

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So good afternoon, everybody. If you are on the SSR2 review team and you'd like to come to the table, you're very welcome.

This -- we're not entirely sure why -- it doesn't much matter. This was advertised as a close meeting. We are quite happy to have it as an open meeting. Denise is quite happy. I am quite happy. I guess there are some consequences in respect to the Adobe room.

Wendy, perhaps we can fix that or do what we need to do.

WENDY PROFIT: What do you want to do? Open it up? So, everyone who tries to join will be accepted.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's not a problem. If anyone wants to, we'll have them here.

DENISE MICHEL: Chris, before we start, a couple of -- first of all, just to be clear, the -- I think we had a notice from the board that it was a closed meeting. And we were always happy to have it open. I think no team member suggested it be closed. There are a couple of team members who are trying to get in remotely, and they have had trouble at other meetings. They asked me to make it clear that they're trying to dial in.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely, not a problem at all. Do you want to wait for a couple of minutes? Happy to do that.

DENISE MICHEL: I don't have visibility whether they are dialing in or not.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can you contact them and see whether they are being allowed in or whatever? That would be really helpful.

THERESA SWINEHART: We're just sorting it out.

WENDY PROFIT: If there is anyone who is trying to get in and is not able to, if you allow me - - give their contact information, I can give them the link to the bridge. It's the one that ends with board1. It's in the meeting invitation I sent out. It's in a few emails I sent out as well. It's the board1 bridge. They should be able to get in, allow any entries.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is Eric. I did send an email, and they said they are having trouble.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So this meeting itself was originally on the schedule asked for by the review team, I think, back in September sometime as a meeting between the board and the SSR2 review team.

There are a significant number of board members, too there are a couple of board members who are not currently here because they are involved elsewhere. But they will try and get here when they can.

Denise, do you want to open up and say something? I mean, you know, it's -- leaving aside -- no doubt you want to talk about what's been happening this week, but I'm happy to talk about whatever you want to talk about. So go ahead.

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

DENISE MICHEL: So it might be good for us to just go around and have the review team members introduce themselves and then there's --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excellent idea.

DENISE MICHEL: We have a general overview slide deck that we can run through.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That would be good.

DENISE MICHEL: If the board would like to hear some information about the ---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That would be really good.

NOORUL AMEEN: This is Noorul Ameen from CERT-India. I'm part of SSR2.

ALAIN AINA: Alain Aina, appointed by ccNSO.

GEOFF HUSTON: Sorry, I thought everyone was. I'm Geoff Huston. I'm appointed by SSAC onto the review team.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm Eric Osterweil, SSR2.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel.

ZARKO KECIC: Zarko Kecic, appointed by ccNSO.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar, board liaison to SSR2.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie, appointed by the ccNSO.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Is there anyone in the seats at the back who is on the SSR2 review team? Nope. Okay.

So perhaps board members could also just briefly introduce themselves as well.

LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky.

GORAN MARBY: I'm actually a member of the board. I wanted to remind you of that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think it's important that you have to take -- nevermind.

GORAN MARBY: Goran Marby for the record.

MARKUS KUMMER: Markus Kummer.

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You are still a board member, Markus.
I guess that's me, Chris Disspain.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

KHALED KOUBAA: Khaled Koubaa.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez, incoming.

JONNE SOININEN: Jonne Soininen.

BECKY BURR: Becky Burr.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And we have Theresa and I think -- from org. And I think in the back of the room we have got -- Asha has just arrived. We've got Avri. Can I see Matthew there? Matthew. And I don't think I have missed anybody.

JONNE SOININEN: You missed Akinori.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I always do miss Akinori.
So, Denise, over to you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is Eric Osterweil. Do we have the slide deck available for --

THERESA SWINEHART: We haven't received any slide deck. So if we could receive that, we can get that posted.

WENDY PROFIT: If whoever has it could send it to board-ops-team@icann.org.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The staff support for our team has it, and they were sending out to --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Let's not spend -- all of us spend our time worrying about the slides. We can get the slides sorted out.

