

20120214_SSR_DT_ID668689

Unidentified Participant: Operator, could you start the recording? Thank you. Just a reminder as well that there's an Adobe room. If you could all join that Adobe room so we can project the documents?

Unidentified Participant: Cool. What was the address, Alice? Have you got that?

Alice: Yes. I just emailed it to you. It should be in your inbox.

Unidentified Participant: I have also email from a few minutes ago from Martin but it doesn't say whether or not he'll be taking part in the call. Do any of you know?

Alice: He accepted the Outlook invitation, so I'm hoping he will join.

Unidentified Participant: Martin? Are you on the call already?

Alice: No, he's not.

Patrick: Simon, it's Patrick. I just wanted to answer the question you raised at the very beginning about the discrepancy on the budget. I actually don't have a problem with the way that it's explained.

Simon: Cool.

Patrick: I think that will be helpful to the security team. It's something we're asking.

Simon: I figured it might be.

Patrick: I don't want to go into too much detail but having this question clarified on the inside would be good. So, calling it out like that is okay by me.

Simon: Good. I figured that might be the case when I put it that way and I thought -- again, I think for me what's really important is that we create recommendations that give power to Jeff and your team to go and do the job you need to do and if that means helping to point out the fact that there's clarity around budget then I'm very happy to do that.

Patrick: And if it results in either carving that part out so that it's very clear it's not part of what we call the security SSR area. That's helpful too because then it's more clear for everybody and also it clears up some of the confusion in areas that share security-related budgets.

Simon: Yes. We recognize that security spread is often just -- as a phenomenon it's often spread across more than just one specific budget part. But I think my point was to have the bulk

of it not under the control of the CSO doesn't feel right. Or certainly with the CSO not having significant input into the status of that, the bulk of it. That doesn't feel quite right.

Patrick: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: [double agree here]

Simon: Alice, are we are seeing -- the PDF version, are we seeing mark-up on there that you've got on the screen?

Unidentified Participant: I have a document in Word format.

Simon: Yes. Alice has put it on the -- it doesn't really matter. I think we're okay.

Alice: Otherwise I can project my screen directly if it helps.

Simon: No, we've got a thing.

Alice: Okay. And we've also got Martin on the call. He's just joined just now.

Alejandro: Excellent. Hi, Martin.

Martin: Hi, Alejandro.

Alice: And Denise is also on the call.

Alejandro: Great. We have Jeff, Simon, Martin, myself. We have Patrick, Denise -- hi, Denise -- and Alice. Very good. So, Simon, it seems to me the most practical thing to do first is to -- if you could walk us through the document you just sent which some of us have already opened. Martin, did you get Simon's email?

Martin: Yes. I did. I just got it.

Alejandro: Are you in a condition where you can display it?

Martin: I am. I already have it up on the screen.

Alejandro: Jeff? How about yourself?

Jeff: Yes. I have it.

Alejandro: Good. So, Simon, why don't you walk us through this document?

Simon: Okay. So, what I've done and the purpose of the document really was just to help us in understanding what work we needed to get done and try and take the -- break down the sections of work remaining, look at where we've got work that's done and just waiting sign off. I've tried to break it down by section. The numbers on the left-hand side of the recommendation don't exactly tie to the Senegal recommendation numbers, mainly because we did those by section.

So, the leading number one point would indicate in section one and then it's really -- after that it should be one, two, three, four, five, six, seven and so forth. You can see from the one on the screen I've gone from 1.1 to 1.3. That's just an admin error. These are, what you see in front of you, unless it says the word "NEW" in bold in front of it, it's a recommendation that came out of Senegal and was either directly as we agreed in Senegal or had been wordsmithed after Senegal and circulated amongst the team. But there shouldn't be any recommendations in here that aren't recognizable from Senegal.

