

SSR2 RT Plenary Call Report
Plenary Call #38
2 August 2018 – 20:00 – 21:00 UTC

Review Team Members:

Eric Osterweil, Denise Michel, Laurin Weissinger, Kaveh Ranjbar, Naveed Bin Rais, Norm Ritchie, Alain Aina, Geoff Huston, Rao Naveed Bin Rais, Jabhera Matogoro, Scott McCormick, KC Claffy

Apologies

Boban Krsic, Amin Hasbini, Jabhera Matogoro, Žarko Kecić, Noorul Ameen, Kerry-Ann Barrett, Ramkrishna Pariyar

Observers

Guests

Phil Khoury (Facilitator)

ICANN Org

Jennifer Bryce, Alice Jansen, Negar Farzinnia, Yvette Guigneaux, Steve Conte

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

The SSR2 Review Team undertook the following during this session:

1. Attendance, apologies, admin issues

Roll call and apologies. See recorded attendance above.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

a. Any amendments?

b. Comments on style/content to be held over to next hookup

Staff relayed outstanding actions noted on the tracking tool on the wiki here:

<https://community.icann.org/x/VrnRAw>.

Phil **communicated that there had been some disagreement over the description of the decision** from previous meeting around whether or not to put in a request to meet in Barcelona. To be addressed in agenda item 3.

3. Next F2F at ICANN63 Barcelona

a. Discussion re: process

b. Discussion revisiting decision / options

Following staff providing the only times available for a F2F adjoining ICANN63 (requiring attendance on the Thursday and Friday prior) **several emails have been exchanged on-list throughout the week indicating unavailability and some expressing a preference for any such meetings to be held during the time of the main ICANN meetings, in pop-up rooms or at a hotel.** Some frustration was expressed that team preferences had not been supported in the past.

Given the frustration expressed and that it seems all possibilities for F2F at ICANN63 have problems, for the team to make an informed choice about the meeting, Phil suggested that staff could provide three

options for meeting opportunities, **setting out the limitations of each option**. Team members suggested a Doodle poll as a reasonable way for team members to indicate their preference for meeting options.

Action item: Staff to share information about options to meet in Barcelona and circulate a Doodle poll.

4. Induction for new members – progress, any feedback on new wiki resource, progress report on summary slides

Phil updated the team on progress of the summary slides; some team members have provided a summary of progress by subgroups prior to the pause, a few are outstanding. Phil will provide the summaries to the team shortly once he has received them all.

Phil highlighted the reorganization of material on the [wiki](#) and asked for feedback, particularly from new members. No feedback shared from team members yet.

5. Recommencing Review work

- a. Outstanding tasks – staff**
- b. SSR2 scope – any suggestions re: possible preparation for team**
- c. NDAs outstanding?**
- d. Review, discussion of budget information from staff**

Outstanding tasks: Staff noted that in October prior to the pause, staff had informed the SSR2 leadership that going forward archives of the leadership emails and meetings would be posted to the wiki in line with transparency processes around Specific reviews. **An outstanding item from prior to the pause was if archives of past leadership emails and meetings would be posted**. Staff suggested that this outstanding item be resolved and past archives be posted to the wiki.

Action item: - Staff to complete task of posting records of leadership meetings and emails to the wiki.

NDAs: Phil noted that the topic of NDAs had been mentioned in discussions and noted this as an **outstanding task that could be addressed**. The team noted that the issue of the NDA had been discussed prior to the pause, some members indicating their significant discomfort with signing the document. Staff provided information from the ICANN Bylaws as to when an NDA might be required, and provided an example from the review team's LA meeting as to how productive discussions have taken place without the NDA.

Phil apologized for raising the issue in ignorance – he had simply thought it was a minor administrative issue.

Action item: Staff to provide a brief email summary of the position arrived at by the review team **regarding the NDA prior to the pause** (include NDA as attachment to the email).

6. Preparation for F2F

- a. Progress update on attendances, team dinner, logistics**
- b. Reminder/reportback re: remote attendance, recording of sessions, observers**
- c. Draft objectives for meeting – any feedback, suggestions**

- d. Discussion re: possible use of TMS work preferences profiling tool**
- e. Discussion re: methodologies for reviews**
- f. Will be one further one-to-one call from me before F2F – am going to make specific requests of each**

Progress update: ICANN org staff provided an update on attendance for the DC meeting indicating that **only one team member would not be attending at all and one would attending remotely**. A team dinner is being scheduled for Wednesday 22nd August.

Recordings: Phil has requested that recordings of sessions during the face-to-face meeting in DC that pertain to internal processes and dynamics of the team not be posted publicly. Normal transparency conventions should resume when discussions return to the review work.

Draft objectives: Phil will circulate a draft session plan for the DC meeting prior to the next review team meeting for people to comment on. He encouraged team members to share any feedback on the report from the 1:1 interviews either on the call or via email.

Team members shared thoughts on objectives for the DC meeting, highlighting the items that SO/ACs raised as part of the unpausing, including scope, as priorities to address.

Action item: Phil to circulate a draft session plan for the DC meeting prior to the next review team meeting.

Methodology: Phil noted that methodology and approach to work are areas where the team seems to have the most disagreement. He has some questions for the team on these topics, which he will circulate via email.

Action item: Phil to send questions via email for the review team to react to regarding methodology and approach to work

Profiling tool: Phil outlined a work preferences profiling tool that the team may wish to use to help determine work preferences and areas of strength of each team member. He will share more information on the email list.

Team members discussed preferences for working via different means, including face-to-face meetings, teleconference meetings and email lists. Team members shared ideas on what types of work were best accomplished via each means. Phil noted that, during the face-to-face meeting in DC, it will be important for the team to establish protocols around which means (email, teleconference, face-to-face meeting) the review team should use for each type of work.

7. AOB

ICANN org informed the review team that as of the face-to-face meeting in DC, Brenda Brewer will be providing secretariat support for the SSR2 review in place of Yvette Guigneaux.

Staff read out action items recorded during the meeting and received a request to circulate these via email.

Consensus reached on decisions/action items: No – action items sent via email for any feedback.