Welcome, Cherine.

So, Denise, do you want to sort of start talking? And if the slides come, the slides come. Is that okay?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I can go ahead and done that. I have done a number of briefings. So I will try to do it from memory. Okay. So I'll wing it. I'll wing it.

So, yeah, so we -- so we started our work with the start of the core understanding that SSR was really important. And it was involved and intertwined in almost everything that was happening throughout the community just in general. And so it wound up necessarily starting off with us having kind of a lot to go over.

And then added to that, we had obviously the -- sort of the retrospective analysis of SSR1. So we kind of knew going into this, that this was going to take a lot of factoring. It was going to take a lot of time. So a lot of us had the expectation that this was going to be a

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

reasonably involved start. So we've done a lot of reading. We've done -- we've gotten a lot of briefings. And we've had a lot of material that we have just generally gone over and iterated on.

Like I said, we knew it was going to be a lot going forward. And so we weren't surprised that, you know, a lot of stuff took a lot of time up front. And it was basically in an effort to be conscientious in what we did. And I hope you all forgive me from winging this from my memory, so if this winds up being out of order with what we get to.

So our team is composed of what we consider to be a very rich set of backgrounds, people with rich backgrounds.

And hooray, okay. Next slide.

Oh, yeah, part of it mandated every five years.

Next slide, please.

Next slide, please.

So -- yeah. So, I mean, we sort of -- when we were constructing our scope, we were -- we iterated very heavily with Section 4.6(c) to identify what that was instructing us to look at and what that actually meant as far as then digesting that into a sort of scope and what we used to create a work plan, et cetera.

And like I said, the SSR1 recommendations wound up not being a bolt on. They in their own right took us in some cases in different directions than we would have necessarily gone, but we have the mandate to do -- to look at them.

Next slide, please.

Yeah, and next slide, please.

This was basically just saying, you know, we knew based on the amount of work in front of us that it was going to potentially take a long time. And as we were conscientious, it was not surprising the early steps seemed to involve a lot of time.

So this is -- this is our team. And, you know, we're reasonably happy with the fact that the amount of breadth of work that we had in front of us was well-addressed by the fact that we had a lot of people with a great amount -- great diversity of backgrounds.

You can see the list of people there, and we've gone around and introduced those that are here now. And there's a couple important notes that we had two members that had to step down for complications, and they are listed at the bottom.

Next slide, please.

So as we started to digest what we were finding and looking at and factoring from our scope and whatnot, we broke our work down into sort of five general categories. First being the review of the recommendations from SSR1. The second was -- and part of this is informed by Group Section number 1. Group 1 was the operational aspects, the internal aspects, of SSR over unique identifiers from ICANN's perspective sort of looking in. And then Group 3 was analysis of the unique identifier space, SSR issues for that, more sort of a complement to Group 2 looking out.

Then Group 4 -- sorry. Section 4 was basically created to sort of ensure, to sort of to try and guard against doing just a retrospective of what applies to things that have happened with the understanding that the bylaw mandate of every five years there being a review team, trying to consider what was reasonably worth our consideration that might make our report useful in the upcoming couple years before the next review team boots up and starts its work. So not trying to use a crystal ball, just trying to be cognizant that a report has more merit than retrospective.

Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team 02 November 2017

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

And then, finally, the impact of the IANA stewardship transition on SSR issues was the fifth category.

Next slide, please.

So this is a general time line of where we've been, where we are, and where we hope to go. We started off our teamwork in March when we first basically met and got together. We delivered our terms of reference to you all in May.

Up until September after that, we basically went into a collection and analysis phase where, like I said, we received a lot of briefings. We had a lot of documentation to go over. We had a lot of discussions around relevant aspects of those things.

And, you know, we're sort of exiting that phase now and entering the sort of formulation of findings and ostensibly recommendations phase. And, you know, there's, you know, I think on the team a certain expectation that, though, we're sort of moving linearly, as with any investigation, there's the potential iterative step of realizing something going back then going forward again. But for the most part at this point, we gathered a lot. We understood a lot. We are sort of getting ready to sort of analyzing. And we have the anticipation of a face-to-face meeting, a drafting session, in January 2018 so that we can then produce a report for public comment following sending a final report to you all.

