

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you everyone, this is Brenda speaking, welcome to SSR2 Review Team plenary call number 41, on the 30th 2018 at 14:00 UTC. Attending the call today, Alain, Boban, Denise, Eric, Kerry-Ann, Laurin, Naveed, Norm, Ram, excuse me... Scott, Zarko, and apologies from Russ [inaudible]. From ICANN Org attending today, we have Jennifer, Alice, Negar, excuse me... Steve, Brenda. I have no observers at this time. Today's call is being recorded, may I please remind you to state your name before speaking and I'll turn the call over to... I am sorry, am I turning it over today to Jennifer? Eric, thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, thank you very much. [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hi Eric, this is Kaveh speaking. I didn't hear my name so I just wanted to make sure it is also noted that I am on the call.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, thank you Kaveh.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. So, hopefully everyone can see the slide that's up in the Connect room. If not, please type something in the chat room or feel free to interject. Is everyone seeing the agenda slide?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, thank you Mr Matogoro. Okay, hearing no objections about the slides visibility, except for those that are on audio only, obviously, the quick sort of overview of the agenda today. We've just done the welcome roll call, in a moment I will hand it over to someone from the staff to provide an update on Barcelona. Then we'll discuss finalizing the terms of reference and scope, this will be hopefully, the point at which we converge on that and put a pin in it, put a fork in it. Then we'll talk about the drafting [inaudible] and look for feedback from the team, and then we'll... 3, an approach to the work plan, and talk about outreach in our comms plan, establish an approach and who the penholder will be. Then if we wind up getting through all that and we have sufficient time, then we'll start talking about SSR1 recommendations, and staff will provide an update. So, before we get started any comments or questions about that? Any agenda bashing that anybody would like to do? Okay, I see no hands and hear no objections. I will turn it over to someone from the staff, Jennifer or whomever, to talk about an update on Barcelona.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks Eric, it is Jennifer here, hi everyone. Just a quick update on Barcelona at this point, we have communicated to the meetings team, the review teams request for two full day face-to-face meetings on 21st and 24th of October. All our meetings team contacts are this week on PTO, they will be back in office next week, so we'll follow up with them but we just ask for your patience in the next couple of days until we get... until they are back in the office and we'll [inaudible] get some assistance from them in terms of....

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great Jennifer, thank you. A couple of points of order on that one if you don't mind. One, is it at all possible to give a rough ETA, even though the support team is on PTO, when we might hear back from you all about perspective timing, and also I see Denise's hand raised, so she will probably cover the thing I was going to hit next. Denise go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks Eric. Actually two things, one it will be useful if staff sent a placeholder calendar invite to review team members, so everyone can hold time on their respective calendars for that face-to-face meeting... meeting dates that we've selected in the ICANN meeting, and also as we've discussed, if you could just confirm it, that also we'll be

---

---

exploring... arranging for backup rooms that can be cancelled in an event that everything comes together within the ICANN venue, in a reasonable time, were committed to ensuring that we are [inaudible] responsible. So, we want to lock down this meeting, get people's travel arrangements done as early as possible to save money. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, thanks Denise... go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure, I just wanted to confirm that yes, we will be looking into the alternative arrangements as we've discussed, perhaps an alternative room in a venue somewhere, either [inaudible] but I just want to reassure you that we are working on that, next week, when the meetings team are back we'll be able to give you a bit more input into timelines and hopefully have a more... a better [inaudible] next week.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, thanks Jennifer. Yeah, if I could just ask in the sort of written communication we have about this, back and forth, to and from the team, if we could just include that consideration for external venue separate room, just so that it doesn't drop off people's radar, people [inaudible] as a way to sort of avoid having to book flights and hotel rooms last minute, per Denise's comment about [inaudible] responsibility. If you could just keep that in the writing, that would be really helpful thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, do we have some people back or just me?