So, these are directly -- tie directly one to one with version four of the document on the wiki site. Thank you, Alice, for pointing that out to me as well. This should be the latest version of the recommendations. If we go to the middle column, we look at status or design to capture whether the recommendation is in the draft document and has supporting text. So, if you see the word drafted it means we've captured the recommendation and we've written some text around it to support that recommendation. If you need something captured but not analyzed fully, it means the recommendations in the report but probably have not got enough supporting text -- if you're reading the report from cold you might say -- How did you reach that recommendation? Does the text fully support that?

If you see the word "MISSING" that means that I couldn't find the Senegal recommendation anywhere in the text of any of the documents. It is possible that some of these may have got merged into other recommendations. So, missing doesn't just mean we've completely ignored it. It just means that as it stood in Senegal the improved recommendation is not currently in the draft in a form that say Bill or Joe Dong or somebody from the team might recognize as signing off in Senegal.

Then if we go down and we see another status I use in here is "SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION". This is a recommendation that is new and has not come out of existing analysis work. So, this is something where it's been worked -- some of the work, for example, Alejandro's done. These are new recommendations that we didn't discuss at Senegal and I'll sub recommendations of existing work we did in Senegal. So, this is kind of new findings. So, I've put that submitted for consideration by the group.

In terms of actions, I've tried to sort of capture what we need to do. They're very rough and ready in terms of what we need to do next and clearly we need to go through those with a sort of fine-toothed comb. And then hopefully we can assign an owner to each of those actions and each of the tasks to say -- right, for example, if you take a look at page one, I've worked out for 1.3, I've put the recommendation in but my text doesn't really support the feedback mechanism we've asked for and therefore I need to go back to the text and make sure I've put something in there that supports that recommendation. Clearly I'm the owner of that task and so I will make sure that gets done. Where I've got a question mark or a blank space then it means it would be useful to assign somebody to do that work.

That's the explanation of the working method behind the grid. Just overall thoughts as I went through it -- there's a lot of work to do. We've got absolutely stacks of work to do. And section three at the moment is quite empty. We don't have any recommendations for the original, we don't have any supporting text for the original Senegal recommendations. So, once we have other stuff that will fit, may well fit into section three, the pieces that we said we'd go into analysis for and supporting text, we have nothing at the moment from the first pass. So, that's clearly an area where we need to think about and focus on how we go about getting that done. So, in a nutshell, that's the document.

I would propose that going forward we keep this as -- I can carry on maintaining this and use it as a status update and also be a bit of an arbiter and say -- Okay, we've got good text in there now, I think we can put that one ready for sign off by the drafting team. So, I'm happy to be the arbiter of this and keep this up to date. That's it for me.

Alejandro:

This is wonderful work. This is Alejandro. I find this extremely useful. I have come to -- I haven't started fresh writing as I promised last week. It was mostly analyzing the documents and I've gotten the angle now of mapping my text, what I have already written for sections 2.6 and 3, the revisions of which ICANN has no control, especially IGF and section three and I'm late in writing. This is very useful because it provides the map I needed for identifying the -- all that stack of work for section three that's still missing. On the other hand it does -- it takes me one step further in mapping as you have done a lot of the text that I have written into the sections where it will fit.

Simon: And Jeff very kindly did some of that work this afternoon for us. So, this has been a team piece of work.

Alejandro: Thanks to both of you. I think basically what we have to do now -- the piece is pretty simple. It's basically use this as a map to make the work crisper because the text better defines crisper and gets them done. For me, I know I have a stack right here in front of me. I have a batch schedule this week but I do have some sets of hours where I'll be able to provide a lot by let's say Friday. It could even by Thursday I could be promising some paragraphs. How about the other members of the team? What do you think? What's your reaction to Simon's very useful grid?

Martin: Alejandro, I just wanted to confirm -- there were some areas that you had drafted that overlapped with section one or two and what I had done was to look at what you had written and I was going to take another look at it and figure out if there's anything new that needed to be added. There were some things that I had already supplemented but I just want to be clear, you're not going to rewrite anything in section two -- one or two, right? That's one of the questions I had.

Alejandro: Not unless it's identified as needed.

Martin: What do you mean?

