BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary #128 on the 12th of November 2020 at 15:00 UTC. Members attending the call today include Danko, Denise, Laurin, Ram Krishna, and Russ. Observer, Dennis Tan. Apologies from Boban. From ICANN Org, we have Jennifer, Steve, Brenda, and Technical Writer, Heather.

Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Russ, I'll turn the meeting over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So we just have one subteam that needs to report out. We had a really good 45-minute discussion over one issue that, of course, blossomed out and covered many issues regarding the approach being taken by the Abuse Subteam. The Abuse Subteam has gotten together and has a direction they want to share with us to hopefully resolve that. If everyone's in agreement with the approach they're taking, then we will have final text for next week or at least a complete text. So at this point, I want to turn it over to—is it going to be Denise or Laurin who walks us through this?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm not sure. I mean, Denise can speak better to the edits that she made yesterday that I'm not yet fully privy to. But I have my e-mail opened so maybe while she opens the text, I will talk about what we discussed. So essentially, we had a call yesterday and we decided on the last actions

for this. Number one is obviously to respond to and work through the points that came up during the discussion, making clear what is possible, what isn't, what it's meant, what isn't meant, stuff like that. We also said we would provide some more detail to the involvement of the community, so give more knots but also include into the text more the kind of activities by the GAC, by ALAC, by SSAC, etc., just to demonstrate where everything stands and what different constituencies are doing, just for completeness sake and to also make sure that no one feels they're being left out or their initiatives and work is not being recognized.

Then we have one action—I'm not sure how Denise has actually tackled it so far—and that is why the Abuse Subteam is recommending something that is not PDP for a variety of these actions, essentially talking about why the subteam kind of feels that this is not working, and thus, why something else is coming in. We wanted to add a little bit more detail as well on the Cross-Community Working Group approach, linking it to the issue with the PDP when it comes to abuse and to show, "Okay. This is why we're going with that rather than the other." And then in addition, obviously, we are still working on some of the references and sites and stuff like that. But from my quick reading, I've seen that a lot more has been added. As we said, after this call, if everyone's happy after more input, we'll take a bit more time and then you should all have something very soon with a lot of days to read, discuss, and understand. Then we can have the call for consensus next week.

Denise, do you want to maybe talk a little bit about like the actual changes to the text you've made, or would this get too long? I'm not sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Denise, if you're talking, you're muted.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: We might have lost her. She mentioned yesterday that she's somewhere with not too good Internet. So we might be able to cycle back once that recovers.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, this is Denise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hey, we hear you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Now it's working.

DENISE MICHEL: Now, Laurin did a great job summarizing. I think we're on track to provide more fulsome explanations and more background as we discussed last week. But we should have the text ready for the full team I think soon.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Given the explanation that we just heard from Laurin, Danko, are you happy with the direction you're taking? Do you think it addresses the comment you raised?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Generally, yes. My comments are there to maybe give a bit of different questions and to support the work of the team. So I'm just happy that some of the discussion was provoked, some of the things were clarified, and I believe that the position in Denise's comment as changes is more clearly stating the intent of the team. So I'm very happy with the progress. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anybody else have comments they want to share with the team while this drafting takes place to help guide it? Okay. So we look forward to the more complete text in the next couple of days so that we can read it prior to the call a week from today.

Next we're going to talk about Appendix D. Heather sent a flurry of e-mails about different SSR1 recommendations. Basically, what happened was in the move of the SSR1-related increment recommendations into the body of our document because we found that there was such overlap, with the removal of that text, sometimes it left a very confused result. And so she has raised questions with the people who did the SSR1 research back at the beginning. I don't know if I'm the only one that was copied on all the e-mails, but Heather's been extremely busy

and many of them have been resolved but many of them are still open. So, Heather, I'd like you to walk us through which ones are still open and what you need from the people who did that research.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Sure. Russ, I'm happy and sad to tell you that you are not actually copied on everyone.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I am happy but I was like, "Whoa."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right. I did send them out as individual messages to control the threading of the discussion. We do have two documents. They're like two in the agenda. I'll also put them in the chat. The first one is just—it looks like Jennifer has already done it—capturing exactly what questions I was asking about each recommendation. And the other one is a link to the text itself. Some of these should be comparatively easy to resolve but others may require some more discussion. Ideally, we would finish this via e-mail because we don't have a whole lot of time to get through all of this.