DENISE MICHEL: Hi, this is Denise, I have dropped and I am back.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, it looks like we all got dropped. I will just give a couple of minutes for people to get back on and indication that their dial outs have happened. Okay, I suspect a lot of us are back on, but perhaps not all of us.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, hopefully we have everyone, or most of everyone. If you are not on the call please speak up, otherwise [inaudible] the slides please. Is this other subsequent slides? I think Jennifer is still being dialed out to. Alright, Adobe Connect for the win. If somebody else from staff able to assume control of the presentation? Great. So... yeah let's finalize the terms of our scope, thank you very much. Hopefully at this point people have had a chance to look at the draft that was penned by Laurin and pushed around and we got commentary from a number of folks [inaudible] and Denise, I thank you very much, there it is. Has anybody

---

not looked at it, that wishes they had more time to do so, because you know, unless you really feel the urge I would like to sort of put a fork in this today. Does anybody feel like it would be too soon to put a fork in it and would be willing to speak to that? Okay, great I see no hands raised. Oh, Laurin go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Right, this is Laurin. Just a quick one as we have been going through this, I have been emailing those people who have points to make sure that I would send that appropriately. I think [inaudible] is not on the call so the only thing is the, you know, the definitions where essentially... I propose that we use the document that is there for community review and is the most up to date based on last SSR review, so that is probably the most appropriate because essentially going back further to various definitions from various years and is... it is all very wonky, so I think let's just go with that one and if people really want to dig into it they can, because there are... actually links to how they're supposed to be [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thanks Laurin. Steve?

STEVE:

Hi Eric, thanks. This is Steve. So, Laurin sent an email out to John [inaudible] and myself, asking about the... creating a clickable path to how the definitions were created. John has received that and acknowledged that it is going to take a little bit of time from the way

---

back [inaudible] because the definitions from the framework was from SSR1 review, one of the recommendations that came out of that was to create a security framework document. So, the impetus of those definitions came from the SSR1 review, but there could be emails or links behind that. I would at this point confer if we want to wrap this up, concur with Laurin that we... you know, we act in good faith that this is what happened and we can always follow up with post spec onto the Wiki or a sub revision once we do have those links, but I am not sure we'll be able to get them today. I am pushing John by next week because then he is on travel and he becomes very difficult to wrangle.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great thanks Steve. [inaudible] your hand was up and then down again, would you like to say anything, or?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, it is okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so I put my hand up, I just got an acute. Just a sort of point of reflection that where we came to, those terms about defining before was based explicitly on the fact that there was a lot of consternation about the exact definition of these generally used terms and previously we had left out [inaudible] references and citations because there were no [inaudible] agreements on the number of these things like what is security and putting that in a box was tricky and we felt like it wasn't worth us writing something down that could then be a point of

---

[inaudible] later on, so we sort of generally left that out on purpose initially, so we can now sort of decide what we want. I am looking at the chat room and I see that Alain has suggested we do 24 hour last call, and I see Kerry-Ann saying her recollection is that Casey provided some citable links. So, on the one hand... I think that there might be... it might be worth pulling the group right now. Do we want to do another last call, or do we want to consider the time that has transpired between the face-to-face and now, the last call. In other words, Alain has proposed we do another 24 hour last call, what does the team think of that? Laurin, I see your hand is up, go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

This is Laurin again. I have been in touch with Casey about this because we were kind of like, trying to figure this out, and that proposal is essentially what is in the document, which is we just used this most recent thing for now. I did have yesterday what you think about this... I haven't heard back, so it might be the best approach to say we're generally happy but there's like a last few hours because particularly, Casey was looking into this as well and wasn't able to come back.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So, without my chair hat on I will just say, I am cognisant of the need for our team to move swiftly, and you know, I think it would be perfectly fine for us to do a 24 hour last call, but I am not sure that would help us converge anymore than before. Right now, I would like to take a straw pull of the team who is on the call... how many people would prefer a 24 hour last call, and then I'll do a straw pull of how many people would



