BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call #133 on the 14th of January 2021 at 1500 UTC.

The members attending the call today include Boban, Eric, KC, Ram Krishna, Russ, Danko, Norm, Laurin, Kaveh, and Kerry-Ann. Observer: Olévié. Attending from ICANN Org is Brenda, Jennifer, Pamela, and Steve. Technical writer Heather Flanagan is on the call. We also have Scott and Naveed joining us we speak.

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

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Thank you. The point of today's call is to see whether we have received consensus on the final report and to deal with three boxes in the public review comment and how they may affect the report.

The first thing I'd like to do is go through the comments that have been added to the final report and see if we can resolve those. There are actually not too many of them, and two of them have to do with the Public Comment table that we'll get to next.

Okay. So, the first comment was on page 19. Kerry-Ann just wanted to check about the number in the paragraph in the middle of the page.

Heather, you put a response into the document. Kerry-Ann, are you satisfied with that, or is there more to say?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	The one that's on the screen is a different comment. I think it's above, Brenda. I don't know who's managing the …
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Middle of page 19.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Yes, she's on it now. Yeah, so the only thing I had a problem with was … I saw Heather's response. It's just that the sentence, I just didn't want it to … I don't know who's reading one section or who will pay attention to it. It just says, "The team determined that there are 27 recommendations to be considered high priority."

It's just that how we have it grouped, as Heather put, "It's 24 groups of recommendations resulting in 63 specific recommendations." She said they weren't calling it sub-recommendations or anything like that. Yeah.

So, I think it should be fine. It's just that it just stood out to me like if someone read it and they saw that at the top we said that we had 24 recommendations and they came on here to see that we have 27 recommendations. The references just weren't adding up to me.

So, that was it. It was just unclear. But Heather said we don't call the big type of recommendations … She said we don't call the 2.1 "sub-recommendations." That's the comment she responded.

But if everyone else is fine with it, I'm not going to hold up the consensus just based on that. It just stood out to me that if I was to put it out as a report or put it out as anything, it just seems confusing.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	I see your point. They're numbered 24 above and then down here you say …
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	27 of them are considered high priority.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Yeah.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	I know it's a sub-recommendation.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	If I may make a recommendation. What if we said that the team determined "27 specific recommendations" to match the language above?
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Yeah. That would probably be better. It's just that if somebody read it, it just [inaudible].
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	No, I understand. But if that would work …?
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Does anyone object to that?

KC CLAFFY:	I don't object to that, but I don't think that would work.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay.
KC CLAFFY:	If we're calling the sub—
RUSS HOUSLEY:	What do you think would be better?
KC CLAFFY:	I think we need two different terms to distinguish these two things.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	But how Heather has it written here, I think we could say that." The team determined that of the 24 groups of recommendations resulting in 63 recommendations …"
KC CLAFFY:	That's fine if she's going to bring that down here.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Yeah. That's what I thought. If we could use that language: 24 groups of recommendations. "And of the 63 specific recommendations, 27 were considered …" I mean, the sentence is long enough. Leave it up to

EN

Heather to figure out how to break the long sentence, but I think that would help me.

KC CLAFFY: Do we call them … Oh, God. I don't know, guys. That's pretty bad nomenclature because we call them recommendations. We don't call them groups of recommendations. Well …

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No. If you look at the Executive Summary—and I've quoted the relevant text in my response—

KC CLAFFY: It says "groups."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It says, "24 groups of recommendations."

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] matches.

KC CLAFFY: [Recommendation] 27. Okay. Well, fine. I'm just saying, does the box in the Executive Summary call it "group of recommendations" [inaudible]?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No, no. From the Executive Summary it says, "24 groups of recommendations, resulting in 63 specific recommendations …"

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, but my point is when they go look at the table, they're going to see "Recommendation 1 … Recommendation 2 …" Is that right?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I don't think that's going to be a big deal.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. Just for me, it's just in terms of reference. And people lift stuff out. So, I mean if they lift out this paragraph, they'll get a precise picture. And I'm fine with that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yep.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. By the way, as long as we're on this sentence, I had a bunch of markups on my iPad that I didn't get to the document, that I'm hoping Heather could just have editorial license to fix because it's just grammar and passive voice. And here's one of them.

I don't understand why we're saying "should be considered" instead of "we consider."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I agree.