Keep in mind that one of the key points was the Appendix is not a place to have recommendations. We're capturing our conclusion about each SSR1 recommendation. We were trying to be clear as to whether it was relevant, whether it was implemented in any way, shape, or form, and did it achieve its intended effect. These are actually three separate questions, such that it can be relevant, it can be partially implemented,

and in that partial implementation, it actually had the intended effect or it wasn't implemented at all but other changes in ICANN show that it had its intended—there's different variables and I don't know for each one exactly where we stand.

So that was a lot of the repeated questions you'll see. So, for example, going to the Appendix D questions document, where for just even SSR1, we say this recommendation remains relevant was partially implemented but did not achieve its intended effect. We're not actually very clear and what we think the intended effect was. That was a recurring question that KC and I had throughout the document. Go ahead.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you have this table and there's still more to say. There's some rows that are not filled in and there's a thread for each one of those rows.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, the hope is that they will all be green. That means you'll know what the answer is by the call next week. Is that right?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Ideally, I would have liked it by today, but the call next week will work too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, given that we didn't get it today is what I meant. Yes.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: There is one exception, Recommendation 12. There were so many questions in the body of the document that I simply said, "Okay. There's a lot of questions here. You need to go look at the document to figure out how to answer them."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. There were so many questions, you need to go look at them. The body of what document? The one you've been working on?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No. The Appendix D doc. This is all about Appendix D.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Everything in this conversation is scoped to Appendix D.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Good. Okay. Denise, that was yours. Will you have time to deal with this, or do we need to assign it to someone else?

DENISE MICHEL: No. I'll take a look at it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, Laurin has his hand up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I'm staring at the document with very few green rows. Go
                          ahead, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just a quick question. Heather, is the idea to essentially add a sentence
                          like I think I did to the Abuse section to just have one or two sentences
                          each time? Like, we're covering the SMART criteria elsewhere and we
                          might have to add some of these as well, I fear. It's just the same idea
                          for this, just so I know what I'm responding to.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, for example, you are responsible for SSR1 Recommendation 4.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: The answer is yes.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Great. Then that's done, you're done.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Because I have been taking liberties with my editorial pen and trying to guess what you all intended, in the hope that we could move this along. I'm not making any assumptions about how these are necessarily answered. A lot of them are verifying the accuracy of something I said. There are others that you were copied on. Perhaps you want to take some of the information into the Abuse Subteam, I don't know. I'm looking specifically at how do I clean up this Appendix.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are there any of these you want to talk about now, Heather?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Recommendation 5 is low-hanging fruit. That wasn't actually assigned to any one person, as far as I could tell, and it's hopefully a yes or no question. Hopefully, the answer is yes. The statement that I made about Recommendation 3 that the intended effect of working from a consistent terminology instead of descriptions for SSR-related material was not achieved—is that an accurate statement?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is a true statement and that also ties back to #1.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Great. That is resolved.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any others we could quickly answer?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: You want quick the ones? Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. How about the ones that are blocking work? They're all blocking work.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: [Inaudible] to that. I'm happy to zip through the low-hanging fruit ones and just get them out of the way. The next easy and obvious one would be Recommendation 14 where I've made the statement, "This recommendation remains relevant but has not been implemented, and therefore, did not achieve its intended effect of improving the timeliness, relevancy, and appropriateness of ICANN's SSR-related outreach activities." Is that statement accurate?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't remember what 14 was about.