---

prefer to converge on it now. So, can people either via the chat room or via the agree button in Adobe Connect, please let me know how many of you would like a 24 hour last call? Yes actually we can do them both at the same time, so yes please agree or disagree, I see only two people only so far and we're split on it. If you disagree with the 24 hour last call, please put disagree, if you agree with a 24 hour last call please put agree. We can take a poll, 4 people, 5... okay, and I am reading, so Kaveh is an agree. Kaveh if you are not in the Adobe room I understand, but if you are if you could do the button that would be helpful. Naveed is a disagree... Boban's....

BOBAN:

Hi, this is Boban. Yeah, I wrote down one comment in the chat room. I would like to finish it today if possible, and one minor thing. When we had a Trello board and we paste the URL of the board. Is that something for [inaudible] or should we delete the board, so if we delete it, we don't have to write it down if we come to use it again, yeah then we should maybe write it down.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, but I am confused, because I feel like I can't tell if you are... like if we just do a binary agree or disagree Boban, where would your head be? [inaudible].

BOBAN:

Forget the Trello board, then yes I have to agree for a 24 hour call.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, so how many people are chatting or not. Okay, so... I think I see a lot more people proposing to end it now, so it's not obviously, unanimous. So, it is a little difficult to [inaudible] together with the agree/disagree. Right now, if I were to call consensus, it would look like people will want to converge on the call now, and I think what I'll do is note the objections and go with consensus, or go with the majority on this. Unless somebody wants to call point order on the agreement protocol. Right now, I will note that Alain and Kerry-Ann are both in agreement for 24 hour last call, Boban, Denise, myself, Naveed, Norm, Scott, and Zarko are all of the preference that we converge on the call. So, I think what I would like to do then is with the majority, [inaudible] anybody saying anything else, go with... last calls now. Denise, please go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah, thanks Eric. I am sorry I had some audio problems. I just wanted to make sure that anyone on the call had any other issues with the terms of reference, now is obviously the time to raise it. What I heard Boban saying is that if we should note other electronic tools as the team deems necessary, in case we want to keep Trello. Is that... that seems like a reasonable and very minor addition that everyone can instantly agree to, but the reality is I think the team can continue to evolve and agree if needed on it work practices. But, if Boban would like to correct, make that addition I would be fine with it, but bring back to my main point, now is the time for people to raise any questions or issues they have with the terms of reference, in my view. Thank you.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks Denise, and Naveed is your hand raised? Am I getting that right?

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: I would like to say something.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Go ahead.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay, so my [inaudible], so in that I am wondering if we should have something as a point that the terms of reference could be reviewed by the team [inaudible] because this is what we are doing now and I don't see that inside the [inaudible] gives us the mandate to do what we are intending to do now, it seems that we are trying to even have the minor modifications without any explicit statement inside the [inaudible] with the unanimous decision, or the majority, the team can reject or review and require something like that. [inaudible], this is what I was thinking. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah thanks Naveed, that's really good. That's really helpful and underscores a point that I think Alain is making comments in the chatroom too. Alain I hope this is responsive to both Naveed and to you, but perhaps it is not. The terms of reference, basically gets us a direction to get started but you know, even on the agenda today we're planning to talk about a communication plan and the way in which we'll evolve, clearly our final report can be much different more than our

---

terms of reference. This is really just directional, for the team, and to give us some guide rails where we need them. So Naveed, yeah I think we'll be issuing a lot of communications, I am not sure they necessarily need to be in the terms of reference. I think that... people, feel free to correct me if you have a different perspective on this but the terms of reference are basically to set up in a direction without the promise of what we're actually going to do. Alain, I see in the chatroom that you mentioned that, if I read you correctly any sort of concerns over things that should be added. I think now would be the time to raise broad directional guide rail issues that you think need to be added, but certainly as we go forward, our work items... there are plenty of things we cover and communicate that aren't in our terms of reference. It's not really what the document is probably for... so, with other... Laurin mentioned a comment about you know, a deadline for more changes. I think I'd hate for us to get into loggerheads over email, between now and the next call, what I would like to do based on the majority vote we just took. Please anybody on the call, does anyone have any suggestions, concerns, or specific items that they'd like to discuss with regard to the terms of reference that we've been circulating for most of a week now? I will give people time... Boban go ahead [inaudible].

