BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call #99 on the 29th of January, 2020 and we're beginning the call at 1500 UTC. Members attending the call include, Russ, Denise, Zarko, Kaveh, Ram Krishna, Kerry-Ann, Matogoro, Scott and Naveed. Apologies from Alain, Norm and Negar. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Steve and Brenda, technical writer Heather is on the call. Today's meeting is being recorded, please state your name before speaking for the record. Russ, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The first thing we'd like to do is make sure that everyone has heard from travel, regarding making arrangements to be in Cancun. As you all know, we pushed very hard to get the document out for Public Comment in time that the Public Comment Period will close before the Cancun meeting so that we can deal with the Public Comments there. We need everyone there and if you haven't at least gotten the welcome message, please let us know now, so we can figure out what's going on.

KERRY-ANN BAARRETT: I got the welcome note but I may or may not be able to come. March is our close off period for all our projects, so we'll be doing all thee project important stuff here, I'll be able to participate for the meeting remotely, the entire meetings but I maynot be able to fly as yet. My boss is out of the country until next week, when he comes, we'll have to go through March to see how we'll organized the resources in the office to meet the reporting obligations in March.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, we'll miss you if you're not there, I hope you can be there and of course, the two meetings at the front end of the or the two days at the front end are when we plan to deal with Public Comment.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'll be able to participate remotely if not, I'll make sure I block and be able to be in office and on the call.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great, thank you.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I have not received; I just double checked my email.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I bet they sent to the wrong email address.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I just searched both of them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Jennifer, you can help on that one, please?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure, I've made a note and we'll get in touch with travel.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Anyone else? I don't remember when the date was you had to go into the porthole in the welcome message because I already did it, out of mind. Next topic is an email that I send out to the team on Monday. We had a lot of people who were concerned about the Recommendation #1, finish the SSR1 Implementation that you started and people felt that was not measurable, yet a lot of people did not want to revisit the appendix on SSR1.

Taking those two thoughts into consideration, I was thinking that maybe we should expand the recommendation in such a way that says, "Complete SSR1 Recommendation 1 by doing X. Complete SSR2 Recommendation by doing Y and thus, get to a point where SSR3, is able to easily measure whether those were done or not" What do people think? I saw a couple notes on thread that I started on Monday but not too much. I can't see hands, so Jennifer, call anybody who raises their hand. Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL:

Sorry, I'm not quite in the room yet. I support your approach of briefly articulating what implementation would look like for the incomplete recommendation in SSR1. My preference would be to note that detail in table or in the annex, rather than there are so many recommendations that weren't fully implemented but I think it would take up a substantial part of the report, I would propose to put that in the annex or write it in a way that is not -- doesn't take up so much

space in the body of the report. But I may be misunderstanding what you're recommending.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, I'm totally fine with it being in a table and the recommendation being complete the implementation, doing the actions shown in table whatever, wherever it's located.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, I think that's fine.

RUSS HOUSELY: Any other thoughts?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Similarly, my email I had sent around is, I think once we have the table that cross references the related recommendations, lifted it out as you recommended, I think will be easy but if we do that and just follow me in terms of my thinking, my concern is when someone lifts up the report, they have to be able to see clearly that we meet our obligations under the bi-laws, first review the SSR1 recommendations and then two, based on current issues, give our own recommendations as a new review team.

However, we write the narrative, to explain how we have put emphasis on the SSR1 are not put emphasis, it has to be particular that one, you have assessed, we have found these things that are not done. As you

said, do them, however, some of these things also lead to other things we've found, so we have to just make sure that wherever we put them, table them, cross reference them in a table, however we structure it, it just has to be clear that the obligations under the bi-laws were met.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yep, I completely agree and that's why in the body of the email I sent, I cited, see SSR2 Recommendation number as one of the table entries would be related to that where we said, "Yes, finish it but we think this other work ought to be done as well." I think only one did we say it wasn't complete but it's overcome by events and nothing further should be done. We would say that in that table too.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think we can add the comments from the Public Comment, is to kind of step back from it and to read the report as someone who heard them for the first time. It's pretty clear in terms of if it's instructional, reflective, it's just as we go through, I guess we'll just work with Heather to just make sure that we are clear as well in our head, what we are trying to state, I think that's what's missing.