EN

DENISE MICHEL:	Yes, it is.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	It is? Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Great. I will mark that resolved. Okay, Recommendation 18. Again, is this an accurate statement to make about Recommendation 18? The original recommendation was that ICANN should conduct an annual operational review of its progress in implementing the SSR framework and include this assessment as a component of the following year's SSR framework. My statement was, "It is not achieved its intended effect as a community remains unable to track as SSR-related activities in a reasonable timeframe." No, wait. That's the wrong one. Shoot. It's the one above it. My statement was, "This recommendation remains relevant. The SSR2 Review Team wasn't able to find any evidence of neither internal review nor public process review that would have resulted in regular updates to the SSR framework, and so cannot determine whether this recommendation achieved its intended results."

DENISE MICHEL:	Is that what we had previously on this?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:	The only thing you really had previously was that the recommendation remained relevant was not implemented. You had the rationale for it, but I'm trying to summarize the conclusion.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. I'll go back and look at the previous SSR1 document. So the issue there is that, technically, staff to no longer does SSR frameworks. So it wasn't implemented. At least we weren't provided evidence that it was fully implemented but they no longer do frameworks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. So the way they're approaching this has changed. But if I remember when we did this work, they had not yet done the cut over either because the frameworks were still out there. Sorry, it's getting to be a while ago.

DENISE MICHEL: I'll take a look at that again and provide what my [recollection is].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. That was originally assigned to Scott. I can drop a note and copy you just to note that you're going to look at as well.

DENISE MICHEL: How about this? Me as backup if you don't hear from Scott.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Fair enough.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I can take a look at that today.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Thanks, Scott.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Awesome.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Scott, I sent it out to your Gmail account. Was that okay?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: No. If you've been sending at Gmail, I haven't been getting it then. You need to go to my reciprocitylabs.com, my work account.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Will do. I'll send it all. We'll send it all there.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: The 19 is connected as well, right? Heather?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Well, 19 I checked in with Naveed. My question for that one was, was it accurate to say that that recommendation has not achieved its intended effect as the community remains unable to track SSR-related activities in a reasonable timeframe?
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Yeah. I think that's true. It's even more confused without the framework. Or at least I'm one of the people who's confused.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Okay.
DENISE MICHEL:	Yeah. It's not clear to me what is replacing the framework.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Sure. Here's a thing to note, though. I'm trying to avoid redoing research here. I just want to make it clear enough for publication. I mean, there's going to be points where look at this and say, "But things change. But this happened. But new report."
DENISE MICHEL:	Yeah. This is one of them.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	This is one of those we have to draw the line.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're right. And now we can't open new cans. We need to just go back to where we got. You're correct, Heather. Thank you for making that point very clear. People may have to refresh their memory. This was a while ago.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Understood. I don't have many other perhaps easy questions. So, for example, recommendation 24 where we say it did not achieve the intended effect. I mean, the intended effect was to have a charter and role and responsibility for the Chief Security Officer team.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. That was my recollection.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was easy.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Great. I'm going to mark that resolved. Yay.

Let's look at Recommendation 27. The rationale points to lots of disparate pieces of information. So my question there was about, did this recommendation achieve its intended effect because there seems

to be information out there, which suggests partial. And only partial since it's in so many different locations, it's hard to find. Or would you say it hadn't achieved its intended effect at all? I could do some clarity on this.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Heather, it's Kerry. I can probably try to explain what I was trying to explain in e-mails. What we gathered was that the information always existed as it is now. What Recommendation 27 under SSR1 was trying to say was to pull it together into one comprehensive format, and it wasn't that there was no existence of a definition or framework somewhere floats on their own. What we found is that what SSR1 Recommendation 27 wanted, which is why we tried to recommend in SSR2 as well is to now pull it back together. It's still from our perspective, it's not a matter of being partial because we still haven't noticed a good faith effort to find risk management frameworks in a comprehensive spot in ICANN. So it was difficult to say it was partial. I'd like to say full. I guess it's partial because we still go back to that the information is out there. Some of it has been updated but it's still not comprehensive. I hope that helps. That's what we're trying to explain. It wasn't a matter of us just not wanting to say partial, it's just that was still difficult to even say partial because there was no good faith effort found to make it comprehensive.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I can work with that text then. Note to myself. There's a similar query to 28. Kerry-Ann, was this the one that you tossed back over to

Boban? I know you did one of them and I remember. What we say is the conclusion remains relevant was not fully implemented. We don't say anything about the intended effect. There does seem to be active coordination between OCTO and various ICANN groups that conduct threat detection. So I wasn't sure if we would say it was partially effective or was something else intended.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Scott's on the call. I'm not on that one. Scott?