BOBAN:

[inaudible] but only one thing, so we initiated the Trello board to organize our tasks and so on, and we had on page seven a section about the [inaudible] so with reference to our mailing list, to the Wiki and so on, and the only question I have is should we also write there that we are using a Trello board and it is public, or not, so if we don't need it we can delete it and if we think, yes it would be good to use it, then we

---

should write it down on page seven, the electronic tools, is the only thing that I think about it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, that's a great discussion item Boban, so let me circle back to that after [inaudible], I note that Alain's comment was getting a refresh of the changes made, so Laurin, if you have the bandwidth and you are stationary enough to go through the review changes in a moment after the questions are done, the raised hands are done, if you don't mind running that based on your conversations with Casey and stuff, bring us up to date on what the status of the delta is on the terms of reference. That would be really helpful and while you consider that, Denise, your hand is raised.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. I just wanted to follow up on Boban's comment. My personal view is that under the electronic tools section of the terms of reference, you know, in keeping with the sort of broad direction and intent of the team, I believe that it is appropriate to note that we have as a primary means of communicating and writing are email list, which is publicly archived and that in circumstances as needed, we will have confidential or non public exchanges and when possible, any non confidential summaries and such discussions are posted to the public mailing list. Personally, I think that covers any sort of, work that we do on Trello, that we naturally, as we have in the past brought back to public documents and the public email list. So, personally I don't feel that it's necessary to specifically call out Trello, or note that we may at

---

times use some other mechanisms to do our work, as long as we're committing to do as much as is appropriate and feasible in the public sphere, I think we're covered with the current language. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I am sorry, I can't put my hand up anymore. Essentially how it looks like from my angle, the only thing that hasn't been fully sorted, of the stuff that I looked at, is essentially the footnote saying, as I said Casey has not replied yet, if there are certain changes, I am happy to put them in [inaudible] so if we agree on a change, if there was just like... literally like a point that I have [inaudible] anything, I am happy to put it in once I am in like a, suitable airport location and then send it round by tomorrow evening with all the changes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, so thank you, that is great Laurin I appreciate that, and I certainly appreciate the position you are in now so certainly understand. I am cognisant of the time, it's half past and we've got a couple of connection issues so it's set us back a little bit on time, so I would like us to move forward. In as much as we didn't agree to a 24 hour last call, I think we're in possession of the most up to date document with changes tracked. I suggest that we put a fork in this and call it done, I think if no one has any burning of I really wish this and I really wish that, and [inaudible] Boban if you are amenable to Denise's observation and perspective on the electronic tools, does that satisfy you Boban and your concern?