Alejandro: What I mean is if you're -- I think we'll have to look at this in more detail. Not Simon and Jeff who wrote it, and see what tasks emerge. Of course I have to concentrate on section three first. If you have identified things that need to be added, rewritten, and so forth. And I'll touch on my work. But I'm not touching that.

Simon: My proposal, Alejandro, would be I certainly can continue to focus on section one and two and to refine those and merge some of your findings into those sections. And I think at that point it might be a good point to then go back and take a look at them as a whole and see if we captured everything.

Alejandro: Very good.

Jeff: And I'm going to do the same for the -- because if you have a big section on areas ICANN controls and areas that they don't which I thought I'd covered all of that but I'll see if there's more we should add to those.

Alejandro: Martin? How do you feel?

Martin: I feel pretty good. Jeff and I exchanged some email related to talking about dividing up the work load to kind of help get this moving and I feel pretty good about it.

Alejandro: So, you'll be working with Jeff on sections one or two?

Martin: I believe so, yes.

Jeff: I think it's mostly -- where Martin had really good insights was on the areas where ICANN has operational responsibilities where it's things like the change in management and a function in those types of things. So, I think that's where we were going to split up some of the documents that Denise and Patrick had provided and see what additional analysis we were going to put in there to support those recommendations.

Alejandro: Okay. Martin, do you have some materials for section three for the contingency planning and risk management emerging from what you had been analyzing on the operational side?

Martin: Do I have a feeling for what, Alejandro? For what the work load is?

Alejandro: From your analysis, from your reading and drafting do you have insights for section three for risk management and contingency planning?

Martin: I'm just looking through that right now. Yes. Section 3.3, 3.4, I was looking at 3.5 and 3.6 and 3.7 which we may want to reconsider. I have some insight. I just -- this is the first time I've seen this level of detail with respect to what's left and I guess I have some insights but probably not on every section that's missing things. This is pretty good.

Alejandro: I'm looking at the parts of section three, Simon, Jeff, Martin, like in the 3.1, continuing forming a working group, I think I have already drafted a bunch on that that can be useful. Some on the risk management framework. But that needs further drafting. 3.3, there's some -- it needs some, I think. I have a bunch on 3.4.

Simon: It would be really helpful if you could, for each of those recommendations if you could think about a specific piece of text that supports that recommendation and then perhaps Jeff can start to piece those together and put them into the overall framework, that might be really useful.

Alejandro: I will do that.

Jeff: If there's anything I can do to help, just let me know. I actually saw Graham here at the IGF meeting and he said they're working on finalizing a charter for their board group. It sounds like they're -- before we finalize, maybe can you send it? I didn't pin down a timing but it sounds like before we get the report out they're likely to have something there.

Denise: Right. I bet internally within the Board working group they're expecting to finalize the charter this week.

Martin: I guess one question I had -- and Alejandro, you may have this already, but do we have -- I think one of the things that we would document in this report is if this is something that is kind of been a long process to get to where we are now where it was a stack and it was referred to the Board and things. You have kind of the background information to discuss or is that something that Denise and Patrick can get us to put into the report? Because I think that's a helpful way to show the urgency of our recommendation is that it's something that's been out there for awhile.

Alejandro: That will have to be done. I think we'll have to be very effective in communicating this, mostly in the effective summary and in the messaging and signaling around the stipulation of the draft and then the final look over. There's one more way to put ourselves into a mindset that may be useful here and also to make that document very useful. This document will be acted upon by the new CEO mostly. The present administration will have a very short chance to implement recommendations. Maybe even when the Board considers the document and finalizes the conclusion there will already happening, the CEO's decision or it won't be just on the equal set. So, we really wanted to be very effective in the analysis and also very crisp in the recommendations. We're providing a roadmap and the signals of the three to five top things that the new CEO has to care about with respect to SSR, the compliance with the AOC.

Martin: All of that is I think part of what the report is doing is just documenting the state of -- current state of things and then overlaying our analysis and in this case that seems to be one of the things that was missing, was the description about how we got to where we are with this new Board committee.