EN

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Sorry. What was the question on that?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: For SSR1 Recommendation 28, which was, "ICANN should continue to act to be engaged in threat detection and mitigation and participate in efforts to distribute the threat and incident information." The conclusion was, "This recommendation remains relevant. It was not fully implemented." It doesn't say anything about whether it achieved any part of its intended effect. The rationale does point to several instances of active coordination between OCTO and various ICANN groups that conduct threat detection. So I was unclear as to whether we wanted to say it was partially effective or if there was something in here that says it was not effective at all because I couldn't tell what the intended effect was supposed to be.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah. I would say that it's definitely partially. It's not fully effective, though, because it's still not including the greater community. They have choice players that are playing in that threat [intel] space.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. All right. I can work with that. Russ, we have 30 minutes. Do we want to just go through some of the more difficult ones then?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Let's go ahead because we have the team here. Let's see what we can get resolved.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I bring your attention, ladies and gentlemen, to SSR1 Recommendation 7, which said, "ICANN should build on its current SSR framework by establishing a clear set of objectives and prioritizing its initiatives and activities in accordance with these objectives." I had five separate questions against this recommendation. Well, between KC and I, there were five.

The first one, is this statement correct about the intended effect? I wrote, "The intended effect of having a clear publicly reviewed SSR objectives and prioritization effort was not achieved." Is that correct?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is certainly true, especially with the overlap with the change in the way they approach frameworks.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Great. The second question regarding the first bullet in the rationale. It indicates that the process for updating SSR-related documents was redesigned by ICANN. Is there anything that we can point to that describes a change, or can we describe what the change was?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know if there is a document that describes what they're doing in lieu of frameworks, which is kind of what your number two is asking, point to what they are doing.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It was one of KC's questions. Since we say the process for updating SSR-related documents has been redesigned, how is it redesigned? It isn't apparently captured anywhere so that's vague.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, perhaps if she can't finish that sentence about how, then it's hard to find. That's an issue, well, if she can't find it on the ICANN website.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: What if we say the process for updating SSR-related documents is not clear? It's not clear and could not be found on the ICANN website. Okay. And the SSR mission and approach was published in 2015. What was the thing published in 2015?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was the last framework.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I can find that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's a 15 September 2016.

EN

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. All right. I will find that. The second bullet in the rationale says there's a lack of community input and a clear framework of how strategy informs SSR activities. The first question is for the lack of community input, KC wanted a bit more explanation as to where did the review team expect to see the community input because she thinks there was actually too much.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But if you up level to what the point was, it was to get to the community to agree on the prioritization of the SSR activities, and that just never happened.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I can adjust that.

DENISE MICHEL: There may have been discussions with SSAC that she is on and familiar with but that's only a part of the more fulsome process of community discussions and providing a clear set of objectives and initiatives.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Fair enough. The second question on that same bullet was around the clear framework of how strategy informs SSR activities. She wanted some clarification as to what that means.
KC CLAFFY:	I'm actually here, guys. I'm trying to figure out, is this the KSK Rollover? Which recommendation is this?
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	This is SSR1 Recommendation 7.
KC CLAFFY:	About SSR framework.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Yes. And this is where I was transcribing the most recent transcription of your comments into a file.
KC CLAFFY:	Is it the highlighted text?
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	It is a highlighted text. If you go down to SSR1 Recommendation 7, the second –

EN

KC CLAFFY: I mean the content that we're on right now, the green highlight on the screen.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm looking at the document itself. I'm not looking at the screen.

RUSS HOUSLEY: On the screen, it's Recommendation 7, item #5.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Yeah. So what was envisioned was what community agreement, is that what we're saying?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, the point is that with the getting rid of the SSR framework, this conversation, we don't know how to find it.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Then I guess the problem here is someone's going to read that and go, "Well, okay, what level of detail and planning is SSR2 implying that SSR1 envisioned?"