KC CLAFFY: Can Heather just fix all of those when she finds them? And I'll circle them later. I don't think they need discussion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree. I don't think that needs discussion. Okay. Can we move to the next one?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Do you mind if I just accept this to clear it out?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

KC CLAFFY: Nope. Don't mind.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Boy, that's a lot of keystrokes. The next one is on 21, and I think this is about formatting that will be different when it's put in a Word document.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. Heather and I exchanged emails. It was just hard to read when I was reading it through because this had gotten so large and I had to go back to the table just to make sure that it fell sequential. And the table was fine. So, when she wrote back to me, she said it's just an editorial formatting issue. So, it was resolved.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. There are two periods after D.3. One of them should probably go. I don't know why I missed that in my previous read, but I did. There.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I have no idea where you are, but that's okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought I marked it. It shows on my screen.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Ah. Yep.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Thank you. The next one is on 40-41.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think it's 40. Okay. So, 40 is the one we need to talk about because when we were doing the review of the Public Comment response spreadsheet, there was a statement that Brand TLDs might need an exception. And then when we looked for that in the report, it wasn't there.

And so, Laurin and Heather and I collaborated to come up with this modification to this one sentence to address that. We either need to accept this or change the Public Comment response spreadsheet. So, does this modification raise concerns to anyone?

KC CLAFFY: Can someone say what was there before? Are you adding the purple sentence?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're adding that front to the sentence that used to begin, "Access to critical data via CZDS remains problematic."

EN

KC CLAFFY:	Okay.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	We're adding that we recognize "certain TLDs (like Brand TLDs) might require accommodations."
KC CLAFFY:	Fine.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	And just to expand on that a little tiny bit, you'll see that the citation was also expanded to include a pointer to an article that talks a little about the branded TLDs and the issues and challenges that surround those.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Not hearing any concerns. And the [additional] reference that Heather is talking about is the first footnote on 41.
	Okay. Hearing no concerns, Heather, you could accept those.
	On 42, Heather, I assume you're just going to [review that break].
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Yeah. That's just a formatting artifact. To be honest, I could not figure out how to make it go away either, but it doesn't reflect in the final … If you export it, we'll be able to deal with that. KC, do you have a hand up?

EN

KC CLAFFY: Oh, crap. I forgot what that was. Oh, I did that one. That was the passive voice thing. Okay. I'll figure out how to put my hand down. There you go.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. So, we're done with 42. The next one is on 45, the bottom of the page. Kerry proposes some rewording.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. So, going through it, like everything else, I think we had gotten out most of the emotive words. But I just still found two sections that still had this kind of … It's more like a [droning] like, "Oh, my God. The decade of insufficient progress…" And I just wanted the whole report read more less emotive, and I still found that this was a bit too emotive. And there was another section that was a little bit too emotive.

So, that was my suggested language instead of saying "decade of insufficient progress" that we just soften it to say, "and the slow progress in addressing DNS."

I know we want it to be strong, but I think the report so far is very strong, and it stresses that we're completely over ICANN's way [that they're] doing this. But it's just where it stood out to me that if I was a reader, I was like, "Why are they being so dramatic?"

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anyone have any concerns with this page?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, it's just because it said a decade. The "decade" just sounded like a very specific emotion.

[RUSS HOUSLEY]:   [inaudible]

[LAURIN WEISSINGER]:   That's fine. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right. [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And then the one after that, it's the same emotive, I think. As I said, it's the only section, I think, that still had [residue] in emotive—was that the process would fail on its own. I didn't like that either because, as I said, EPDP is going to be used … We don't know. We don't know what will happen, but it's just that I didn't want to just say that we think the process would fail.

I suggested language that, "We believe that the [EPDP] process concerned with abuse would not bring an effective and timely solution" which is what our justification after that sentence says. Just that that

one sentence had so much emotive language in it, so that was my suggested languages in the comment tab.

Heather had indicated in her reply to me that this was language that was accepted in the last consensus call we had for this text, but I just wanted to point out, as well, I just didn't like the fact that we said it "will fail on its own." It's very negative, and I don't think we need to have that kind of negative emotive language.

KC CLAFFY: I'll make a comment. First of all, I'm inclined to support any toning down of language wherever we can. I just want to be clear about the meanings of the words, however.