Alejandro: That's in part what I've been trying to provide with everything you've already seen and now I'll completely focus on the orange parts. Is that okay?

- Simon: Alejandro, are you comfortable then if I act as an overall coordinator and sort of -- I used the phrased arbiter. I used that deliberately in the sense of I'm going to try to hard to that principle from Senegal which is we've got a set of great recommendations and my primary responsibility in this role is to make sure we go back to the wider team with -- Okay, we took away the recommendations and here is the supporting text to support the recommendations. Therefore, are you comfortable to approve this? I'm happy to be that sort of stand back and take that look if that makes sense.
- Alejandro: That function has a well-known name and it's the editor. If you take it up. I will work closely with you with respect to that team's responsibility, but I'm very happy if a native English speaker takes the editing function.
- Simon: Sure. Regardless of what you call it, if everyone's happy then I'll keep control of the sheet. That will mean me saying to people -- Right, this recommendation, explain your thinking more in terms of why you've merged this or why you've added this one in and then putting it to a vote if we need to then take the team -- does this one stay, or does this one -- do we leave this one out of the report, if that makes sense. And you're right, it is a sort of editor role but I wasn't proposing that. I was thinking more about keeping us on track and getting the task done.
- Alejandro: I have no objection. I will put my best efforts though so you don't have to carry the whole weight and particularly you don't have to fight for the issues. I'll do that.
- Jeff: Simon, I realize --
- Alejandro: Let me rephrase that more precisely, more crisply. You don't have to fight on the content of the recommendations except where you want to fight.
- Simon: Sure.
- Alejandro: So, make that separate from the process.
- Simon: Sure. Thank you.
- Jeff: I was just going to add I think you also triggered the fact that I had tweaked some of the recommendations as well and I'm going to go back and really strictly either adhere to what was agreed to or give you an explanation of why you might want to think about changing it. I think it was really helpful to have your matrix to really take us back to where we were in Dakar.
- Simon: Yes. I'm not sure -- I'm trying to avoid making any personal judgment on whether of a recommendation should or shouldn't be in. What I'd like to is just -- I think my guiding principle will be if to get this done if we could focus on getting text behind the recommendations that were agreed in Senegal and then secondary to that is if as a result of drafting that text we really feel it supports an additional recommendation or a change to one of those recommendations then that's fine too but let's document why we've made that change or tweak and then thirdly once we've done all of that, if we feel as a result that there are issues that we've not tackled that have come up since Senegal but we need to bring those to light and make further recommendations, that's okay. But as arbiter I'm going to keep going back to saying -- Well, actually we haven't finished the Senegal recommendations yet, let's make sure we're focusing on those. Because in terms of delivering back to the rest of the team I think it's our duty as a drafting team to make sure we are -- we come back and answer the recommendations that the drafting team put together. That would be my primary focus. And I absolutely recognize, I think we will end up with new recommendations on the end of this which didn't come out as part of Senegal. What I would hope is that we leave those to the end because I think we're up

against it time-wise now and completing the work we agreed to is the most important thing at this point.

Alejandro: No objection here.

Simon: Cool.

Jeff: Same here.

Alejandro: So, we have a plan. Meet next week?

Jeff: I think we should.

Alejandro: Alice, we would like you to help us set up a conference like this a week from now?

Alice: Okay.

Alejandro: We will give you available time so we can get it in right away. As soon as possible and get to work. My work is mostly filling up for the recommendations, second priority, new or tweaked -- new or changed recommendations and work with Simon for the overall edit to see where we can separate the procedural part and the contents where there's any -- we foresee any disagreement. And our goal is to have a full draft that we can circulate to the team on the call next week. Is that okay?

Simon: Yes. Can I --

Alejandro: We have a lot of open paragraphs, things where we lack someone specific to provide an opinion or text but we -- let's say by the end of the call next week we are sending out something to the whole team?

Jeff: My to do is to go back and look at all the section two recommendations and link them back and I'll note if there's something that I really think is worth adding and, Simon, you can see if you agree and then work with Martin to fill in some of the operational pieces and also, Martin, I think we should look at what Alejandro drafted in section two and make sure we're capturing all of that into it.

