BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 plenary call #111 on the 27th of May, 2020 at 14:00 UTC. This meeting will be recorded today, I do want to do attendance. We have members joining us including Kaveh, Laurin, Ram Krishna, Russ, Danko, Scott, and Kerry-Ann. Apologies from Boban, Alain, and Eric. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda, and technical writer Heather. And, as I stated, this call is recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. And Russ, I'll turn the meeting over to you. Thank you.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay, so last week we talked about the timeline [and if] we're not able to have another face-to-face meeting during this year, when would the team finish? So, we had that discussion and came to the conclusion that it would probably be October. And so, I worked with Jennifer and we came up with a blog to share with the rest of the community to let them know what to expect. Interestingly enough, I got a reach out from one of the AC chairs who was asking, "When are we going to see the final report so we know what to do?" So, glad I had an answer for him, but I guess others are probably having the same question.
	So, please take a look at the proposed blog text here. I think it just captures the decisions of the last week, but I wanted to give a chance for the team to take a look before we posted it. So, it's short, it's less than a page. Anyone have any concerns with this going out as it is? I see some people sending check marks, I don't see any hands, so I'm taking that to mean that we're all set with this.

EN

Okay. So, Jennifer would you please have that posted?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I will do, and thanks everyone for taking the time read it.

RUSS HOUSELY: Thank you. Okay, next we have subteams who are doing some work. I got a note this morning from Naveed saying that he is the wrong person to lead the Recommendation 28 work because the comments relate to NCAP, but he's not an NCAP person. I was wondering if someone who has some familiarity with NCAP would volunteer to be the rapporteur for subgroup 28. I have only a superficial understanding of NCAP, can anyone on the team help out with figuring out who the right person here should be? Okay, then I'll take this to the list and see if we can get somebody who has some familiarity with this to lead it.

Okay. Subteam 1 …

STEVE CONTE: Hey, Russ?

RUSS HOUSELY: Go ahead.

STEVE CONTE: I'm sorry, I was going through the list and looking at the names. One name of note, and I do recognize there could be a conflict and she's not

here to defend it, KC is on SSAC and NCAP is an SSAC project, so she might be a good vector to at least approach and start that conversation.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, I see your point, but I can reach out to her and ask her to help us find somebody. Okay.

So, Sub Team 1 has text for the group to consider and I sent a reply to the agenda with two links in it. The first one is the changes to the document, where if you go into Google Docs and go under the tools, I guess it's a tab, the third item down is review suggested edits. And since all the edits were put in this document—by the way, for the rest of the rapporteurs, Heather made this document with all the changes accepted from me, so that we could only look at only the changes that are being proposed by the Sub Team 1.

So, the first one is to change the priority of this recommendation from high to medium. I don't know if that is going to be controversial, but we also said that we would take another prioritization pass when we were done with the merging. So, I don't want to spend a lot of time on that, even willing to revert it and save that for the later discussion if that makes more sense. In fact, what I might do is I'll just reject that. Okay.

So, the next changes are in the Recommendation 1 section and right underneath the table, just a little bit of wordsmithing on the first paragraph. And then after the four numbered items there's a paragraph added because last week the suggestion was that we not make many changes to Recommendation 1 but also strengthen Suggestion 2, so this puts the forward [pointer] Suggestion 2 into the findings part here. And

if you go down to the assessment, in the second paragraph, there was the "results from review:" and there was nothing after it, so I put the pointer to Appendix D there, which is where all of that information is.

And then, here's the big change, is to the text of Recommendation 1 itself. "ICANN Org should perform a comprehensive review of the implementation of the SSR1 implementations. While SSR2 R2 recognizes that the guidance provided by SSR1 R2 is not sufficiently measurable, Appendix D offers a table of additional actions that should be part of a thorough implementation of the SSR1 recommendations. After a comprehensive review of the implementation of SSR1's recommendations, ICANN Org should develop an implementation plan to complete the job and execute that plan."