The new language has the word "timely" in it. I don't think that word should be there because I don't think the issue is that it will take a long time. I think the issue is that the people who wrote the sentence—and I'm probably agreeing with that—is that it just wouldn't ever work.

If you gave it 10 years, it wouldn't work. Because we gave the EPDP for the data stuff three years, and it didn't work. And that was supposed to be expedited. So, I think I would be okay with that sentence without the word "timely" in it.

What do you think, Kerry-Ann? And others should speak up.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, I'm fine. As I said, it's just I didn't like us saying it will fail on its own because [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I agree with that.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, anything else—"will not bring about an effective solution"—because I said the justification, what we have after that, justifies exactly what we mean. The examples we gave are very precise in terms of how long it took. And it already has quotes that say "failed," so we don't need to put our own statement on that part.

                             But I'm fine with dropping "timely." I was just trying to find something to cover the issue.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, just one other note. The "on its own" was something that I suggested would be important because if we're … It seemed very strange to me for us to say, "The review team believes that an EPDP process concerned with abuse won't work,"—however you phrase it, it's not going to work—when we're recommending an EPDP process.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: The "on its own" is fine. I'm okay with keeping that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: How about something like, "The review team saw no evidence that it was likely to succeed" or something like that? Is that any better?

EN

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No, unfortunately not because that's that sort of double-negative that translates very poorly.

KC CLAFFY: Well, this got caught in the vortex of we all thought this temp spec thing would be a good idea. And then someone pointed out, "Well, you can't do a temp spec alone." A temp spec inherently is followed by an EPDP, I think according to the bylaws of the temp spec. Or somebody else can correct me what the details are there.

But then we came back and said, "Okay. Well, why not just do an EPDP?" And I think that's where we got the "EPDP by itself isn't going to be sufficient," because it will take too long. And we still don't think it would come up with a good outcome. So, I think that's how this language crept in over time.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'm okay with how it's worded now. I think it hits both Eric's point and [all of] what the issue was at the time we were trying to fix. I think this is a better language. It's just that the "fail on its own," I thought, was not. [I didn't want for it] to be hung up on our words. I want it to be hung up on the points that we're making.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, I'm fine with that language.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anybody have concerns with the rewording that is on the screen now?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I feel it's good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Heather, we'll let you do the accepting and the un-highlighting. The next one is on …

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Heather did that so fast. She's like, "You don't have to ask me twice."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: … the bottom of 52. I think Kerry-Ann's just calling for a deletion of the sentence.

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Oh, no. It wasn't a deletion. So, I could clarify. And tell me if I missed something in one of the meetings. My sincerest apologies.

So, starting in this section, going forward, we have this last sentence where we assign it to someone. For all the other 17 recommendations before, we never assigned it to anyone. So, usually at the end of these Recommendations 1 through 17. And I said, I just looked at this in a different lens [inaudible] just to make sure if I was a reader.

So, from 1 through 17—

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you look at the last sentence on 51, it does that.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, no, no. What I'm saying is that I was just wondering if it was a drafting rule that we agreed to because I know we agreed to doing [inaudible] what we consider when it's implemented, what we consider when it's effective. But for some, we assigned it, and for others we haven't assigned. So, it's just that if somebody reads it, they're going to wonder, "Why didn't they assign Recommendation 10 to someone?"

RUSS HOUSLEY: My point is, if you just scroll up one page, on Recommendation 17 the last sentence assigns it to ICANN Org.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, but keep scrolling up. Who's scrolling? Brenda, that's you?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Brenda's [the scroller].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Russ, if you—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. If you go up from some of the others we did. And so, I was wondering if someone asked us why have we assigned some to some—why some recommendations were assigned and others weren't—I just wanted to know if we had an answer.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, this was an artifact of there being so many sub-teams that were handling things slightly differently.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Everything after this, though, Heather, has an assigned—

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes. It was different …

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And everything above doesn't.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. I personally don't find this kind of sentence to be at all useful, given that the recommendations themselves state who should be doing the action.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, I would be fine with removing all instances of this after the recommendations themselves.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. It just stood out to me, Russ, only because, as I said, 1 to 16 didn't assign anybody. 17 down assigned people. And it would stand out. If I had to implement, it would start letting me think, "Okay. They did not assign anybody. Am I supposed to [guess it]?"