Next slide, please.

So this sort of outlines a couple of our key milestones. We had, like I said, a bunch of briefings and topical issues that had us starting in March. And at that point, we sort of created a team structure. We elected our leadership. We designed the sort of idea of how we would function as a team. And then we really launched into getting a whole bunch of ideas about what to do.

And then we met in May, and we sort of structured how would we actually break this sort of enormous number of things we had to consider down into sort of manageable tasks, things that sort of worked together. And we did a sort of big group brainstorming session, and we wound up sort of casting the die of these five things that we sort of bucketized in a really good face-to-face session we had.

Then, you know, the next bullet we've talked about, you know, an RFP about trying to structure that and get that going for a while. And I think at this point, we're reconsidering a number of aspects of whether that's what we want to do or not, especially because as we've engaged with the community, we've been influenced by their perspective obviously. And we've also been structuring our own internal momentum as well. And then we've been very eagerly looking forward to ICANN60.

Next slide, please.

And that's because, you know, the slide was sort of aimed for a lot of our outreach, so it's a little bit generic. That's because we are really eager to have touchpoints with the community and reach out, you know, to SOs and ACs, tell them what we think we've done and hear what they have to say, get some course corrections, et cetera, and so forth. We were very eagerly looking forward to this week.

And to that end, we sort of front loaded the week by meeting for a day, structuring our plan and creating this sort of messaging as a group. And, you know, we're sticking around for another day and the plan has been to sort of like, you know, factor what we've done. We have these sort of high bandwidth face-to-face sessions, and we tended to make a lot of use of them. We were eagerly looking forward to that.

Next slide, please.

Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team 02 November 2017

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

So I think this mostly takes us to where we basically said to the SOs and ACs, We're really interested in hearing from you. And we even have a strawman question that we would propose to them the sort of -- prime their pump on giving us some feedback on what they think just because sometimes the audience is a bit cold when I get done rolling on.

So you can hit the next slide. It's basically just a placeholder. We have a number of slides in the background deck for details. But that's pretty much our main story. Thank you all.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. I have a question, which is -- and forgive me if I'm saying something which should be obvious to me.

Leaving aside the timing of the start of this review team which I understand was slightly -- was late, not to the review team's fault, of course, the resolution that the board set that actually started the review team says "Requests the team develop and deliver to the board their approved terms of reference and work plan."

Now, I confess to not having been intimately involved in -- over the last months in all of this. But I've seen traffic saying some are suggesting that the work plan has been delivered, some suggesting that the work plan hasn't been delivered.

And I haven't -- I missed seeing that on the slide. So can we -- can you -- would you prepare to address that. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. Of course, all the SSR2 members should feel free to weigh in.

So the team got together for the first time in March. The board resolution had a due date for the terms of reference and the work plan for March 30th. And it's a very diverse group of 15 SSR members from literally all over the world. Many of them have never been involved in an ICANN group before.

So the norming stage and -- of course, is a very complex and potentially broad-ranging review with a very significant first SSR review to deal with.

So it -- it took two months to come -- for the team to come to agreement on the terms of reference that were sent to the board. I think another challenge is that the bylaws also require an operating procedure for all of these reviews, and, of course, that has not -- that has not been done, although I note that they have just recently posted a first draft for public comment. And the -- so I think it would have been useful to have an operating procedure because I think we're seeing a lot of process questions come up, including how to effectuate the bylaw requirements and those sorts of things.

So anyway, early -- so May 3, I believe it was, terms of reference were provided and the board provided some input in response to that. The work plan, which we discussed with the team and, of course, Kaveh, the member of the team that the board appointed was there as well in those discussions, and then the work plan was -- was agreed to by the team and posted on the wiki in early August, I want to say 4th or 5th, and I think the expectation there was that the board member would provide -- or the staff would provide it to the board. Again, I think there was perhaps a misunderstanding if a formal letter needed to go to the board saying here's our work plan. We also highlighted it in our regular newsletters and notices out to the community. There was -- did I miss another point, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No.