---

BOBAN: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. So then based on the sort of majority vote I would like to call this done. Alain, I think... I suspect if there is something serious or something very minor that doesn't really cause [inaudible] maybe if by the end of the call, if you can send a note out to the team suggesting something, but I'd like at the end of this call to have this done. So, with that said, I will give just a brief pause, any comments or questions before I... Alain, thank you for putting that in the chat room, anybody else, comments or questions before I move onto the next agenda item? Great, alright, thank you very much. If Jennifer or someone from staff could please bring us back to the next agenda item. Great work everybody, by the way, on coming together on the TOR. Okay, so here is the draft communique, so is everyone able to see this, how many people are voice only? I am not sure, this did come out to the list just recently, right? Or am I mistaken about that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It was circulated to the list already.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Do you recall when? Sorry I am a little behind.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sent probably by 3PM Pacific yesterday.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, yesterday afternoon, okay. So, it's possible that not everyone has had a chance to look at that, but I would like to give people a moment in the Adobe chatroom, I am happy to read it, if there are people that are audio only that can't see the chatroom right now, the Adobe Connect room. I will just go ahead, introduction. The SSR2 review team met in Washington DC from 22-24 August 2018, a record of the meeting can be found here, and there's a link. 13 review team members attended the meeting in person, 2 review team members attended remotely, the meeting was facilitated by Phil Khoury, and a link to his consulting practice. Objectives. The primary objectives of this meeting was to onboard new members who have joined since the quote pause, unquote, for the review team to select its leadership, to agree on means of working together productively to reach consensus and agree on a scope of work for the review. Herein a complete list of meeting objectives can be viewed here, hyperlink, the review team believes that it has successfully met the objectives of the meeting. Review team membership and roles. Denise, would you like to go now, or would you like me to finish.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh no, please finish.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Review team membership and role section. The five team members appointed to the review team during the quote pause unquote, Kimberly [inaudible], Russ [inaudible], Scott McCormick, Rao

---



---

Naveed, Laurin... I can't say your last name dude, Weissinger, is that close? We were present in Washington DC and successfully brought up to speed on the work of the review team to date. The complete review team composition can be viewed [here](#), hyperlink. The review team decided the following leadership structure, chair, Russ [inaudible], vice-chairs, Denise Michel, [inaudible], Laurin Weissinger. Terms of reference, scope, and work plan section. The review team is in the process of refining its scope with intent to finalize its terms of reference and scope in September 2018. These will be shared with the ICANN board and supporting organizations advisory committee's and constituency group leaders for informational purposes. Revisions to the work plan are underway including to the timeline of the review milestones, the review team intends to continue regular outreach and communications to keep the ICANN community apprised of progress towards milestones. Closing, the review team would like to thank Phil Khoury and the ICANN staff for their contributions to a productive meeting. The team is looking forward to progressing its work efficiently and plans to next meet at ICANN 63 in Barcelona. Details for this face-to-face meeting are currently being confirmed. The only comment that I will make before going into Denise's in the closing, ICANN staff the S is probably supposed to be capitalized. Alright, go ahead Denise.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you Eric and thank you staff for giving us a first draft on this. I would just note, in my personal opinion, that I think we want to be a little more accessible in our communications that we issue, not the governmental advisory committee. So, I think we should keep in mind what the community really wants to know about the review team, put

---

that upfront and make the style a little more informal and accessible and, to that end... however, I think all the basic facts seem to be here. I would like to do some red line edits to rearrange a few things, change the tone a bit, and I'd like to put that out on the list for people's consideration. I would suggest that we take a day to share some edits and then re-circulate an updates red line and give people another day to consider before we send this out. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great comments Denise, thank you. Naveed, go ahead please.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah, one of the things in the objectives as mentioned is the agree on the scope of work and terms of reference is not mentioned here, so, I believe that it's implicit either, or we need to mention it explicitly the terms of reference. But, in the terms of reference scope and work paragraph, we say that we are still in process of finalizing or refining the scope in terms of reference. I think this is the thing we can say and communicate that we are done with it, we have refined the terms of reference and scope, and we making the regions to the work [inaudible] method than what was your objective, objective was to take on board the newcomers. Except that objective I can see that [inaudible] none other objective was actually met during the meeting. I want to give a message that no we did more than that, so I think that we finalize almost here the scope and terms of reference. I would like it to be like rephrased as we already did that, rather than it is in the process of refinement.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that's a great comment Naveed. Thank you. I see Denise and Norm agree with you. I am going to make a proposal to the team, I would like to ask someone to please volunteer to be the penholder and I would like to do a last call on this where we iterate over email, and say let's have people submit comments to an editor and have the... have a last call for it, let's say Tuesday morning and we can pick a time UTC. This will give us several days over the weekend and the remainder of this week and into next week for people to submit comments, so one does that generally sound acceptable to people? I am sorry, let me rephrase that. Does anyone have any concerns with that, basically doing list collaboration over edits to the draft communication with the close, early in the day of Tuesday next week, does anyone object to that proposal? Okay, great. I don't see any indication of dissent, that is excellent, and I see Denise volunteering to hold the pen. I think Denise, no one else has spoken up, I think that you get the duty. I will ask then for people to take the draft communication that was circulated on list, please do some red line comments if you have any and submit them back to the list, Denise will hold the pen, finalize and retransmit the final draft Tuesday. Denise, you pick the time on Tuesday, so everyone we are [inaudible] to Denise's schedule for Tuesday, but that gives you several days. Anyone have any objections to that. Great, alright, so let's consider that one completed. So, let's move back to the agenda please. Okay, so... agree approach to work plan, so... I see typing in the chat room. This is sort of our last major accomplishment for the meeting, the SSR1 stuff was aspirational and I see we're coming, time is at a close. I guess I'll just... this one I'm not sure exactly what our objective