We write a lot but what the outcome is and what we want to write is what we should be concerned about and as you said in your email, not so much to be concerned about being prescriptive but to make sure that we're clear and articulating whatever you do or however you get there, this is the end result we're expecting to see.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, right, right and that's hard to write, in terms of a measurable outcome. It's easier to say, do this, than it is to say, do something that get's you to a state where…

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Agreed.

RUSS HOUSELY: I'm not hearing anyone think that building this table is a bad idea. If there is such a person, please speak now.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Zarko, is in the cue.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: Hi everybody. I don't think that's a bad idea but how we are going to do that, recommendation itself and our findings. That question on raising for long time, that we have findings which cannot be supported, actually there is no evidence, they maybe supported and we have very strong statements somewhere in some places that ICANN Org and ICANN Staff doesn't do their job. Looking at the table we have two recommendations sitting, two recommendations are not implemented and also others are only partially implemented.

Our finding is the recommendations, they don't reach in term of effect, and the preamble we say that it is very difficult to measure and to find what is intended to be effective, so at least we should write down what we expect and that's exactly what you are talking about, Russ, to say, please do this so we can consider or SSR3 will consider the recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's exactly what I'm proposing, yes. The first part of your question was, how we're going to build the table and I see two ways we could do that. We can ask one person to go off and make the first pass at it or we can each sign up to do a row or two and then look at what we get. The first one will get a more consistent wording and so one and the second one will get it down faster. I'd like to know what people think.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: This will be done during Cancun?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We need to have this done before Cancun.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But we would need -- the table would just be numerical, not content.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: The table would be the recommendation number and what needs to be done to finish its implementation or a pointer to another SSR2 recommendation.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I was just thinking how to minimize editing of that at the end, when we get back the Public Comments because we may have substantive -- I don't know how substantive the comments will be in terms of what we need to change, it could take text. Just to kind of think through that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yup, it would have to be, as we resolve the Public Comments, we will have to look at this table as well, that's correct. Do we have a person who likes the idea that one person does the whole thing and is willing to do it as opposed to one person would like some other person to do the whole work, is not what I'm looking for? Otherwise, in the interest of people's times, I think we will be faced with doing the second. Okay, Heather, you built a table in a Google Doc, right?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes, I did.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Could you send that to the team and I will ask people during the next couple days to sign up for two recommendations, to write the sentence?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Umm hmm.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. Did Laurin join the call?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I believe Laurin did join and Zarko has his hand raised again.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Zarko, go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: I have a question about the approach. What if different person do look at recommendation and find out that the previous findings are not right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, then I think they're going to have to bring it to the whole team, since we got to the point where we thought that was done several months ago but if they find that either something has changed since we wrote it, that changes the result or that they find something that the other person missed, than I think we're going to have to bring that to the team and talk about it. Does it make sense?

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, that's okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, Laurin joined and then went away, is that what you said, Jennifer?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I did not go away.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, you wanted to talk about Agenda Item 3, Tracking Potential Changes to the Report.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, essentially this is something I noticed when I went through the report and we kind of touched on the on the Leadership Call this week. It's essentially about what it would do if things that we now, after having cleaned up the document and we have something clean and nice to look at, when we see gaps, errors, mistakes, how we want to track that while we're in Public Comment and I just wanted to put that to the team, how we can approach this?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'm sorry for saying this, I'm trying not to laugh.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Welcome to my world, it's early on the west coast.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It is but that is not the problem. Let me change my headset, that will probably make it fine.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Blame the equipment, Laurin.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we understood his words, let's start the discussion. I'm thinking that as we find things that need to change, we just need to keep a log of the changes we make, so that we have something when we get together in Cancun, to make sure that we don't forget anything and that we haven't made a change that moves away from consensus.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Part of me is struggling with this to a certain extent because we're back to working on the marked-up copy. There is a lot of material in the mark up copy which we didn't explicitly discuss, which was just sort of accepted for the sake of getting to Public Comment. We've got two different kinds of changing perhaps that we're talking about. We're talking about whole new material, which we need to track in someway shape or form but we've also got the stuff that we have that we still haven't discussed yet, it's already in there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm hoping we will resolve those parts between now and Cancun on these calls. I hope, so that we can highlight the plate, so in doing so, we will make those more like the first, does that make sense?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I think so. I do have spreadsheet ready for us to keep track of new substantive things.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: And I have consolidated the comments from what was put in the clean copy and what was sent to me privately, into the marked-up copy, that is ready for discussion.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I also feel that essentially when we go through the copy that we've sent to Public Comment, if we all do that, if we know the old repot we can all essentially say, this is something that was accepted, that I don't agree with or this is something that somehow fell off the truck by the weigh side at some point and this is exactly why I brought this up because I noticed two or three things where I went through the thing we went to Public Comment and I thought we somehow didn't talk about this.