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. And --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So leaving aside the -- the logistics of having the work plan provided to the board, which is not desperately relevant at this point, is it -- so that I'm clear, is it the SSR review team's position that there is a completed work plan? When I say completed, I don't mean as in you have completed the work of the work plan. I mean it is not a draft work plan. It is completed and signed off by the review team and ready to go.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. And so the -- and I do invite other members to jump in. The -- and so the -- as the -- as the -- so I'd say there is the work plan that was agreed to and posted, but part of the agreement was that this work plan is a work in progress. It will evolve. There were -- there were additional information gathering and research going on. There were decisions to be made to refine some of the topics and the subtopic areas. And so the team also agreed that this was a document that would be -- that would be updated, and I think that's also noted on the Web site. So the team did provide a lot more detail and a Gantt Chart, which is not usually done by review teams, but -- and other ICANN groups, but we felt it would be useful, and absent another template for -- for a work plan, that's what's been posted. And yeah, the idea was very much to add to it and update it, I think.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Does anyone else -- did you want to say something, Steve? Did I hear you?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I was able to bring up the work plan because it's right on the confluence wiki. If we put it in the Adobe, you can all bring up the work plan that Denise is talking about. It's a Google sheet.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So Denise -- and I'm so conscious this doesn't become the Denise and Chris show, but for now anyway, all I have seen is an email -- I'm not suggesting there is not something up on the wiki, but all I've seen sort of announcing that is an email on the 14th of August to the team which says, find attached an updated draft work plan for your consideration. As discussed, we need to add more detail and dates to our work plan, including our subtopic group work. So I'm not -- I'm not seeking to score any points here. I'm just seeking to get clarity. It's -- it feels to me like this work plan isn't finalized yet.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is Eric. So yeah, I don't have my laptop in front of me so I'll sort of, you know -- just sort of roll from that. You know, I think what -- one of the things that we've been doing is iterating around these -- these subgroups. We at one point actually broke them into subteams and we've allowed the subteams to have a lot of discretion in how they move forward. And I think we've been iteratively working on both that as a procedure and both the work that they've done, and some of them have surged more than others. And so again, I'm sorry I'm not like -- I don't have my laptop in front of me, but certainly I think the view is like Denise had said. Our hope was that in sort of like the investigative stage we would iterate a bit on things. So I'm not sure if that answers your question or not but, you know, yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm sure, yeah, I get it. And I suppose -- why I said at the beginning let's ignore the delivery of a formal letter or not formal letter or what was required or not

Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

required to the board. I suppose my question would be, if you had written to the board, if you had -- if you had written to the board on the 14th of August, would you have been saying to the board, pursuant to the resolution, here is the approved work plan?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Sorry, I'm -- I'm a little bit lost on that question. So I think I'm going to not answer directly by mistake but I'm going to try to answer it so help me out. So yeah, we had a lot of discussions that tended to happen on verbal calls, and I think we could probably take from a lot of what's gone on that, you know, we probably need to institute more rigor around taking what was discussed and actually memorializing it in a more searchable way. So I think there might unfortunately seem like there's a gap between things that were on the list and things that were -- those things being discussed and coming to resolution on calls and then not really being re-effectuated in sort of written medium.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. So it -- so the initial work plan was agreed to on one of the team's plenary conference calls. And then it was updated in October again. I think, yeah, the -- it's somewhat challenging, I think, to get -- to pull some of the facts out of the plenary calls. We have long audio recordings, but really don't have the sort of action items that are highlighted. And, you know, improving the communication and, you know, working with staff to get the wiki to be more user friendly is, I think, on the list of things to discuss on Friday.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So -- and I'm going to -- Rinalia wants to ask a question in a second. But I just want to ask one more thing again. Because you know that -- sorry, I want to make sure I do this correctly.