---

---

accomplish with this is, does everyone agree with so for example, we just had a majority vote... is that sort of an agreeable way for everyone on the team to move forward? Where sometimes not everyone gets their way but we do a straw poll or something like that, does anyone have any objections to the way we just handled this? Okay, does anybody have any comments or would like to discuss anything about it? I only harp on this because I want to make sure that were on the same page with this, I want to make sure that we try to minimize any sort of wrinkles in the future, I would definitely appreciate, I think the team would appreciate hearing anybody's perspective if it differs from what we've just done.

Okay, so I will just discuss generally what our proposal for how we move forward, and I definitely hope that people have either a sense or input to the following. So, one of the sort of chair call, we discussed how to move the work forward, and our perspective on this was probably at this point based on the relative levels of maturity of each of the former sub teams, and sort of the energy behind them. It made sense to probably inline them, to not do them in parallel, to do on them plenary, these main calls with each other and in between, focus on one thing at a time, and what our thoughts were subject to the teams perspective, is to start off with SSR1 as you can see on the agenda for today, that would be the first of the sub teams that we would begin to work on. We would go through the reviews, we would listen to the outstanding things and there's some commentary on that if we get to it in a few minutes, beyond just working on it. Subsequently, what we would do is, we would go through the iCANN SSR sub teams work, the work that included the LA meeting, outstanding questions, work that we had to

---

do, after SSR1 was done, we would go to that. After that, we would go back to the DNS SSR and that one could potentially take more of our time, because it was a less mature sub team, as far as progress went, to SSR1 or ICANN SSR. After that, that's when we would circle back to the future work, which was necessarily a bit blast on the other teams completing their work anyway. So, that's our general work plan suggestions to the team, and I'd look for comments or questions, or suggestions, or commentary on that. Including if I was unclear. Boban go ahead.

BOBAN:

Thanks Eric. Yeah this is Boban, yes really appreciate it here and I would also like to start with SSR1 but regarding the sequence of the other one, well we should wait for the output of SSR1 and decide in together, if it's good to start with the ICANN SSR or DNS SSR or something else here, because I know if the sequence is the correct one yet, because decided only with sub groups and we numbered them, yes, we had sub group number 1 and it was SSR1 and we had sub group number 2 and that is ICANN SSR, and maybe we could change the sequence of them. That is all. But, I really appreciated the focus altogether on one chapter.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great, thank you. That makes perfect sense. Naveed, go ahead.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:

I agree with this approach of finishing SSR1 first, in my opinion I think all the team members should first work on SSR1 and to see in different

---

perspectives, different backgrounds that we come from and that could provide a real good input of what we are going to recommend for this SSR2 round. So it's imperative that all the team members and not only the teams that we created, the sub teams that we created to work on that SSR1. The whole team members should rather work on that one. At some point we need to resolve also the, what I learnt that staff already give feedback that SSR1 was completely implemented, what was recommended and the review team [inaudible]. So we need to sort this issue ASAP as well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, great. Yeah. So, I am going to suggest that we sort of record this sort of decision reached on the level of the team agrees that, and by all means raise your hand. Boban is your hand, is that an old hand or are you raising your hand again?

