggestions? I'm only hearing support. Okay, I notice that recommendation 19 was put after the suggestions, instead of before, so I missed it in my first pass.

EN

KC KLAFFY: Oh sorry, my fault.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you could scroll to the end of the document and look at that one. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands, I'm not hearing any speaking, so I think that this looks good. So, I think the most important for the team now is to get the rest of the recommendations into this document, then we can do as KC and Denise suggested, which is grouping topical, but we need to get them all here before we can do that.

KC KLAFFY: Russ, I did something on L and I guess I put it in the wrong palace also. I don't know. Where did it go? I think I put it at the bottom of the document because I was tired. But I thought I was assigned L and I admit I wasn't clear on the difference between the numbered recommendations and the lettered ones.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The difference is the order in which they came in. They were being worked at simultaneously so that was a way of not allotting. And then when we went through them, we talked about combining. Many of them had notes added about being merged with one of the numbered ones.

DENISE: I think, yeah, when we were together in Brussels, for the sake of expediency we included rough drafts so people could think about them, talk about them, and work on them. I think the letters indicated that they were rough drafts for people's consideration, more than formal recommendations. And also, things that needed to be woven into other recommendations.

KC KLAFFY: Okay, so maybe we could [inaudible]. I thought I had L in here, dammit. I don't know whether I … Okay, maybe I wasn't sure what to do about L then. I'll take it to the list.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, [inaudible]. Could you walk them through the rest of this? Thank you.

KC KLAFFY: Hello? Are we there? I guess we lost Russ.

DENISE MICHEL: Did we lose Russ?

KC KLAFFY: Yeah. He had sent email that he had to leave after 30 minutes, so I guess he expired abruptly and he wants you to be him.

DENISE MICHEL: Who? Me?

KC KLAFFY: Yes, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Alright. So, I'm in transit, so it's going to be a little bit difficult for me to see the screen and talk at the same time. But are there any other items, recommendations in this document that we need to discuss this morning?

KC KLAFFY: No, but I think I sent an [inaudible] that need recommendation L repopulated into the document by somebody because I managed … Maybe I screwed up and deleted it accidentally. Or somebody can turn what I sent it a list of what I thought it was from some previous version. But that's just for Jennifer to help me, rescue me. [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Brenda, could we have the agenda back up? Are there any other items that we were intended to cover this morning? Okay. We're on draft recommendations.   Since there is a significant number of draft recommendations that need to be moved into this document [inaudible] consideration, I'd like to suggest that [Angie] follow up on email with the people assigned in the other document to check on their status, see if they need any help in finalizing the language and moving it over, so we can have a more fulsome document to recommend to

review at the next meeting. Anything else on the draft recommendations? Okay. So, our goal here is to have all the draft recommendations for discussion in the doc for next week, so we'll follow up on the list on that.

That moves us onto the work plan updates. Brenda, could you display the work plan? And that was also sent to the larger list, is that correct?

BRENDA BREWER: Correct, it was sent to the list and we'll pull it up. One moment, please.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. While we're waiting for that, did anyone have any questions or comments or suggested edits on the work plan? Is Laurin on the call.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: She is not.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Alright. Well, I'll touch base with Lauren and Eric, make sure they didn't have any comments on this, and then we'll call it an updated draft. Unless there's any other comments on the work plan, we'll move on to the next agenda item. Jennifer, are there any outstanding Doodle polls or other things that you need team members to respond on?

EN

JENNIFER BRYCE: I believe there is a 'doodle poll outstanding on the Marrakech dates that one or two people had not filled in but that's all. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, great. Any other items people would like to address before we move to the wrap-up on action items and end the call? And please feel free to speak up. Since I'm in transit, I'm having a hard time looking at the screen, as well. Alright, hearing none, I'll hand over to you, Jennifer, for a wrap-up on next steps.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Great. Thank you. So, the action items for [Angie] to follow up on the email with people assigned to the recommendations not yet included in the v3 recommendations document, with the goal to have all of the recommendations in the document for discussion next week. Denise, you are going to follow up with Eric and Lauren since they're not on the call, and confirm no further updates to the work plan, and then advise staff to post the document to the Wiki. And then I just took an action for me to help KC and find the missing recommendation L somewhere, and I will work with you on that one KC. And unless there's any action items that I missed, that's all I have. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Thank you, Jennifer. And Brenda. Thanks, everyone, for joining the call. We're done for this morning – or this evening, depending on where you are. Thanks, everyone.

EN

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Bye.

DENISE MICHEL: Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks everybody, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]