The subgroup that was -- that put forward the stuff that we wrote to you about in October, is that called audit stuff? Whatever you call it. I don't know what you call it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We were calling it fact finding.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Fact finding, fine. That subgroup, that work would have formed a part of, presumably, a completed work plan. In other words, the indication -- I'm -- the indication seems to me to be -- leaving aside the fact that we wrote and said we weren't happy, we thought it was out of scope, which is a different discussion, it seems to me that the fact that stuff was happening still in October and still being proposed, because my understanding is that it wasn't finalized at that point, that again indicates to me that the work plan was still a work plan in progress rather than a signed-off work plan. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. We don't want to go into that much detail about who submitted what. Just to clarify the work plan situation, the only communication we have is the letter that you read out which is a call for the team to comment on a draft work plan. I also -- which with all due respect, I disagree with the assessment that it was mentioned in plenary calls because actually as the team has done, every decision or everything that was -- that was decided by the team would become an action item and then action items are also followed in every plenary. I haven't seen, or I don't remember and staff can correct me if

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

I'm wrong, there was no action item to finalize or to post the work plan. So the work plan was never an action item.

There was a first draft 14 of August, which was mentioned in the mail, and the second one was 27th of October, which is just a few days ago.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. So can I just say, I -- Kaveh, I appreciate the input, but I don't -- really don't want us to get into a he said/she said discussion here, if at all possible. Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. So one of our co-chairs, Emily Taylor, who, you know, for business reasons left the team, had to resign from the team, was sort of leading the effort of developing the -- this -- I don't know. I see Emily back there. I don't know if you have additional recollections. We can go into the plenary call meetings and look it up in terms of which calls, you know, discussed it and what was said. Do you want -- would you like us to get back to you on that?

Hold on one second.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So ICANN is a very formal organization and somewhat process focused and rather bureaucratic. The board operates on a basis where it responds to it when it receives something. So when it says, we need this from you, it means that we would like to receive it from you. And there was a timeline, and you were not able to do it because it was a fluctuating environment and you were still learning and gathering information, which is fair. But it would have been nice to receive a message or notice or letter saying that we're going to take a little bit more time regarding the work plan because it's not quite completed. That would give us an indication that okay, work is ongoing rather than a red flag that something's not quite right.

(Off microphone).

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, and also Kaveh is just reminding me that in both of the letters the board sent just saying again the work plan, we haven't received it, and we received no communication.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think -- this is Denise. I think that's where it would have been useful to have like an operating procedure in place when the review team started. There was sort of a lack of process and guidance, and you make excellent points and I think the team would -- will definitely send formal communications to the board, particularly now that we know that was the expectation rather than rely on, you know, other -- other modes of conveying the message. And, yeah, I'll leave it at that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Now, could we go back to the point you asked me about, because I was slightly -- I wasn't -- you said do you want us to do that. What was it that you were asking me if you wanted you to do?

DENISE MICHEL: Send a formal communication regarding the work plan.