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Kerry, we get it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. On 49, for example, though, we say, "This is effective when ICANN Org can demonstrate." So, it's implied that ICANN Org has the action. And so, it's fine to delete this sentence when it really isn't adding anything because the previous part already says, "Considered implemented when ICANN Org creates and maintains." So, it's pretty obvious that that's already assigned to them.

So, I'm fine with deleting this. I don't know what other people think.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And Jennifer has a comment in the chat.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I'm watching the Google Doc.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I was just point out that there is a table at the start of the report that lists all the recommendations and who the owns are in that table as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, do you have a recommendation?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Delete it.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anyone object?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I've had my hand up for a while.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I've been watching the Google Doc. Just jump in, please.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Some are logically assigned anyway. Right? It's in the text. And then whole sections like risk and internal security are [inaudible]. I think with the table in the beginning, that's all we need.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I'm not hearing anyone object to deleting it. Heather, do you need the action to excise the other places where that exists?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Mm-hmm.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. And the next one is on page 60. Laurin, what kind of change do you want? Do you want … ?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm just … I'm going down … [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does "validate" solve your problem?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm just rereading it because I made this comment like a month ago. But I think [Jay] added, "Validate that the process functions as intended." Yeah. I think that that's fine. Before, it essentially sounded like, "Okay. You have to validate [that it will] work in practice," essentially. essentially. So, that was [good].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, clear this one?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yep. And that brings us to page 98. Heather, I don't know what this is about. Oh, it's going to plug it in.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is a place holder.

EN

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is a place holder. This is purely administrative text that the review team reports have a place to put links for where you can find public comment. That's it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Cool. All right. So, unless somebody has something else they want to raise, we are done with the report.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, a quick note about … KC, you mentioned you had some grammar and style nits that you were concerned about.

KC CLAFFY: Mm-hmm.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I admit I'm going to handle those very, very, very cautiously because even, and perhaps especially with passive voice, it may not be that I know who's supposed to take the action because it is inherently general. So, I'm not going to necessarily change a whole lot.

KC CLAFFY: Yep, agreed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. But in the one she pointed out, it was clearly the review team.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yep. That's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, [inaudible] fine.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Right. Okay. At this point, let's turn to the Public Comment matrix. The link is in the Agenda Item 3, and there are three red boxes we need to talk about.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, effectively, there's only one red box we need to talk about because we've resolved the other.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct. We did. But I thought I would just be very formal and deal with them.

So, row 40 is the first red box and it says that "the SSR2 team will check how or whether this is related or could be integrated into the ongoing work in the New gTLD PDP." Did that happen in one of the subgroups? Because I am not aware of it. If it did, we're fine. If it did not, we need to change the text in the red box.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Who was on this sub-team?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't remember who was on [inaudible].

BRENDA BREWER: One moment, please. Four was Noorul and Ram. But I think this ended up being merged with RISK.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. That's what I was about to say. I think it did get merged.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. It was integrated into RISK at some point in time. I think I can confirm that the RISK team that—how can I put it?—took it into the section at some point in time after work had already been done on it did not reach out to anyone at this point.

I cannot remember why we did this. Maybe someone else still knows if we assumed this had been done or if we actually did not [inaudible] anymore because we took this at a later stage and [inaudible]. I cannot remember. What I can definitely say is the RISK team did not do this.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Laurin, you did break up quite a bit. I think what you basically said was, while the RISK team didn't do this, you also brought this in after work

had been done. So, there is the possibility if Noorul or Ram are on the call and willing to speak, that it was done before you guys got it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. This is exactly my point. We took this at a later stage in the process because it made sense to have it in that section so we [could not treat] public comment.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Ram, are you active? Could you maybe drop in the chat whether you spoke to the New gTLD PDP Working Group when you and Noorul worked on this recommendation?

All right. Hearing nothing, I think we need to actually revise the text of the comment because the review team … We cannot say that the review team reached out to the working group.

KC CLAFFY: So, Ram has said in his chat his mic is [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Ah. Good. It's not working, but did you reach out to the New gTLD PDP Working Group? Well, I can't tell if you're writing a really long response or if you [don't hear us].

KC CLAFFY: [Maybe we should] go on to the next one.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: There is no next one.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, there's only a reporting on the next one. So, we could do that while he's typing unless Heather already cleared the red box.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I didn't clear it because I was waiting for your okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, good. Thank you.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: But we needed to clear the red box.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Row 235. This response assumed the addition of the text on page 40, which you guys just accepted, so this response is now fine [and we can] make it green.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just to clarify …

RUSS HOUSLEY: And the same with ...