RUSS HOUSLEY: But it's fair to say that whatever the level is, with the removal of that whole activity, it's gone.

KC CLAFFY: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That way, I don't think we need to dig to—did we turn it to 11? We can't even find the knob.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I adore that analogy but I'm not quite sure how to fit it into this for now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You'll find a place to use it at some point.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: At some point it's definitely going in there, yes, but maybe not right here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But did we give you enough for you to resolve the text?

EN

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That's kind of more of a question for—all right, what are you guys looking at on your screen? Okay. You're looking at that. KC, can you open the Appendix D document itself? Are you in a position to do so?

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, guys. I have network issues. I'm going to try to reboot from my cell phone. Sorry that I went away. Yes, I'll try to open D.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Because, Russ, the challenge for me to answer your question is this wasn't my question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I know. I saw the redirection you did.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes. I did have a question, though.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The path was fumbled.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Indeed. While KC—as soon as she can get into the Appendix D document, one of the questions I did have was on the third bullet of the rationale where we say, "It is apparent that a level planning exists." It is apparent. Where is it apparent? Was this part of interviews with OCTO? Is this something on a website?

DENISE MICHEL: Well, currently there's a strategic plan or strategic and operating plan. There are SSR elements in there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There a lot of SSR elements in the strategic plan.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Outside of that, I don't know.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, if we say that the apparent level of planning I can point to as evidenced of the existence of the SOP and the procedure to build it.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: Can someone put the link to Appendix D in the document? I've no hope here. I mean in the chat.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Sure. Just a second. Got it?

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Thanks.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: We're essentially in the top half of page six.

KC CLAFFY: Thanks. Are you waiting for me, or what are we waiting for?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The question for you is, you had a question on the rationale, bullet two, about where you've highlighted "Clear framework of how strategy informs SSR activities," and you said, "What does it mean?"

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. You're saying they had an SSR framework long ago and they stopped using it, or you're saying they never had a framework that we considered clear?

RUSS HOUSLEY: The latter, I think, when they stopped publishing the framework. I think that that means we can't find it and neither can anybody in the community.

EN

HEATHER FLANAGAN: If they stopped publishing it, there's nothing to find.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly. I mean, they published a strategic plan but not the framework. And this is all about the framework, right? This whole recommendation is about the framework that they don't do anymore.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. But they did at that time, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

KC CLAFFY: Do we say that in here? I don't even see that.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think we talked about it in our new recommendations. In our new recommendations, we talked about the need to make sure that is done more regularly but not specifically to the SSR1 recommendation. In the new recommendation, we speak about needing to have this as a more iterative process and publicize in terms of the results.

EN

HEATHER FLANAGAN:	What I can put in the SSR1 rationale is a clear framework of how strategy informs SSR activities, given that the previous framework model ended with nothing apparently replacing it. I'll word it like that. Does that make sense to you, KC?
KC CLAFFY:	Yes. Again, I'm putting myself in the mind of a reviewer who doesn't have all the context that we have about, "Oh, there was a framework, then they don't have it anymore. So how can it be effective?" And I'm also putting myself in the context of the ICANN zone position was they did all of these recommendations. So presumably on the slide that they gave us that said they did this recommendation, they pointed to what they considered the framework. I just think we ought to be clear that, yeah, this is what we mean by we disagree with they did it rather than there's no clear framework.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Okay. You also had a couple questions on the third bullet of this rationale.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Sorry, Heather. Before you go, because of the statements KC just made, the footnote that's there, does that lead to the footnote with that 2016 report?
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	No. That's something I need to add.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So probably just make a note of that, because I think the point that KC made I think it's valid in the sense that we recognize this was done all the way back, and then just here it is. But guess what, since then there's been nothing. So that will kind of add to the logic that you just spoke about.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I want to avoid the perception from some people or the ability for some people to argue that this is not a fair assessment. It's not well substantiated blah, blah, blah. So that's just why I want to make sure when we say claims like there's no community input, there's no clear framework, we don't have someone else who can point to, "Look, here's community input right there. They went through the process. And here's the framework." So obviously, we shouldn't listen to any of these assessments because they didn't do it [for free].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Fair enough. Based on this discussion, I think the last KC comment I want to approach is on the third bullet in this rationale where we have a sentence that says, "The level of detail and planning envisioned in their recommendation does not seem to be provided in public discussions," and KC asks, "How do we know it was envisioned?"