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Thanks. I'll take -- I'll get back to you on that. Is there anything else that you want to cover with us, that you want to talk about with us right now, bearing in mind we know that we've got a meeting in however long it is, half an hour, with the leadership, community leadership. We're very happy to talk about anything that you want to discuss, if you want to. I wanted to get some clarity around some of the things that have been said and that I'd heard. So if there's anything you want to bring up, anything that you want to talk about, whether it's to do with the letter we sent you the other day, anything. I'm asking you. I'm not guaranteeing to give you an answer, but I'm guaranteeing you the right to ask a question or bring it up as a point.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. That seems like that's a two-hour discussion or -- I know. There's so much that I guess to talk about and it's been, you know, quite a -- an evolving -- an evolving event here. Obviously the team was surprised when SSAC sent a letter to the board and surprised when the board sent the letter to the team and surprised that the team was suspended. And fortunately -- so we've had some good dialogue with SSAC here, which was really useful, and I think we've gotten some input on -- and some insight into things that the team can do differently to help with communication and things that the team will want to, I think, discuss tomorrow such as scheduling regular meetings, you know, with SSAC and with the SO and AC chairs, using the public comment forum to take a more formal approach to making sure that the community has a chance to provide input. And unfortunately a couple of months ago the team had scheduled all of these outreach meetings to raise awareness for what the team was doing and most importantly to get input. And as you know, the outreach is a vital part of our success in these type of consensus projects. Unfortunately, the suspension of the team a bit derailed that interaction in that the -- all of our meetings and with all of the SOs and ACs and constituencies and stakeholder groups became about the team's suspension. So we've been set back a bit in terms of outreach and input as well as obviously there's a lot of questions around what specifically the team needs to reconsider on -- in terms of scope and process and, of course, the SO and AC chairs have been talking about how some of them want to change how they appoint people to the team, and so there's a lot of process questions. We were unlucky in some sense to be the first review team out of the gate under the bylaws where this type of process hadn't been done before with the community review. And so I think a lot of us are learning as we go as well. And the -- but it's been quite heartening that we had a impromptu team review team call yesterday and there were several members that were remote. Almost every member of the team was around the table or on the call. I think there's, you know, been a challenge in terms of a lot of team members flying in from all over the world and expecting to do outreach and get work done and not to be able to but instead be asked why they failed. I think that's a hard thing for volunteers who have put in hundreds of hours of work to hear. And so we're hoping for some clarity and resolution and what -- personally what I heard from the review team yesterday was, there's a lot of commitment and a desire to find a productive path forward. But I've really done too much talking about it and invite other members --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. I'm going to go to Geoff in one second. I just want to address one small point now. And I know this sounds like semantics but it's a big -- Becky always

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

says, words matter. We -- we haven't suspended the review team. Implications of a large beam across the room. What we have done is to put -- suspend or pause, I know there's some concern about using the word "suspend" or "pause" the review. The team is still the team. We've just -- we've paused the review. So I just want to make that clear, because it does matter. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, Chris. I picked on your comment, Rinalia, when you questioned, should we interpret the lack of submission of a work plan as a red light. And in some ways I think personally I agree with that comment, that in my perception, things are not going as smoothly as the chairs have made out. The level of participation amongst the 15 members is so variable that effectively some are simply not contributing, and that is really placing an extraordinary burden on the others. That is tough. It is tough to make progress under those circumstances. And our progress has been -- it hasn't been geological, but it's certainly been glacial. Extremely slow and haphazard. And it's just the documentation, all the necessary infrastructure behind meetings just is not taking place. And everyone is losing track about where we are. This is not working very well.

The level of support we get from staff here, in comparison with our work in other SOs and ACs is certainly anomalous. Now I have no particular understanding of why, but I'm used to in SSAC an extraordinary amount of support from staff in terms of producing outputs. That level is not visible in SSR2 work. I do not know why. I'm not a leader of this team and I'm not in real position to demand that of staff. But certainly in my mind, it is an issue.

On the other hand, though, while I'm talking about leadership, and I hesitate to say this, but it is a delicate issue. We demand an extraordinary standard of rigor from our leaders in terms of clarity, transparency, and inclusion. And at times I must admit it's been hard to do this in this team. In particular under this week where the pressure has been on us. We certainly have had little blowups around. Is everyone on the card? Is everyone here? And, you know, ultimately I look to our leaders going, I expect the highest ethical standards from you out of this. And I think that's a reasonable expectation. It's tough to adhere to, but it's certainly an issue.

More generally about the review, we were thrown into something with real lack of clarity over depth versus breadth. It's almost impossible to figure that out on your own when everyone comes from such extraordinary backgrounds. We have a lack of clarity over audit versus review. How deep to go and how much to suggest. We also, I suppose, to put it down, have a lack of clarity over capacity versus specifics. You should be doing X or do you have the capability to understand why X is important?

There are actually different responses to the same underlying issue. And whether we are meant to identify and fix things, which I doubt, or identify organizational awareness and capability isn't clear in the work plan, in the structure of the work. It's a set of variable assumptions by a number of individuals, and we're not all on the same page on this.

Now, maybe that's an expression of the fact that a stability and security review is exceptionally complex and can be extraordinarily hard for everyone to be on the same page. We are living that nightmare.