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh. Russ, sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And the same with row 326. That's all.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I just wanted to ...

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just wanted to reiterate for everyone who was or was not on the abuse team, we [shared out] a document with actions, and we said, "We will take this action." And somehow, we forgot to take the action and to add something on the document even though it was discussed and agreed and presented to the team and approved. So, just so everyone knows where this came from.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, let's mark this one as green as well.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And I think that we're just waiting to hear from Ram.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: KC, is your hand raised? Okay.

KC CLAFFY: No, sorry.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Your arms must get really tried.

[KC CLAFFY]:   [You might can say that.]

HEATHER FLANAGAN: All right. We're not getting clarification on whether the review team talked to the working group.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I guess we need to … So, I don't think it did, is what I'm getting. And so, we need a different response back on Row 40.

So, Laurin, as kind of a pseudo-lead for the RISK team, [what do] you think we should say here?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, dear. I just wanted to say let's have a quick look at the recommendation and question just so we all know where we were and what it actually says.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Do we have the terms of reference for that new working group? Because we could probably cross-reference that as well just to see. Because I think that's what the person's asking—whether it's related or could be integrated into their work. And I guess if it could, they were probably wondering why we don't just recommend that it does. That's what I gather from the query.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. I'm still slightly lost in terms of "what" because SSR2 Recommendation 4 is "Improve Risk Management Processes and Procedures."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: And this mapped to the new revised recommendation [SSR2 Recommendation 3], that group of [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [That was 3]. Oh, sorry. Yeah. [inaudible].

EN

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [This is to] Recommendation 3. Does not really say anything about new gTLDs. So, unless I'm blind, I cannot see a reference to new gTLDs in the Recommendation 3.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, is the new response that, in rewording, this is no longer an issue?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: If we're only looking at Recommendation 3 and I'm not blind, yes. I'm just rereading it just to make sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, this was originally about budget transparency. Right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. And we still have the budget transparency, but we're not referring to the new gTLD. So, I guess this kind of just got nixed [in a way].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that the bottom line is that we are seeking budget transparency in the entire budget not just new gTLD budget. Maybe that's the way we put it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does that work for you, Heather?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: One moment, please. There. Is that okay?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. That makes sense.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Works for me. Anyone else? Heather, the pound sign in front of the comment, was that a tag to you?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No. That was a cut and paste.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: There. [Fine].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I didn't know if it was something you did …

HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Nope.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. All right. I believe we are done with the Public Comment response issues. Does anyone have something else that I'm unaware of that you want to raise on this doc?
	Okay. That moves us to Agenda Item 4. Laurin and I have volunteered to be implementation shepherds. Is there anyone else who wants to volunteer to join us?
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Russ, my hand is up.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Go ahead.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	I had indicated to Brenda I would have volunteered as well.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Or to Jennifer. [inaudible] I had indicated to Jennifer and she said to raise it at this call.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. You're certainly welcome, Kerry-Ann. KC, I see a hand.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I guess I will volunteer for that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Okay. That gets us to four shepherds. Anyone else? Okay. Would the minutes please record those four volunteers?

[JENNIFER BRYCE]:   Got it. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And the next part is for Jennifer. Could you please go through what happens now?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. I am happy to. So, I put together a slide which Brenda has kindly displayed on the screen now. And it assumes today as the date that we will hand the report to comms, so if for whatever reason that changes, please do keep that in mind.

But in any case, the next step is that communications team will do a final proof just for spelling in accordance to ICANN style guide, and they'll put that into a style template. And then as part of that process, we'll also add the final fact sheet from the review team which will be added as an appendix. I think it will be Appendix I at this point.

EN

So, that will take a couple of days. These dates here include the weekend and then the holiday in the U.S. on Monday. Once that's done, I'll send the report back to the review team and you guys can have however much time you want to take over it—if it's 24 hours or 48 hours—just to check that there's nothing super weird that has happened with the formatting.

And then once you're comfortable with that, you'll confirm that the report is ready to send to the Board. And so, I expect that will either be next week or early the week after depending on when we get the report to the communications team.

And then, just to remind everybody, that once the Board received the port, that starts the six-month timeline in which the Board has to consider the recommendations and take action. So, the Board action at this point is probably going to be in July at some point.