So, this is the text that was come up with to implement the choice we discussed and I'm certainly open to proposals for improvement. See Kerry-Ann giving me a check mark, but I don't see any hands raised. Somebody highlighted … Laurin go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hi everyone. So, I said on Monday I would have to have a look in-depth myself. And what I'm noticing is that when it comes to this whole smartness and accessibility, a lot of what is in SSR1 is somehow covered by our own recommendations, at least the ones we say matter.

So, I'll just give you an example. The last one is … Oh God, Google Docs is not scrolling for me, my apologies. Okay, now. "ICANN Org should actively engage in threat detection and mitigation, and participate in efforts to distribute threat and incident information." Okay,

EN

non-measurable, right? We know that already. But then we look at, say, 25 to 27, this is all to do with risk. It would essentially be incorporated and would happen if I think [whether it's] Recommendation 5 or 6 were to be implemented.

So, I think what we should maybe add is to essentially say, "By the way, there is huge overlap. These are hard to measure, and essentially you should get there by just doing the SSR2 recommendations." So, I think that's an important point. So, the same would be true with 24, which is about what OCTO, CTO office do, etc. We have all of this. So, I'm just wondering should we add a bit and kind of explain that we believe that by doing our recommendations, you will automatically arrive at completing a lot of SSR1?

RUSS HOUSELY: So, I thought about some of this and there are, like the ones that led to our Recommendations 2, 3, 4, we put in that table, the one that's down in Appendix D, well now referenced from Appendix D, that we didn't have any actions because our Recommendation—whichever number it was—2 superseded the actions that we found undone or not complete.

So, I was thinking as the merges and other things happen, we may find other places in that table where we want to point to an SSR2 Recommendation and say that it supersedes the actions or encompasses, includes, some other word we come up with, the actions that would have gone in that table. Does that make sense?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Awesome, thank you, Russ. So, this is exactly my point. Having looked at it again and looked at, at least [what's in there, risk theme is happening and then the abuse theme.] I just wanted to kind of note, I feel in the end it will little left that is SSR1 completion only that it will not be addressed by an SSR2 recommendation. So, my feel is as long as we make ours smart and we do as you say and kind of check back later on, my feel is that probably there will be so little left of this one that …

RUSS HOUSELEY: Well, if it turns out to be that there's a few rows that are left, we pull them up here and change the pointer to Appendix D to the table below, right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Exactly. I'm more going in the direction that I would want to say let's look in the end if we still need this recommendation or if it's superfluous because there's nothing left. That's essentially my other point.

RUSS HOUSELEY: Okay. Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, your explanation a while ago helped a lot, Russ, but the language we have now, the only caution when I'm looking at it is that when we started the review of SSR1, the ICANN Org was of the view that they had done it. So, I think the language that we have where we want them to

EN

perform a comprehensive review, that's why they have us as SSR2 to do our review of SSR1 recommendations, so I think we should change the language. It's not a matter that they should perform a comprehensive review, it would have to be the SSR1 recommendations as of [inaudible] in this report of additional actions needed. I don't think we could leave it at just implementation of SSR1 recommendations, which in their views, have been done already. That makes sense? So, it has to be a little bit [tighter to the] …

RUSS HOUSELEY: [I understand what you're saying]. Let me tell you where this idea came from. In email, KC said that this review team didn't have the appetite to turn each row into a smart recommendation and so the way forward seemed to be something in between, which was tell them it wasn't fully implemented and ask them to turn each row into a smart measurable outcome for the implementation plan. That was how I got where this text is.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But I would want us to extend that even further because we've actually had … see, it's more to me than just saying smart. I think for us with the SSR1 recommendation is to actually just say, "It was not done, these are some of the things as we had done before that we think could help you get there." And I think we would have absolved ourselves of our responsibility under the bylaws.

But, as we have it now, it still stops short of saying that we actually conducted a review, regardless of our ability or inability to make what

was said in the past smart, which we didn't know what they needed anyway. It's more to say that we've looked at it, we understand the essence of what SSR1 wanted to do and we think these things would carry you closer.