I hope, Heather, to address your concern that this can kind of work as one in those cases, where we know the old report and we read the new one we see if there's a discrepancy we care about, there's a problem.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The table was just sent by Heather, so if you guys would please put your name in the assigned to column and then we'll, over the next week or so, fill it in. Is there anything further on that topic, Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I don't think so, I think we have an approach, right? We can read the reports, we have a table to put our concerns and notes and I think that's good. Then, as you said, my hope is also that we do these discussions not in Cancun but on the calls, so that we can deal with the Public Comments.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Indeed. Okay, that brings us to Any Other Business Agenda item, is there any? I'm sorry, Webinars, I skipped one. Backing up. Usually what review teams do is before Cancun, let the community know what's going on in a webinar, either a week or two before the meeting, which puts us towards the end of February, beginning of March to do that.

There's not much before the meeting, especially for us with the two days on the front of the meeting. Jennifer, how do we pick dates for these webinars and then we can figure out what material we need for them? My understanding is that we would be talking to the document that is out for Public Comment.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Russ. That's exactly right. The content would be the Draft Report, the webinar would specifically be to give community members an opportunity to ask questions on the Draft Report. It's not necessarily a pre-Cancun webinar, it just so happens to fall within that timeframe based on when you put your report out for Public Comment.

I would note that the ICANN Org is having and ICANN67 Prep Week, all webinars, I believe that begins the week of the 17th of February, through to the 24th, I think there's a whole five days of webinars, so I would advise to do it before that which would mean the week of the 10th. The team can decide whether or not to do one or two webinars, some teams do to two to accommodate different times zones. Obviously the webinars will be recorded and posted publicly.

What I would suggest that we do is, unless you want to commit to a couple of dates and times on the call today, we could circulate a Doodle of a couple of options on perhaps the 10th and 11th of February or the 11th or 12th, around that timeframe, with a couple of time zone options and then if we ask people to complete that by the end of this week, we'll just go with the one's that most review team members make sense to have at those times. That would be my proposal.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, that works for me except the 11th and 12th, on my calendar are blocked for something with a customer, so the 13th and 14th or the 10th and 13th, something like that would work better for me. I don't know if

EN

others have days that are already blocked in their calendar. Of course, I don't have to be there, somebody else could lead the webinar.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm also in support of let's just do that week because I'm also thinking if we're getting let's say the 10th and 13th as options, that's also useful. So, if there is a conference or get away or whatever for any group that might be interested and we have a bit of a spread as well, so don't do day one, day two and then someone on a plane is missing both.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that was an argument for, let's spread the -- when we pick two times, let's not make them the same day, is that I think I heard you say.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, that is one aspect to it. I just also think, let's just have that whole week as options and see what people can do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, is that okay, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: That sounds fine, happy to do that and we'll get the Doodle Poll out today. I just ask in advance if people could fill that out prompt that would be really helpful, thank you.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Heather, could you start the draft for the slide deck? I think you have the ones from Montreal to build on, changed a little bit.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	You bet. A little bit, I'll take care of it.
RUSS HOUSLE:	Okay, thank you. Now, we're to the Any Other Business.
KC CLAFFY:	I missed earlier, I'm sorry, I had family stuff going on. But if somebody was trying to yell at me, I'm here to be yelled at.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	No one's trying to yell at you but there is a table was just sent to your email, regarding the SSR1, making a table that says, complete the implementation by doing X, Y or Z, whatever the answer is and so Heather put together a table for us to each to sign up to write that sentence. If you would pick one or two to do that for, I'd appreciate it.
KC CLAFFY:	Yup, I can totally do that.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. Any other, Any Other Business?

DENISE MICHEL: Not business really but just more of a comment. I had a chance recently to catch up on what other review teams are doing and I note with a bit or irony that the WHOIS RDS Review Team also found that a significant number of the previous recommendations have not been fully implemented and recommend that they be implemented without specific guidance. The ATRT3 Team also found that the majority of the previous recommendations were not implemented and also directed that those recommendations be implemented, again without a lot specific guidance. I'm just sharing that information.