KC CLAFFY:	Yeah. What public discussions are we pointing at? And "seemed to be," like, we should not be using "seemed to be" here if we're making these kinds of claims. So every word of this made me cringe.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	For what it's worth, I have a hard time trying to dive into, how do we know it was envisioned? The whole Appendix D is about SSR2's understanding of the SSR1 recommendations and their intent. So, I mean, what further detail would be appropriate to go into regarding, "Well, we've done the homework to research this."
KC CLAFFY:	Well, we state at the beginning of this whole thing, we say it was impossible to do this because we didn't have data, etc., and now we're basically pretending we didn't say that. We're pretending we can do this and we know exactly what SSR1 envision. I don't think we can have it both ways.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	That's fair.
DENISE MICHEL:	Well, I think the team brought a common sense understanding of the SSR1 recommendations and the Board adopting them and directing that they all be implemented, and then staff saying we've implemented all of them, providing the slides with some links on what was implemented. In most cases, that was cursory and not with a reasonable reading of the

recommendation and the work that they pointed to, in most cases, fully implemented in the judgment of whoever was assigned this recommendation. And independent research and discussions uncovered some additional material and I think in places that's reflected.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, in what places now? That one just just surprised me. What additional detail?

DENISE MICHEL: No. I'm just speaking broadly. There's that slide show which passes for an implementation report and in looking at these recommendations over the course of three years, there were other presentations and there were other meetings. Other things were found on the website that people found to be relevant that wasn't in the slide presentation. It's that.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. So, guys, the first sentence in this bullet says, "It's apparent that a level of planning exists within the OCTO." I don't know how it's apparent. I don't know what a level of planning mean.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That at least we resolved, at least in the earlier discussion where we said the fact that there is a SOP that has SSR elements and a procedure to build that SOP that that's something I can clarify now.

EN

KC CLAFFY: And why is that not acceptable replacement for a framework?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I have no idea.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Again, it's such a strawman. It is way too easy to blow this off for even a neutral party to say, "Look, they're pointing at a strategic operating plan. They're saying that it appears to be informed by the SSR framework, and now they're saying there's no clear framework." The lack of community input seemed –

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. There is no framework.

KC CLAFFY: We say in the first bullet the SOP appears to be informed by the SSR framework. So we acknowledge the existence of a framework.

RUSS HOUSLEY: In 2016 that was true and they stopped doing it. So I don't see how we could … You're right. The words need to be fixed. But the conclusion doesn't –

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	So then we want to say, "It was being informed by," and then we say that framework ceased to be completed or failed to be completed.
KC CLAFFY:	Is that the current operating plan? Is it some previous operating plan? And what year of framework is it, the 2015 framework?
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Yeah, the FY15 to 16 is the last one they did that I could find.
KC CLAFFY:	And that's what we mean by SSR mission and approach? We mean framework by those words in the last sentence of bullet one? And that's what we're going to link to? I don't know how a reviewer or a reader is going to figure all this stuff out that's in our heads. Well, it's not in my head.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	I think we just need to put a footnote on that to point to the doc.
KC CLAFFY:	Or call it a framework, if it's something we're referring to above.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Yes, it is.