So, I think it's [tying] … It's just because that we stop short of just saying SSR1 recommendations. I would want to continue the sentence and say taking into account suggestions made or something like that because you have it in the next sentence of us apologize, like kind of given that disclaimer that it's not sufficiently measurable. But there's a disconnect between the first sentence and the third sentence, which starts with Appendix D. That make sense?

So, for me, it's tying it together that they should perform a comprehensive review taking into account that Appendix D …

RUSS HOUSELEY: No, that's a comma, not a period.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's a comma? Okay. It's a long sentence then.

RUSS HOUSELEY: It is a long …

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I would prefer the first part is because it starts "While SSR2 recognizes," I would want to tie recommendations and go straight into "Appendix D

offered," and then do the disclaimer at the end. It's just that I think it should be tied with them doing a comprehensive review, taking into account our Appendix D.

RUSS HOUSELEY: I see.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Rather than separating it because I think the point is lost when I read it. The other thing I just wanted to …

RUSS HOUSELEY: Like this?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. So, just to continue, it should make sense but I [can just make a it flow.] "ICANN should perform a comprehensive review of SSR1 Recommendations. Appendix D offers a table of additional actions that should be a part of such a thorough implementation of [inaudible] After comprehensive review of the implementation of [SSR1]." Yeah.

RUSS HOUSELEY: And then put this last part right here …

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And then put the last part in, yeah. It's just to kind of tie Appendix D so they're clear that we've already absolved ourselves of reviewing it. [inaudible].

And I just want to put on record as well that while I agree with Laurin's point about [the end] … Give me a second, let me just … Yeah, while I recognize the need to make the report shorter, I still wanted to just put on record that, for me, it's not about shortening the report, but demonstrating very clearly that we do understand the correlation between our work and what SSR1 did and if our work does supersede what SSR1 attempted to do but ICANN Org either failed or it's actually fully implemented, that that reference [be] not necessarily to just remove the recommendation, unless the languages are so clear that we don't ignore [probably a salient point] that SSR1 wanted to do, which we did pick up on.

And if the issue is still subsistent, we state that, that SSR1 highlighted this, while they may not have made it measurable, we have seen that this issue is still subsistent and we think that our recommendation will help to get you there. But I don't think it's just a matter of absorbing SSR1 recommendations and removing them, but we still need to make that specific, intelligent correlation to ensure that ICANN Org understands that we understood what we were doing, which is why it took us so long, how we wanted to make it very specific, very measurable, but we still understand that you have not done your work in the past four years, five years, six years.

RUSS HOUSELEY: Right.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, I just wanted this on record. My thing is not about shortening the report, but making the report comprehensive and very intelligent.

RUSS HOUSELEY: So, I'm looking at the text now. Do you think it would be better to start with the last sentence as context for what … Instead of ending?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. We could. And if you start with that sentence, probably put "ICANN should perform a further …" because, as I said, they believe they did that, which is why they have the slide deck. So, if you start with that sentence, it would have to be "ICANN Org should perform a further comprehensive review of the implementation taking into account Appendix D, which offers a table of additional actions that should be blah blah blah."

LAURIN WESSINGER: I just wanted to quickly respond or clarify because I noticed I must've been unclear. So, my idea was not to just subsume, but more I'll use the risk as an example, where essentially I think the team is going in the direction of where we can say, "If you do what we tell you, according to …" also trying to make this smart, right? So that there is a way to monitor it, "you will automatically implement SSR1 Recommendations 22, 23, 24, and 25" I think, and we can just note that in the text. So, that

is more my idea to essentially provide that link rather than to just say "We just have thrown them out," but more like to say, "Yes, we have kind of incorporated this and we have tried to make it in a way that is actually trackable and auditable later on."

So, that was more my idea, not to get rid of anything.

RUSS HOUSELEY: No, I got that. And the question is how big is that? See, the other thing to think about in structuring this is do we really to, I don't know, pick one of those recommendations you just said, if the board decides not to implement it, we don't want them not to implement the piece that was proposed by SSR1 [with something] to finish the job they started on that implementation even if they don't pick up on the piece that we want built on top of it. Does that make sense?