And then during that time period, the Board puts the final report out for public comment. That's a standard process for all review team final reports. And that public comment is to help inform the Board Action as well. And so, you can expect to see that happen probably in the next couple of weeks. And the Public Comment period is a minimum of 40 days as usual.

And then one final thing I wanted to suggest is that the review team should consider hosting a webinar during the Public Comment period. It's up to yourselves if that's something that you want to do. Other review teams in the past have chosen to do so just to walk through the final recommendations with the community and give the community

members a chance to ask any questions to the review team or seek any clarifications.

You're all familiar with how the webinars work, so I just wanted to put that suggestion out there as something that you might want to consider. And if you do, then we can help with scheduling with that.

But I hope that's an overview that provides some clarity on the next steps. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

I see Kerry-Ann has a hand raised.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I was hoping someone would [add] something [inaudible]. Your voice sounded like it was [either] filled with tears of joy that this is over, and I thought [that it's] going to raise another [inaudible] that I didn't see in it where the review team will be sent individual bottles of champagne to celebrate that this long journey has ended.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Oh, yeah. [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] we spent so much money on travel, and I think it should be [inaudible] with all the [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: I can't believe I missed that.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: We need some celebratory boxes sent to each of us to celebrate on a call.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Absolutely. It's really a shame that we're not together in person, but hopefully we can celebrate at some point in the near future.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, do we need to have a call-in order to look at what comes back from comms, or do we just do that on the mail list?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Is that question to me or to the team, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it was … All right. Let me ask it this way. What have other teams done?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Other teams in the past have just use the mailing list to raise any issues, so you can decide how long you want to take to look over the report. Again, it's just that the communications team aren't going to change any wording. It's really just to do a final check for spelling. And then they'll also put it in that template. So, it really is up to you. In the past, other teams have just used the mailing list.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, assuming that we get it on the 20th, does anyone have problems with looking at the changes they've made by Friday the 22nd?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: To me, that sounds fine. I was a bit worried about 24 hours, considering time zones and everything. But I think with two days, 48 hours, we should be fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. And do people think we should do a webinar?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: To me it sounds like a good idea. I mean, if we didn't have very high [attendance, I think, ever].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's actually what I was thinking. That's exactly what I was thinking. Is it worth the effort?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: However, this is now the final report, so I would at least consider making the offer and see if people are interested in doing so.

KC CLAFFY: I think we have to do a webinar.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: These recommendations are sufficiently creative that they're going to confuse people. We need to explain them and be ready to answer questions.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think that's one. And the other reason I would say why I think it's important is because we made significant changes to this report in the past year, and so people who have not been following that—and I don't think many have—would be likely very surprised and might have questions.

KC CLAFFY: In fact, I would urge that the webinar be early in the Public Comment period so we don't get a bunch of public comments that would be different if they had heard our webinar because they understand better what we're saying.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, we don't have to respond to these public comments. Right?

KC CLAFFY: I know that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: It's just that we might like them to be based on what we [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: To be based on reality?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What world are you living in?

KC CLAFFY: We've all been looking at this report so long, we don't know how fresh eyes are going to interpret some of these things.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's fair.

KC CLAFFY: Steve had his hand up and he dropped it.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Steve?

STEVE CONTE: Yeah. Now I lowered my hand. It was covered. So, I defer to Heather who has her hand up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You yield your time?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, I want to be absolutely, perfectly clear on this one because it's a change I'm going to make to the report that I consider substantive. Can I say that we have full consensus on everything?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I was going to get to that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Tag, you're it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I explicitly asked that question of e-mail. I saw no response to it, so I believe that we are allowed to add the sentence now that all of the recommendations have full consensus of the SSR2 Team.

Anyone object to that? Thank you very much. I think that is really a very important sentence.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Excellent.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you, Heather, for making sure that didn't fall through the cracks. And it really did need highlighted. And yes, it's a substantive change but it needs to go, I think, two places: 1) at the intro of all of the recommendations right before the table, and 2) once in the Executive Summary.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Is there any other business that we need to do today other than celebrate when we're allowed to finally be face to face again?

