

SSR2 RT Plenary Call Report
Plenary Call #39
9 August 2018 – 13:00 – 14:00 UTC

Review Team Members:

Alain Aina, Ramkrishna Pariyar, Noorul Ameen, Jabhera Matogoro, Kaveh Ranjbar, Laurin Weissinger, Rao Naveed Bin Rais, Eric Osterweil, Norm Ritchie, Denise Michel

Apologies

Žarko Kević, Geoff Huston, Kerry-Ann Barrett, Boban Krsic, Scott McCormick

Observers

George Sadowsky

Guests

Phil Khoury (Facilitator)

ICANN Org

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

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/pgZpBQ>

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 – Phil to lead discussion on issues raised by email

Phil noted there had been some exchanges on-list over the accuracy of the records of some recent calls. He suggested that, until the review team meets face-to-face in DC, that the team continues to use the style of meeting minutes currently in use. **Phil put the advice to the team that until the ‘pause’ issues had been discussed and put behind them, then lengthy exchanges about the accuracy of minutes would be quite unhelpful. He requested that the team be content with minutes as recorded for now.** After the face-to-face meeting in DC, the team and leadership **should be in a better place to have a ‘normal’ process for settling** how the written meeting records should look.

Team members emphasized the importance of the meeting records being as accurate and representative of the team discussions as possible. Eric suggested that the team should avoid discussing substantive historical matters until after the face-to-face meeting if the style of meeting records will not change before then. Phil noted that he will make **a few** edits to the record of the previous meeting to pick up issues that were raised by the team and recirculate to the team.

Action item: Phil to update meeting record of previous meeting, August 2, and re-circulate.

3. Next F2F at ICANN63 Barcelona – note from Phil circulated via email

- a. Discussion/questions re: proposal note from Phil**
- b. Settle 3 options, agree for Doodle poll?**

Phil noted that he had circulated some options for the team to meet during or around ICANN63 to the list, and asked for feedback on the logic of this as a method for the team to choose its next face-to-face meeting. **He stressed that team popularity votes on dates does not solve for problems of participation.**

Eric re-emphasized that there had been a discussion on-list regarding some team members being unable to meet in the two days prior to the ICANN meeting, and that some team members would prefer to meet during the ICANN meeting.

Denise suggested a Doodle poll of people's availability to include the 24th and 25th October, as well as the two days before and two days after the meeting. Denise also suggested that, if the 24th and 25th were selected, the team should send a note to SO/AC Chairs requesting for their help to accommodate the team meeting during those two days as this is during the ICANN meeting.

Action item: Staff/Phil to circulate a **revised email** regarding options to meet at ICANN63 and a Doodle poll with the options.

4. Induction for new members – progress on summary slides – part complete summary slides circulated via email

Phil updated the team that four of the five subteams have shared their summaries; he is missing the IANA transition group summary. Staff noted that two of the members of the subgroup, including the rapporteur, had resigned from the team. Phil will circulate the combined slide deck to the list for any further edits or input from the team.

5. Preparation for F2F

- a. Any update from staff on attendance**
- b. Draft session plan attached – brief introduction from Phil**
- c. Discussion, questions, comments, requests**
- d. Final calls from Phil before F2F**

Phil noted that he had circulated a work-in-progress draft session plan on-list. He asked that review team members share any suggestions or response to the document on-list or during the call, ideally before the next team meeting. Denise suggested to add a discussion point around consultant support to the agenda.

Action item: Review Team/Phil to add 'consultant support' as a discussion topic to the DC agenda.

Phil advised the team that he will schedule 1:1 calls with **as many of the team as can be managed** before the meeting. He asked the team to share any absences they expect to have during the face-to-face meeting with him, as well as any additional feedback to the draft session plan.

Action item: Team to share any absences they expect to have during the f2f meeting via email with Phil as well as any additional feedback to the [draft session plan](#) that was circulated to the list.

6. AOB

Denise suggested that staff draft a summary update of activities and progress including substance of what was addressed prior to the pause. Eric noted that not all subgroups had reached the same point and that qualitative judgements should not be included but work products that exist in different places could be put together in one place.

Phil suggested that he finalize and circulate the subgroup summaries for additional edits from the team, and will work with staff to identify items from the wiki that could be included.

Action item: Phil to finalize summary slides of subgroup progress, and work with staff to suggest any edits/additions to the wiki that might help new members with summarizing work to date.

Regarding action item from the team's 2 August meeting, "Phil to send questions via email for the review team to react to regarding methodology and approach to work": Phil reported he's researching methodology that might be useful for the team to conduct the review. He asked the team to share if they have any methodology suggestions or resources that would be useful to help the team find common language when talking about different approaches to work.

Staff read out recorded action items from the current meeting and asked for any edits or additions. None provided.

Consensus reached on decisions/action items: Yes