JABHERA MATOGORO: Hello? Yeah …

RUSS HOUSELEY: Hi.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Hi. I was just going through the text. I see that we have almost two messages to communicate. One is that ICANN Org performed its implementation, but the SSR2 sees that the implementation that has been implemented by ICANN Org was not to an extent to which the

recommendation given by SSR1 was required. And ICANN Org also gave reasons why they feel that the implementation was okay. The reason they gave is that the SSR1 recommendation was not smart. So, I support the statement that we have given that for this …

Sorry, my connection was interrupted. So, [actually, what] I wanted to say that Kerry-Ann mentioned that we could say "ICANN Org should perform a further comprehensive review of the implementation." So, in that way, we acknowledge that the implementation has been done from ICANN Org's side, but from the review that we have done, we have noted that it has not met the SSR1 intention. So, I think in that way we could have expressed what the message you want to give from this text we are trying to review here. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSELEY: Okay, I added the word "already."

JABHERA MATOGORO: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSELEY: Okay, I'm not seeing any other hands. I do think we're going to have to come back to this after we're through merging recommendations and updating.

But I think next I would like to look at Suggestion 2, which is on page 65. This was quite a bit rewritten. This basically is calling for an online tracking of each recommendation from each review team going

forward. This would allow the community to engage earlier when they notice a shortcoming in an implementation and it would make the assessment of the implementation much easier for the following review team. And then I observe that with this rewrite of Suggestion 2, it seems to subsume the original Suggestion 5 as well, which is to establish a system to track review team recommendation implementation. As Suggestion 2 was broadened to cover its original intent and that tracking, I think we are able to remove Suggestion 5.

DENISE MICHEL: The new text under Suggestion 2 looks good to me. Thanks, Russ.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry for maybe not being in the loop here, but how does this relate to the implementation shepherd process that's already in place with CCT?

RUSS HOUSELEY: That's a good question. My understanding of the shepherd thing is reaching back to the team that made the recommendation to make sure it's having the intended effect, right? Which, is in the middle of this, saying somebody from the review team should be designated, but we could maybe add a parenthetical there that says, "Building on the idea of the implementation shepherd from CCT."

DENISE MICHEL: It would be good to get an explanation from staff on what they're doing for the few CCT recommendations that the Board accepted. I suspect

I'm not the only one that isn't clear on what an implementation shepherd is and what process they're using.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, that would be good, too. We could certainly, once we know that, just be clear about how this is different, like Russ just said. It looks like maybe this, certainly the online tracking part, is more about transparency of the process and maybe implementation [inaudible] …

RUSS HOUSELY: Correct. Tracking and transparency.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, and that leads to my second question, which is why this is a suggestion and not a recommendation? Because it's not SSR2 specific?

RUSS HOUSELEY: Correct. It didn't fall in any of our workstreams.

KC CLAFFY: [All right.]

RUSS HOUSELEY: Jennifer, would it take long for us to get a short briefing on how the implementation shepherd concept is being implemented?

JENNIFER BRYCE:	Sure, that's no problem. I can ask my colleagues and perhaps they can join and give a briefing on the next call.
RUSS HOUSELEY:	Yeah, the next call or two.
DENISE MICHEL:	I'd prefer some written material, too. That would be great. I know a lot of us aren't able to make every call.
JENNIFER BRYCE:	Sure. So, we can do the call and they can pull up written materials as well.
DENISE MICHEL:	I mean, I assume there's links just describing the process. Can that be shared?
JENNIFER BRYCE:	Yeah, we can provide something to the review team. It's no problem.
DENISE MICHEL:	Thanks.

RUSS HOUSELEY:	Okay, that finishes the Subteam 1 report out. I think we … No, [inaudible] Sorry. The bottom of Appendix D, there's a new paragraph and then insert the table that has all of the actions that we felt were needed, or that we found undone, not yet done, to finish the implementation. So, I had forgotten that was in a separate spreadsheet and not in the report, so when I went looking for it, Heather had to help me find it. So, anyway, what this is is just an introduction paragraph, then followed by that table. So, as Laurin has already pointed out, we'll have to update that table again once we know what the final recommendations look like to point to the right places.

