SSR2 RT Plenary Call Report
Plenary Call #132
17 December 2020 – 15:00 – 17:00 UTC

Review Team Members Boban Krsic, Danko Jevtovic, Jabhera Matogoro, Kaveh Ranjbar, KC Claffy, Kerry-Ann Barrett, Laurin Weissinger, Krishna Pariyar, Russ Housley, Zarko Kecic, Norm Ritchie, Scott McCormick **Apologies** Denise Michel	**Observers** Dennis Tan, Olevie Kouami **Technical Writer** Heather Flanagan **ICANN Org** Brenda Brewer, Jennifer Bryce, Steve Conte, Pamela Smith

These high-level notes are designed to help SSR2 Review Team members navigate through the content of the call. They are not meant to be a substitute for the recording or transcript, which are posted on the wiki here: https://community.icann.org/x/DAENCQ.

The SSR2 Review Team undertook the following during this session:

1. **Welcome, roll call, SOI updates**

See attendance record above. No SOI updates provided.

2. **Discuss comments/concerns regarding SSR2 Final Draft Google document (please add comments to the document in advance of the call)**

The team discussed the following:

- Recommendations 3.1 and 4.1: Russ noted there is overlap here and suggested these be merged into one recommendation.
- Recommendation 18 – Russ noted the "This recommendation can be considered effective when…" text is not accurate. The team agreed to adjust it to say something along the lines of, "when the information becomes more accessible", vs. when the effects of the policy can be seen.
- Recommendation 20 – Russ noted a disconnect between findings and recommendation text. Findings text includes "propagation delay", which is not included in the recommendation text. The team agreed to remove the "propagation delay" text from the findings and outcomes.
- KC raised two overarching issues with the document: Problems are not clearly identified, and it is not clear how is the solution going to be measured. One example was discussed in detail:
   - Recommendation 2.2 and 2.3: KC noted it is not clear what finding leads to these recommendations. Laurin suggested to put this recommendation at the bottom of the section, and will revisit his notes on this section to see if there is additional findings text that can be included.

- KC suggested given that some of the recommendations are not SMART, it would be good to say at the beginning of the document that they tried to make SMART recommendations, but as a Review Team did not always have all the information required to make this assessment. Some recommendations are not therefore SMART and this gap should be filled by the implementation planning. KC agreed to write text to this point that will go in the 'executive summary' section of the document. Laurin also suggested additional text for this section to explain why some of the recommendations are so long.
- Recommendation 3: KC noted the findings do not support the recommendation. Heather also noted there is no clear problem statement. Scott noted some examples of best practices, which he will send to Heather for inclusion in the report.
- Recommendation 6.1: KC said she's not clear how the ISMS piece differs from the previous ISO discussions on this in the document, so it is confusing to readers that it's brought up again here. Laurin noted there is connection between the standards and agreed that a sentence to acknowledge that these best practices are linked together would be useful.
- Recommendation 7: The team discussed making it clearer that the team is looking for geographical and political diversity – whether a third site is added, or a new second site replaces one of the existing sites can be left up to ICANN.
- Recommendation 9.2: KC asked where ICANN is supposed to get the "over 50 complaints" – there was agreement that this should be rewritten slightly to clarify.
- Recommendation 9.4: KC noted that compliance doesn't "address security threats" and suggested this should be edited to make it more accurate.
- Recommendation 10.2: "Analyze the types of complaints and their impact" – KC noted that this is not clear. Laurin suggested to remove "and their impact", to which there were no objections.
- Root zone data and IANA registries: Laurin raised concerns about the wording of this section and sought input from the team as to if there are changes needed. Heather and Laurin discussed proposed clarifications to be incorporated.
- Timelines included in the SMART criteria: Laurin raised a concern that some of the timelines may be too aggressive, or not reasonable. The team had a discussion about this. Based on the discussion, Russ asked Heather to take out the timelines and put a general statement in that is in line with KC's previous comments about SMART and asks the timelines to be considered as part of the implementation planning, with input from the Implementation Shepherds.
- Appendix D: KC noted concerns with SSR1 methodology text. Heather reminded the team that the 'Process and methodology' section of this report shouldn't change because this part of the document has already been agreed to over numerous iterations.
- Additional editorial changes were discussed. Heather will incorporate these suggestions and reach out to commenters in the document for clarifications, where necessary.

Russ asked for consensus from the team on the substantive issues discussed on the call. No Review Team members on the call raised issues. Therefore, Russ noted that this set of recommendations has consensus from the team, noting that those Review Team members not on the call will have a chance to see the changes in email. Russ noted that he will ask those who were not on the call to raise any concerns on-list. Team members agreed that this would be a good approach.

Action item: Heather to reach out to KC to work together on text for the 'executive summary' section of the document to acknowledge that some recommendations are not SMART, and gaps may need to be filled by the implementation planning.

Action item: Scott to send Heather the control number of the documents he referenced for inclusion in the CISO position findings.

Action item: Russ to send a note to the email list to advise team members who were not on the call of the changes discussed and agreed to by those in attendance. He will ask for those not on the call to raise any concerns that they have on list.

Action item: Heather to incorporate the changes discussed on the call today, and share an updated document with the team for review.

Decision reached: The team members on the call reached consensus on the recommendations, with the changes discussed on the call. Another final call will be taken via email.

3. **Discuss results of the prioritization survey**

Laurin presented findings from the prioritization survey, noting that 10 members had completed the survey. Laurin will provide a table that summarizes the prioritization of the recommendations, for inclusion in the report. Kerry-Ann noted a challenge with prioritizing, in that there was no reference to guide what the team considers as 'high' and 'low'. She noted that respondents to the survey may have been using different criteria, so they should explain this in the report.

With regard to the 'suggestions' included in the document; Russ suggested that these should be reorganized based on priority order.

Action item: Laurin to send Heather the table of prioritization for inclusion in the report, along with short text on the methodology.

4. **Next steps**

   a. **Next plenary meeting scheduled for Thursday 14th January (15:00 - 17:00 UTC) - purpose of this meeting is to discuss the public comment response spreadsheet**

Heather will update the report to incorporate the items discussed and agreed to on the call today, to be circulated the week of 21st December. Team members should look at this document ahead of the next plenary call. By 10th January, Heather will circulate the public comment spreadsheet to the team, which will be the topic of the call on 14th January.

Russ will call for final consensus on the document via email.

5. **AOB**

None raised.

6. **Confirm action items / decisions reached**

Action items and decisions were read for the record.

Consensus reached on decisions/action items: Yes