RUSS HOUSLEY: When I reviewed the ATRT Report, they had a statistic in there that 60 some percent of all recommendations from Review Teams are not implemented.

DENISE MICHEL: I think it's good that this team wants to hold itself to a higher standard and go further and provide direction for implementation. It's a bit ironic that other teams seem to be in the same boat and KC on the side, I'm a little surprised that ATRT3 didn't actually address that issue, that there is a systemic problem with ICANN Org simply not implementing recommendation.

KC CLAFFY: I think they really did address the problem; they addressed the issue in the report. My understanding is that they did actually, when they sent around, I have to go back and read that report, that's next on my list

because I've actually finished reading this one now, they did actually fold it into recommendations, they would say, "This recommendation wasn't implemented, we address this in the new recommendation seven." Sort of like what we do with some of the ATRT, some of the SSR1 recommendation.

The other difference I think we should be aware of and again, part of this is as Denise alludes to the academic in me and part of this is that the way ICANN is now trying to be responsive to the overload of recommendations, is they came out with these new Operating Standards and one of the things that ATRT3 does say in the report is, part of the reason that recommendations weren't implemented is they are very hard to figure out.

Part of the reason that there's a disparity between ICANN's view of whether they're implemented and the review teams review of whether they're implemented for every single review team, is that the recommendations are kind of vague and it's not clear what the measured outcome is when they're implemented. Both we and ATRT3 say that in the report.

That is part of my concern, is we say, we basically justify why there's such a disparity in perception of whether these things are implemented and then we go say, "Go ahead and implement them again." Even though ICANN has just said, "They're not implemented."

Maybe the table that we're talking about is going to handle it, we're going to be explicit about what we mean by go finish it. I did think that

ATRT3 tried to do that, intended to do that but I take the point that there was a lot of mis fire in the whole ATRT3 process.

DENISE MICHEL: They seem to have just really skipped by the additional reason that implementation is not carried out. To suggest that it's all because of the recommendations, really shows a lack of homework on this.

It's also a lack of implementation plan. It's a lack of duedilligence on the part of ICANN Org, to actually ask, "Is this what you mean? Here's our implementation plan, does this seem right?"   I mean, really basic implementation steps obviously not carried out for many recommendations that I'm aware of and that's a more systemic problem that hasn't been addressed and we should take this offline.

KC CLAFFY: Let me just say one more thing because I definitely heard the conversation happen in the phones and if it didn't make it to that report, which frankly got pushed through without us reading it, I think we were to comment and I want to make a last plea because we have two days left for anybody on SSR2, I'm not asking for a group reply but I'm asking anybody on this call who will listen to me, to go make a public comment and that comment that Denise make especially, if it's in the public comment it will give me a lot more ammunition to push it back into the report because know it was discussed on calls.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER:	One of the issues, if we're on ATRT as a topic, I have noticed that our work, as in SSR, if you look at the review options that they're bring up, I am wondering what they want to do with the SSR Review.
	To me it seems, how can I say, it seems problematic that they're thinking about doing a five day SSR Review because if we think about what matters to users of the internet, eventually all that matters to SSR are of key importance, excluding maybe pricing and I'm not sure how the team arrived there and maybe KC can enlighten us potentially but as I've already just heard. This was also a pretty rushed process, maybe there is no light to be found.
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah, I don't want to get too deep into ATRT2 but offline, definitely you can get me started on this. There are multiple problems with reviews, everybody agrees there's multiple problems. I had a hard time, despite lots of trying, getting the ATRT3 team to write down what the problems were that they were trying to solve because the options that are in the back of the report are sort of, I think a throw darts at the problem.
	Obviously the three to five-day idea for SSR Reviews was trying to throw a dart at the problem of, the reviews are taking too much time and they're taking too long and a lot of time by the time the recommendations are out, they're obsolete or such. It is a problem but the bigger problem in several people on the ARTR3 team and this is documented in the phone calls if anyone wants to go read the transcripts, is what Denise just said. There's an accountability problem, not just a volunteer overload problem.