KC CLAFFY: We have hands.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry. Go ahead—let me get to that screen—Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'll probably turn my camera on for this one. I just want to [publicly] personally thank Russ for leading us to this conclusion. We've had leadership over the period of a million years, but I really appreciate …

RUSS HOUSLEY: A millennia.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: A millennia. But personally, I think I've really appreciated your stewardship, your calmness, and your anger when it was needed. And I think it allowed the group of professionals that we had on this review team to actually buckle down and apply their minds and work despite how tried we were of this. So, I just personally thank you.

And as I said, even when ICANN won't pay for this, we should try and still get together. I don't know when, how. But we should try and get together. It's really been a pleasure under your stewardship. So, I just wanted to just thank you, personally.

And the team, of course. You guys have been amazing. But this shout out was really for Russ right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you for those very kind words, especially recognizing the anger part.

Steve?

EN

STEVE CONTE:	I'm going to follow Kerry-Ann's good example and remind people that there are faces behind the names, and it's been so long since we've been together that I think it's important that we remember that.

It's been such a long journey. This first call, Jennifer reminded me, started in March of 2017, so we're close to five years. And if we take into account the pause, we're close to four and a half years on this journey. And it's certainly been a roller-coaster ride.

And I applaud all original team members who have stuck it through. I think you guys have done an extraordinary amount of work and an extraordinary job of getting this complete. It's been every single action you've taken has been a pull, and I understand the exhaustion you guys might be feeling.

And I also want to applaud the people who came in post-pause to refresh the team. Especially, I want to call out Laurin. This is his first review team, his first big action within the ICANN community. And not just to step in, but to step in as a leadership role. He did a fantastic job.

And, of course, Russ and Eric and Denise and everybody else in leadership has done great. But I just really wanted to call out Laurin on this that he stepped in and then stepped up.

And I applaud you all for the work that you've done, and it's over for you guys and the work is just beginning for us. So, SSR2 will be on my mind for the coming year(s) as we get through this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Five more?

STEVE CONTE: But seriously, thank you all for everything that you've done. Personally speaking, I don't agree with the entire report, but I do agree with much of the report. And I think that the work that you guys have completed will continue to move ICANN in a better place to serve the public and serve the community. So, thank both. Thank you, all.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'll just jump in. Thank you, Steve, for calling me out specifically as well. Yeah. Thank you very much, all, for us having gotten to this point. I wanted to comment before while we actually have consensus. Of all the reports I've read from other review teams, there are not many where this happened. At least not recently. And maybe it has been the long cooking time of this whole thing that kind of helped us come to a point where no one said they're unhappy.

So, I think Kerry-Ann is right and we should meet up at some point if things improve and we can find a space in the world where this is going to work out. Maybe we will find that. Yeah. Looking forward to seeing you again in person soon, hopefully.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I definitely wanted to thank Heather. She stepped in at a really awkward time, not really even knowing the history before. But her professionalism and ability to really translate our thoughts into words really has been good. And the report is really readable compared to some of the things she was given. So, thank you very much, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: You're more than welcome.

Just to let you all know, I've learned a lot over the last two years of working on this report. And I took the opportunity to meeting directly with ICANN and just an informal debrief in a way to say the next time you want to hire a technical writer, here are things that you might want to consider; things that I wish that I had been aware of when I started; changes you might want to make to the job description, that kind of thing.

So, they were very gracious and very open to my suggestions. And I think the next review team, whatever it will be—I think it's the Holistic Review—will probably have slightly different job description for the editor as they come in.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, and I do hope they take our suggestion and seat the editor from the beginning because it really would have helped.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. We talked about, and we also talked about the challenge of what they asked for versus what they needed which happened to be two very different things.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, thank you for being the combination of both.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: More than happy to [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Absolutely.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What was asked for and what was needed.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Absolutely, Heather. You turned a lot of messy, complicated, multicolored Google Doc text into something that people can actually read and understand. Yeah, we kind of had to help from time to time, but a lot of the work in the past few months in particular was all on you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I'm not seeing any more hands, so last call for any other business. All right.

SSR2 is done except for the webinar. So, that's the only thing I know about in our future. Thank you to the three people who volunteered to be shepherds along with me. Thank you very much.

We're done!

JENNIFER BRYCE: Congratulations, everyone.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you, all.

[BRENDA BREWER]:   Thanks, all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

[BRENDA BREWER]:   Russ, I'll work on the slide deck for the webinar for you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you very much.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Bye, everybody.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Bye.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Thanks, Jen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]