BOBAN:

[inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, I think that might be an old hand. Boban, interrupt me if that's a new hand. So I think the decision that we reached here is that the team agrees the general approach of inlining all of the former sub teams into the main plenary call, to start with SSR1, while we could maybe have a sort of a standing, you know, presumption that we might go to the ICANN SSR work next, we will assess which sub group to address next, after we've finished the SSR1, and I think that makes good sense. I

---

certainly think this is something that we can continue to discuss on the mailing list, and I think certainly if there are issues on any of the sub team topics, that are relevant to people, there is no reason not to bring them up on the list. In the event that the list, for some reason becomes difficult to manage because somebody is... some group of people are speaking about the work item that isn't currently being discussed. We can manage that on the list and revisit on the next call, but this isn't an attempt to squelch people from discussing or considering things on the list. This is just sort of deciding what's the main, you know, official focus of the team at any given time. So we will start with SSR1, we'll have a general perspective on what the next sub topic would be, but we'll formally decide that after we get finished with SSR1. Does anyone think that that sounds different than what the team consensus is right now? Wow... I don't know if that's a form of consent or not. So, Kerry-Ann has asked if there will be an opportunity to add new sub topics? What do people on the team think? Do we want to consider the prospect of adding new sub topics at some point? I will note that the DNS SSR topic itself was reasonably undefined, so in a sense one of the things that will happen with that, when it comes to that is its breadth and scope will be sort of considered at that time. So, what do other people think? Okay, it looks like people are happy to consider adding new topics and I think that's fair, I don't think we should consider anything here to have been restricted. I think when new topics come up, we will certainly have to consider the appropriateness of them in regards to the terms of reference we just ratified. Certainly that will always be part of a discussion if we bring up new topics, but it looks like, just reading the chat room. It looks like people are generally okay with that, Naveed, I see you asked a clarifying question about [inaudible] to the existing

---

---

topics. I think if someone brings up a new topic, we'll discuss that. Certainly we don't want to retread the same ground in the new topic if it's already considered by a previous topic, so we're speaking in generality so it's really hard to be specific, but I think that's a fair concern. [inaudible] that looks to me like it was a very well received comment, thank you for that.

Okay, so any other comments or questions about the agreement approach or our work plan? Which I know I missed reading the slide, but I thought it was important to put those two things. Going to wait for the chat room to...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, good. While the host is away we can move forward then. It looks like we have a little bit of time so we're not going to get too heavy into SSR1 but one of the first things... sorry outreach and comms plan. Sorry, [inaudible]... the outreach and comms plan. So, we have very little time before we get to the... staff would you like to discuss the template that you mentioned on the chairs call? I am sorry, someone from staff, Jennifer of whomever.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, it's Jennifer here. Sure. So, yesterday on the leadership call we discussed a template that was developed during the pause, which you



can see on screen here and it was actually used by the RDS review team quite successfully. I would like to emphasize that this is a template and you know, it's just suggestions so the review team can edit this, or you know, make it functional for your own purposes as much as you would like. But we just wanted to make you aware that we have developed a template for you know, your outreach plan that might be helpful so, as you can see the idea is that you would list the goals and objectives that you are trying to achieve and then maybe list the methods that you would do that and the communication methods that you might use. So, you can see that here and then questions to pose and then outcomes, and we would obviously suggest that this is posted on the Wiki and it can be used as a reporting tool as well, you know, it will be publically available to everybody to see, okay, who you spoken to and the outcomes of each of the communications. So, it's on the screen here for those of you who can see it and with that, happy to answer any questions.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay thanks Jennifer, so I will be first in the queue and maybe that will prime other people to jump in. We only have a few minutes left so think quickly people if you have comments or questions and we won't necessarily converge on it here today, so take time to think about it. Jennifer, is the goal of this template, like per, for example, for engagement, or per milestone reached by the team. Like what is the expected use of this template?