Alejandro: I would also like to ask Martin to look at what spills over to section three from what you and Jeff have been doing together.

Martin: Okay.

Alejandro: How are your availabilities as I said when I took my first -- I have a batch scheduled but I do have a chance of time as well through this. The weekend seems pretty good for extensive editing and writing after that. Simon, how does it look for you?

Simon: I'm good. I can give six or seven hours this week into the cause. Next week's patchy but I've got some next week to do -- it's going to be a bit of when I can fit it in, really.

Alejandro: Okay. Jeff, how are you? Being in Geneva especially.

Jeff: Definitely may have to wait till the weekend to really dig into it but I'll be able to do that. Definitely I think if we could do a call Wednesday or later next week, that would be helpful.

Alejandro: Okay. Martin, how are you?

Martin: I am actually in the office from now until February 23 and then I depart for India. That's my window right there.

- Alejandro: Okay. Let's make the best use of your window. You're an important resource on this team. We'll have to have a call in a couple of days when you've look into and made it more expedite for me pick up from very raw drafting or just the analysis by word. Okay. Do we have a plan there.
- Simon: Can I raise a couple other points? Two things, one is I think it would be a really good idea to see if we could get a call with the wider SSR team before Costa Rica. I think they need to be brought up to speed on where we are. I think we need to share the grid with them and any drafts we're at I think would be really useful. I'm not predicting we'll get a lot of input from them but certainly it would be good to bring Anders and Bill up to speed on where we are with our thinking.
- Alejandro: I have been trying to get -- do this with Bill. I have not felt it's certain with Anders in our present state of drafting but I can certainly share the whole lot with him and so we will probably be planning to have the conference with the group, to have our next conference call around next Wednesday, you said, Jeff? That would be February 22. Should we plan for a full team call for the Friday after that, the 24th, just two days later? Or do you want to have a weekend between things? That puts us very close to Costa Rica though.
- Jeff: I think we're far enough into the final draft where it would be good to fill in a little more time. I mean, we're going to be seeing a lot of new material for the first time when we have our next call.
- Alejandro: Great. We're planning to meet among ourselves around February 22 and maybe again on February 28 and the team call on February 29 or March 1? That's already a week before people will need to be traveling.
- Simon: Can I raise -- if we're okay with that point, do you mind if I raise a second point?
- Alejandro: Okay.
- Simon: The second one was just about meetings at Costa Rica and thoughts on meetings. My feeling is we're going to need quite a bit of face to face time to go through and approve the draft with a plan to go into Costa Rica with a draft document an then basically sit down face to face with the team and spend time putting the final words to the document, getting a team sign off and approval of the document and then hopefully before the end of the meeting submitting the draft for consideration. That's going to take quite a bit of time. My proposal would be we have all these public meetings, we're already meeting with other constituents as much as possible and by that I mean the GAC, the CEO, the Board Chair, anybody else. Because I think we should really get down to focusing on delivering the report. That's a proposal. Obviously we may need to have some meetings but I just wanted to get the group's thoughts on that.
- Alejandro: What do others feel here?
- Jeff: I don't feel comfortable knowing -- if we get a draft out -- I guess my feeling is if we get a draft out at least a few weeks before the meeting, even if the comment period is well after the meeting then that provides a basis for having -- if we run into issues, I think we'll know more next week. If we're really still not there then I agree with Simon. I don't feel comfortable having any additional meetings until there's a completed draft report that's publically available for people to have looked at before we go to India. I think it's a little too early to tell. For me at this point, until I feel more comfortable that we're going to have that.
- Alejandro: I'm very uncomfortable with canceling things that have already been scheduled. I'd rather make that decision after the call next week.