So, the other thing that Subteam 1 did was provide a response, just a few sentences, into the spreadsheet of public comments. Let's see, hopefully Brenda you can bring that up. Yes, thank you.

So, the first one is row 5. Basically, it recounts that what we're proposing is that ICANN staff implement Suggestion 2 and some of the comments were just "yes, we agree with you" and I just said "thank you" there. No change to the document.

And then such as in row 7, summarized the update to Recommendation 1 and then basically all of the ones that this team had to deal with were one of those three, except the last one, which is basically saying that we have too many implementations and they overlap and what are the adjacencies between them and the SSR1 ones. So, this is similar to the comment that Laurin had already made, so I think that we can't answer row 16 yet because, as the recommendations are being touched, we need to make sure that this

answer aligns with that. But other than that, I think Subteam 1 will be done. Any questions or concerns? Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Looks good to me. Thanks, Russ.

RUSS HOUSELEY: All right. So, KC, you were not here earlier. We had an observation from Naveed that he is leading Subteam 28, which is really about NCAP. He doesn't know enough about NCAP to lead that. Is there someone who knows more about NCAP since it's an SSAC thing, besides you?

KC CLAFFY: Let's see. I mean, I can find out. So, you can throw me on that group. Throw me on the team. There is an NCAP working group, or whatever they call them, on SSAC but it actually had long ago figured out it couldn't do the work itself because it was too much work, so they actually pioneered this new model that is ICANN funds a third party to do the work and the SSAC working group is sort of an overseer to that process.

Now, what happened recently is the paid consultant finished a report, it went to the group, but I'm not on that group, I just heard about it, and then I don't think it's come to the full SSAC yet. I don't think it does come to the full SSAC, which there was some consternation about. So, I'll go find out more, but that's my understanding of where in the process that is. I don't know if that report's been approved and presumably it'll get published when it's approved.

RUSS HOUSELEY: So, on the table that we have now, [you've been looking at it].

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSELEY: The ones that were assigned to 28, which is row 255 through 263. And you'll see that all of those have NCAP in the comment. But this will help you understand what the nature of the question is, and it may be we missed something.

KC CLAFFY: All right, let me go look.

RUSS HOUSELEY: But if you can find us a resource to sort this, that'd be very appreciated.

KC CLAFFY: Wait, I can't see. Which one? This is the not the sheet with the … Somebody put on the chat the sheet with the …

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It's the "Organized by Section" tab. So, the second tab, not the first one, which is organized by submitter.

KC CLAFFY: I only see one tab.

RUSS HOUSELEY: Sorry. Thank you, Heather.

KC CLAFFY: What do you mean? I only see one tab that says, "Sheet 1." Oh, tab on the browser. Sorry.

RUSS HOUSELEY: It's in the Google Doc. Or Google Spreadsheet, whatever they call that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The comments spreadsheet. We don't have that on the screen right now.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. But it's also not in the email that went out, so I have to [look it up].

RUSS HOUSELEY: It is in my email.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, fine. You guys are taxing me at an early hour here. Yes, [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSELEY: Yes it is.

KC CLAFFY: All right. I'll go look at the NCAP documents and I will get together with Naveed and try to give him a little more material to work with.

RUSS HOUSELEY: Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Yep.

RUSS HOUSELEY: All right, is there anything else we need to talk about today? Okay, so just an encouragement for the Subteams to keep working. Laurin said that the group of teams that are focusing on the risk are going to try to have a result for next week. Hopefully other teams are making good progress, too.

                             All right, I'm not hearing anything else for today, not seeing any hands. We'll give you back 15 minutes then. Thank you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Bye everybody.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

JABHERA MOTOGORO: Thank you. Bye.

UNIDENFITIED MALE: Thanks, [inaudible].

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]