I think people are really blowing out of proportion the volunteer overload problem and confusing it with the volunteer frustration problem that their work is meaningless because it doesn't get attended to, that there is a volunteer overload problem, there is prioritization of recommendation problem, there is a sausage making factory problem that happens in all governance processes, where everybody gets their little pet recommendation in because nobody wants to disagree with anybody else and they want their pet recommendation in so you end with way too much sausage at the end or pork I guess they call it.

That was covered in Montreal and when I say covered, one person got up at the mic and complained about it or actually somebody on a panel complained about, saying part of the issue with the ICANN Community is that there is a very strong pressure for consensus, to the exclusion of realism, so you end up with everything in there because nobody wants to say no to somebody else, nobody wants to get in a fight and you cannot govern that way.

That's why we end up with 500 recommendations that cannot possibly be implemented with the current laws of physics. Back to three to five days, it was trying to address one problem, not acknowledging the other problems. One thing I'm trying to get SSAC to respond to, at least in the options because nobody has time to respond to 222 page report, nobody has time to even read it, is that they way that the options are presented in the report, it is not clear what problem they are trying to solve and an honest look at what other problems they make worse.

One of the options says, "Let's start an accountability office." Like starting another committee is going to solve the problem. Well, what

problem is it trying to solve? What problem is going to make worse? That is a Public Comment we're trying to get in this week, is that ATRT2 has to be much more systematic about how it's proposing the options and how it's analyzing the options.

Obviously, Laurin, three to five days would help the volunteer overload process. If I can imagine a world where they had a three to five-day SSR2 Review and it was every six months, it could actually be quite effective, if we found a mechanism to solve the other problems. I'm not dissing the three to five day, I'm just saying this whole way of proposing options is broken, it's incoherent. Sorry, I'm going to shut up now. I said I wasn't going to get started.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thanks a lot, KC.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm glad you didn't get started.

KC CLAFFY: Really, I did not get started.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thanks for that, KC. This is exactly the point, right? I had not thought about, if we do this five days per year, every year or every six months, so I think your comment regarding what you want to put in it is true. This is needs flushing out because otherwise it might look strange.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, is there Any Other Business?

JABHERA MATOGORO: I was curious to see if we have any mechanism of maybe reaching out to our specific community for them to give out the Public Comment. For example, I was thinking like if you represent ALAC or Africa Region, then if SSR2 or ICANN Org or the team in general can also think of an approach or if the same approach has been used with other review teams to reach out to [inaudible] so that they can give out their user comments, public comment especially during their public comment period.

                          Because it is also important that we reach out to our community so that we can get useful comments that can help shape our final reports. I was just thinking aloud on that angle and see if apart from this statement [inaudible] has been given out, if we can also have a strategy of engaging more audience so that we get use of inputs during the public comment period. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you for that. I was wondering, do you think that the slides we're preparing for the webinar would allow different people to do whatever outreach in their community they want to do?

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yeah, I was thinking for example maybe before the public [inaudible] if we can have a strategy, maybe reaching out for example people from different regions, for example, those who are [inaudible] the academia, they are people who can be engaged and give out good public comments that can help shape the final report that we are preparing.

Of course, it's a kind of outreach, of reaching a wide audience so that we can get more input on that. Because as we know, security, stability and resilience are those hot topics but sometimes people are shying away, giving out the comment because they take a lot of time to understand the points and also comment on what has been written. That's something I was thinking of.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do others have comments on that or concerns?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think it's a good suggestion.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I just have one thing to note, that I think I have neglected to mention already that the overview and executive summary section of the draft report are at the moment in translation into the five additional UN languages, so that section of the report will be available I believe on the 10th of February if not before, so we can obviously share that to list and that might help with outreach as well. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you for that.

KC CLAFFY: Well, that's a bummer because they're abbreviated, we didn't spend any time of them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, we spent more time on, these are the comment we are looking for. Okay, Jennifer, would you like to go through the action items?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure, thank you. ICANN Org is going to ask the Travel Team to resend the welcoming off to Scott and confirm the current email address for him. Heather has completed this one already, send the SSR1 Table to the team members to volunteer to add text regarding what needs to be done to measure the completion of each recommendation. Staff will send a Doodle Poll regarding webinar options for the week of the 10th of February and team members to complete by the end of this week. That's all I captured, let me know if I missed something. Thank you.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Heather has an action to work on the draft slide deck for the webinar.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Great, thank you, Heather.

RUSS HOULSEY: Okay, everybody thank you. Talk to you next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]