- Jeff: Simon? Are you okay waiting until next week? It seems we'll know a lot more after next week's meeting about how close we are to being final?
- Simon: Absolutely. I'm being -- I'm playing devil's advocate slightly here. I appreciate -- we may find ourselves in a really great place. I just want to make sure that as a group we are comfortable that we don't -- we do not go into meetings with anybody without a draft document in our hands that we've already circulated. I think politically it's not going to look great. Any of those parties I think would be perfectly -- their first comment to us should be -- Where's your draft report? Would be the first thing they'd say to us. I think I want to make sure we avoid that if we can. Hopefully we've got a draft report even if it's later than the formal comment period. I'm with you on Jeff, let's say we can get that out. My only worry is -- I think we have to get approval by the wider group before we send any report out to anybody. I'm just aware of how difficult it is to get hold of people and get them in a room. That would mean quite a significant amount of work on the phone to read through and get finalization of wording and copy, particularly around the more politically challenging areas like ARSAC and Iona. My feeling is -- and this me just speaking completely personally here, that's got to be done face to face and it's going to take time to work it through. I don't know that we can rush out a report prior to the meeting and do that via conference calls. I'm happy to be corrected on that but I'm just trying to be a realist.
- Alejandro: We're between a rock and a hard place on this. So, let's make that decision after next week's call.
- Simon: I think that's absolutely appropriate to make it next week, absolutely.
- Jeff: It seems to me a lot depends on going back to see six of the recommendations that we've already thoroughly discussed and it's going to be an issue and if new issues are emerging as we're finalizing, then I think it's more likely we're going to have to meet face to face to work through them.
- Simon: Yes. That's very pragmatic.
- Martin: I have one nit-picky issue. After looking at the WHOIS report, maybe they numbered each recommendation and then when you pull it back into an executive summary it flows really nicely because you can talk about recommendation 23. I think as Simon, as the next generation of this, if you are kind of becoming the master of the list, I would suggest that maybe we start numbering these, one down, and maybe for next week's meeting by then, I think that will also help keep us to the list -- this is the list and this is what we're going to work from.
- Simon: Yes. That's a good idea. That was also -- I think from memory, that's how the SSAT report was structured as well which went really well. Happy to take that action, yes.
- Alejandro: When we get -- I think this is around where we get to know more closely -- to forecast more closely the final structure of the document and now is the time to make sure that we can do that kind of edit. We'll need something more -- a database behind that document. At least a spreadsheet.
- Simon: I think if we just track it to these numbers and we all make sure that -- I think what I'd also propose as well I think if it's okay with the group is rather than circulating separate sections, one, two, and three, I would propose that we create a merged document now which is the draft report. Obviously we're going to have big holes and gaps in it. I'm quite happy, and Alice, if you're on the call, if you're happy to just help me with the administrative side of that, we can keep a version that ties back to the status grid if you like and has everything in numbered order, that's going to make life easier as well.
- Alejandro: We'll work on that considering the week, by the text as well. Very good. Okay.

Jeff: Simon, thanks for adding organization to keep us in line.

Simon: I'm just a said CIO. That's all I can do, Jeff. That's the limit of my powers.

Alejandro: More than that.

Jeff: Somebody's got to project manage us.

Alejandro: Okay?

Jeff: Okay. Thank you.

Alejandro: Patrick, if you're still on the call, Denise, Alice, anything you feel is missing?

Denise: Patrick had to drop off. I think we're set from our end but if there's anything additional you need from staff to complete these sections, please let us know. And we have some just brief notes on some repetition and additional background and we'll forward those to the pen holders today.

Simon: Actually, Denise, from my perspective, if there's anything you guys want to add, Alice very kindly checked my work today before I sent it through and added some really useful input to the grid. If there's anything you see or Patrick sees or anybody else sees and would like to make suggestions on that grid, then I'm all good for that. I think the more eyes we have at this stage, the more eyes we have on this to keep us focused, the better. So, your input as always is very welcome.

Denise: Thanks. Happy to help.

Alejandro: Very good. Okay, guys. See you online with files of text and next week by phone. Thanks a lot, Alice. Denise, thank Patrick, please.

Simon: Bye, guys.

Denise: Thank you, bye.

Jeff: Bye.

Alice: Bye.