Our prospects for success and the ability to deliver a useful and coherent report to the board and to the community are at this point vanishingly small in my view. And certainly I appreciate this opportunity of the board to at least review this. And perhaps it's a case of more people. Perhaps it's a case of particular expertise required from the SOs and ACs in

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

getting this through. Perhaps it's a case of also having both staff support that we are used to in other areas of ICANN's activities would perhaps also assist this work. But all of those things, all of those things in their totality contribute to an outcome that quite frankly I think you all use it at this stage is alarming.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Geoff, thank you. I want to, if I can, just address -- I may not get to all of them but just some of the things you've talked about. Just to finish off on the work plan letter and your comments on -- sorry, the work plan and your comments on the work plan, the last communication from us was on the 3rd of October. And it says as we noted in 23rd of June response, "The board looks forward to providing further input once the SSR2's work plan is finalized and adopted. While the board has not yet seen a final work plan for the review as a whole, our examination of the Subgroup 2 work plan raises -- so I think we were pretty clear that we didn't think we had seen a work plan.

Did you want address that first, quickly? No problem.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I wanted to actually just follow with Geoff. Sorry.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No problem. I'll get there.

On the staff support question, thank you. We're always happy -- I mean, it's for Goran. It's not for the board. But Goran will be happy to be spoken -- to have communication about that and to see what, indeed, the issue is, if there is an issue, how you would explain it outside of this room in a way that is understandable as opposed to talking at high levels.

Do you want to say something about that briefly, Goran, before I move on to the next point?

GORAN MARBY: Of course. I'm still on the board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You said the word "still," is slightly scary.

GORAN MARBY: Twice during this meeting, I have been accused of not being on the board. I just wanted to --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I resent that. Go ahead. What would you like to say?

GORAN MARBY: We brought it up. Theresa has asked for specifics.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

GORAN MARBY: Everybody does mistakes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

GORAN MARBY: If there is anything we can do to do better, we will do that.

I asked Theresa specifically to speak to them and ask what we can do to -- if there's anything we can do.

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

GORAN MARBY: I think it started a little bit unstructured and, therefore, it's been also hard for my team sometimes to know what's requested. But we are here. Our job is to support.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

And then, finally, I just wanted to say a couple things. You talked about the depth and the breadth of the review and the lack of guidance. And I think there's also a lack of process and Denise very rightly said perhaps it's unfortunate we are the first review out of the traps, out of the box, whatever you want to call it, with the new bylaws.

And, I think, you know, the action -- the steps that we've taken and the fact we're about to start a meeting with the community to talk about how we fix this is indicative of the fact that there's complete lack of process. There is a complete lack of mechanisms. It's no one's fault -- it just is -- a complete lack of mechanisms to deal with problems that arise in these circumstances. And so I'm pleased at least we have been able to arrange the meeting that's coming up to try and start the thing.

I agree with you. I think it's not clear to me what this review is meant to do or, rather, what the overarching goal of this review is meant to be. Not the review in the sense of what you decide is your scope but what that principle of this review is necessarily meant to be. And I don't think there's enough depth about that. That's just my opinion. So I wanted to say thank you and acknowledge you for what you said. And over to you, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry. I feel like I'm chomping at the bit. I'm listening to what you are saying. I think we all really appreciate it.

I think we as a team really appreciate the sort of renewed interest and what the sort of the trajectory is and whatnot.

And I think Denise and I, in case it goes without saying, we are very committed. And I think it's a good sort of opportunity for us to go and reaffirm the commitment among the team. I think that's sort of part and parcel of some of the things that Geoff said as well and find alignment and whatnot.

But then, you know, in addition, I think Geoff has mentioned a number of items that are substantive support that would really help us as a team considering the workload, you know, really do a lot of the work that we need to get done, help check a lot of the boxes that need to be checked.

Sounds like we started this discussion, and I think that's great. And I think we're all on the same page.

And, yeah, I think that's pretty much it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Steve, did you want to say something?