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: I am sorry, can you repeat the question.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, what is the expected use of the template. Like, do we fill this out every time our objective is to meet with a supporting organization for example? Or is this to issue an item every time we reach consensus on something, or is this sort of a living document where the bullet list continues to grow? What was the envisioned role of this template?

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, the way that it was developed was for each specific outreach, so at the top it says name of target groups, so you might want to put there... I don't know... you know one of the constituency groups or whoever your target audience is, and then develop one of these sheets for each of those audiences. Then [inaudible] each communication or outreach that you have with that specific audience. Does that make sense?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Yes it does, thank you. So, while people think, so feel free to raise your hand at any point if you have a perspective on this but I think also part of our comms and outreach plan could be our expectations or our ambitions around, for example, issuing blocks and things like that. So, does anyone on the team have a perspective an opinion, an aspiration or anything about that sort of outreach? Okay, well this item is something that we need to start thinking about, I would propose that we take this to the list and nominally give people until the next plenary call to think about this. Perhaps it will make itself into the agenda for

---

next week as well to put a fork in, but this was just a proposal from some people on staff based on other review teams success and interest in it. Yes, I see Kerry-Ann, you're exactly right... that's what I think we need to talk about is a broader plan in addition to this. In the past we've talked about blogs and we've issued some blogs, we've talked about communicae, we have a communicae that we're going to be working on until Tuesday morning. I think coming up with a coherent, what is our communications plan, this is just one piece of it, but I think it would be good, if nothing else to make sure that everyone on the team understands what our plan and perspective and our expectations are around how we communicate. Does anyone have any thoughts on that? As we come to the final minutes of the call. Okay, I see Kerry-Ann suggesting that we use some of our work in DC to come up with frequency of engaging specific groups. Yeah, I think on the one hand we could sort of leave this sort of [inaudible], on the other hand I think we've been given secondary indications that that may leave people silently in the works, so I think we need to come up with a more structured plan, even if it just clarifies what we're already doing. So, let's take this to the list and if the list doesn't converge on this, or even maybe address it, I think it may wind up showing on future plenary calls. So, we don't... I think in my estimation, have time to go to the SSR1 right now and what I would like to do is move to any other business, in the last three minutes of the call. Does anyone have any other business they would like to raise? Okay, I see none, so I will turn it over to Jennifer or whomever on staff to go through the action items.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks Eric, Jennifer here. So, the decisions reached that we have recorded are the team finalize the terms of reference document agreeing to accept the track changes in the last version circulated to the list and call it final. The second decision reached, the team agrees to the approach inlining for the sub team to the plenary level, the team will start with SSR1 and assess which sub group to address next with the agreement that as new topics come up, they will be discussed. Action items, [inaudible] placeholder calendar invites for the Barcelona dates, that the team agreed to. ICANN Org to explore the possibility of holding meetings at an alternative venue. On the communique, review team members to send to [inaudible] edits and comments to the mailing list by Tuesday, Denise will hold the pen and issue the revised final draft. Then finally, move the outreach template to the list for the team to discuss further on list. Any edits or comments on those, let me know. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you Jennifer.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, this is Denise. I just have a quick clarification. [inaudible] offsite room, please indicate that as a backup that can be cancelled once a venue room has been identified. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great I see that is being updated as we speak, the action item was. Great everyone, I am prepared to return to you several seconds of your

---

day. Thank you very much for a productive call, please send your comments to the list for all the items that need that and the deadlines associated, and otherwise we will talk to you again this time next week.  
Thanks.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**