EN

KC CLAFFY:	Then we need to say when we imply there's lack of a clear framework, that might mean there is a framework, but it's not clear. Is it the framework we mean in the last sentence?
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	I think probably the word "comprehensive" again is probably more useful. I think because everybody's technical, using the term framework mean there's something established, something that's at a map to an existing standard that somebody could refer back to. I think the framework that we're referring to is the fact that there's no comprehensive process that's evident to anybody in terms of how they're doing it. I think what probably is emotive is the words "appears to be informed" and then in the bottom it is "apparent," and those are words that are highlighted. So I think it's just more of saying exactly what Russ just said.
	In the SOP, it was linked in 2016 to this. Since then, we have not seen any clear directives or clear association with an established process where it should come in the form of a [inaudible] to state exactly as Russ just said it. And take off emotive words of "appears to be" and "apparent". I know we tried not to be direct. But I think what KC is calling for in here is that because we're talking about a very direct absence of a very systematic approach to this, we want to just say that.
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah, I don't think we get to say, "Appears to be a piece of crap," and then say it throughout the document. If we're going to make accusations like this, they have to be solid.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that a really good point but I think we're sort of evolving it. The thing is, this is really helpful feedback. So, KC, if no one said it, thanks for going at it like this because I think it really tightens up the wording.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Unfortunately, I had to tighten the wording myself. Again, as Heather repeated before, I would say there's too much community input on SSR stuff. It's just that we don't like the input that ICANN listens to.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think part of what I hear you saying is, basically, you're sort of identifying in our words what's actionable and what can we really demonstrate. And I think that's kind of our objection to a lot of feedback is what's actionable and where is it actually substantive and helpful. I mean, perhaps that's the way to attenuate this wording is to say that the feedback hasn't been constructive. Obviously, we don't want it to be emotive. So we have to figure out the right way to say it, but isn't that the objection, a lot of noise and a lot of signal?

KC CLAFFY: Well, I'd be even stronger. My view is that the feedback from certain stakeholders is weighted more. So there's an abundance of community input. Most of it comes from stakeholders who have resources to spend a lot of time providing community input. And that is also the set of stakeholders that fund ICANN. So it is natural to expect that that sort of

community input would be weighted more, and that is in fact what we see in the SSR framework document, strategy planning, operations, whatever. It's straightforward and we seem to be dancing around it here and pretending like another outcome is a reasonable thing to expect.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Heather, we have like four minutes. Can we wrap this one, and then wrap the call?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I've got enough information to try and take a stab at it but it's going to need the group to see if I got it right. And I will be working on that as well as the other ones that we did resolve and I need to create some text on 27 and 28. Scott, I will be resending you the ones that are still open questions that went to the wrong address. I'll do that later today as well. Then there's still a bunch left, unfortunately. So I will be sending out reminders asking people to take a look at those, where possible. We're going to have to come back on a call and discuss it again.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Folks, please, please respond to those e-mails so that we can have this behind us for the call next week.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Russ, I had one question before we run off.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I don't know if this was discussed at the chair level or anything. Because we're getting so close to wind, are we planning to do a two-hour session or something like that or zero session when we have everything cleaned up? I haven't heard any discussions on it so I was just wondering if it's something that we're contemplating to block. Like how we would have done the face to face to kind of read the whole text together, and then agree once and for all. I know the minor changes we are doing now, we're doing it weekly, but I just wondered if there are plans in the future for us to have a longer session to finalize.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, you're thinking ahead, and that's good. Where our heads are at the moment is once we have agreement on the text for the Abuse team next week is the hope that we will have that agreement. Then we will give Heather two weeks to put the document into shape. If she has questions like the ones that were dealt with today, we'll deal with that in the call between week, and then at the end of that two weeks we will have the, "Hey, everybody, did we've reach consensus with this document?" That's the call we're thinking about making longer.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: All right, great. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Do we think we have room in the budget maybe to hire a voice actor like Morgan Freeman or something? I'm thinking lots of penguins to read the document. I mean, that would get a lot of our members to pay attention. I think it'd be really cool if you could just have Morgan Freeman read the document to us.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think we should have this [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: It should be somebody with a Darth Vader mask on.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. James Earl Jones. Perfect.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right, guys, we really got a good minute left. So thank you very much for hanging in and please answer those e-mails so that we could have a super productive call next week.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Take it easy, everyone.

DENISE MICHEL: Bye, everybody.

EN

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]