STEVE DelBIANCO: Steve DelBianco. I'm only an observer on the team. But I have an observation that could perhaps be helpful on the question of staff support. Because you're thinking staff support and you're imagining once the team convened how much support are they getting as they begin. But most of the staff support that seems to have been lacking is things that have occurred over the last five years because the bylaws, as well as the AoC, required this team. "They shall examine the extent to which the prior recommendations of

**Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017**

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

SSR1 were implemented." That was taken over verbatim from the Affirmation of Commitments into the bylaws.

So to do that, that is not something you can just begin to assess. Presumably, once the community and the board approve the recommendations five years ago, presumably there was an ongoing effort to implement. And along with that implementation, there would be maybe a status of implementation, a document that would show up on the hands of the review team so that they would have a relatively detailed assessment by ICANN about the degree to which they are all implemented.

And we don't have a lot to go on perhaps other than the ATRT, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. That part of the ICANN staff had done a stellar job of tracking the implementation of prior recommendations. So that was sort of the standard in mind. It was quite well done.

And I'm not assessing whether the current list of implementation was in-depth enough. But I'm just suggesting that's not something you can just do as soon as the team convenes. It would have been done by I.T. staff over a period of five years. And that started this team off with a little bit of a disadvantage compared to other review teams. Let's be sympathetic to that, if you can.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Steve. And, yes, I am. And empathetic as well.

I'm going to suggest that unless anyone has any burning things to say that we have ten minutes until we start the next meeting so let's wrap up so we can stretch, hug whoever we want to hug, and we can have the next meeting.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. I wouldn't say it's burning, but I think it might contribute to the discussion. So I think -- personally I would say that one of the things I learned this week is there seems to be a bit of confusion or perhaps people aren't aware that there are 28 recommendations from the first SSR review and that the bylaws talk broadly about SSR and list various areas that we may address. But there's one "shall" in those bylaws. We must assess the implementation of the SSR1 -- there's 28 recommendations -- and their impact. And so I think the SSAC -- someone on SSAC had suggested that it was a good idea and we're going to discuss as a team and that is to go back through our activities and work plan, flag things as applying to SSR1 or SSR2 or both and do a better job of sort of teasing out the "why" of some of the activities and topics the team is doing, how they link directly to the 28 recommendations in SSR1. So I think that will be helpful. Of course, we noted this in -- so that the October 3rd board letter, the team -- the co-chairs replied on October 6th, that addresses the SSR1 recommendations that were relevant for that fact-finding. It also provides the board with the links to the work plan as well. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So that's fine and accepted. Just to finish then, with specific reference to the point you just made about what you shall do and what you're required to do, is it -- my understanding is that you have received an analysis of the SSR1 implementations from ICANN org for a full analysis of those. Is that correct?

DENISE MICHEL: Alain, others might want to jump in here.

Joint Meeting - ICANN Board with SSR2 Review Team
02 November 2017

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

So I wouldn't use the word "analysis," but a final report -- well, the implementation of SSR1 and a final report was provided to the team -- we started March, April -- I think around the April, early May time frame.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It might not be an analysis. It's a report from staff that says this is what we have done to implement. We have done this, this, and this. We haven't do this. We've done this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, let me just -- yeah, we received a number of briefings that covered all the organizations and there's some of them given at different times. It wound up taking a little bit of time. But we've been briefed on all of it. I think it sort of fell into one of the subteam's charters to do more work because we needed to do an analysis of what we could get from that and what we couldn't. I think that's sort of the point at which when we started to have an complement of 15 out of 21 potential team members that we wound up having things stretch a little bit longer.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No problem. The comment wasn't about timing, just to make sure that you actually had got the sort of staff's explanation of what had happened.

Okay. I'm going to call this down to a halt now and let's wait for the start of the next session in eight minutes' time and we'll talk to the AC/SO chairs. Thanks.

If there's guys who was supposed to be up here at the next meeting, please feel free to do so. Come on in, people. We're closing this off for now.

So, Wendy, you can close that Adobe room down now. Thank you.

We're going to start at 2:00 as scheduled. We have a five- or six-minute chance to stretch.