

---

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR2 Review Plenary call #42 on September 6, 2018, at 14:00 UTC.

Attending the call today, we have Denise, Eric, Kaveh, Naveed, Norm, Ram, Scott, Kerry-Ann, Zarko, Russ, and Laurin. We have no observers at this time. From ICANN Org, Jennifer, Steve, Negar, Alice, and Brenda. We have apologies from Bogan, Alan, Mr. Matagoro, and KC.

I'd like to remind you all today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking. Russ, I'll turn the call over to you. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. So, let's start by hearing from staff about the arrangements for Barcelona.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Russ. It's Jennifer here. Hi, everybody. The meeting request for the Sunday the 21<sup>st</sup> and the Wednesday the 24<sup>th</sup> of October are with the meetings team. Both days we will have room for their review team to meet with a few caveats, which I will go over in just a minute, but I wanted to start with the fact that you should be receiving e-mails from the travel team within the next few days with the approved travel dates and please go ahead and start making your bookings as soon as you are able to do so. As usual, just drop us a line if you're not able to attend in person or if you plan to attend remotely.

---

*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.*

---

So, with that said, on the Sunday, at the moment, the only room that's available is a self-service room, which means it has a polycom phone only. There's no tech equipment and push-to-talk mics or tech support that you would be used to usually at an ICANN meeting. However, we are still trying to find a regular room for you all to meet in. It might be that we have to do two separate rooms, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Regardless, MSI support staff will be there and we'll continue to work to try and find a regular session room.

On the Wednesday, the good news is that there are regular session rooms available with all the tech support that you would be used to. At the moment, the room is not guaranteed and I will emphasize that, however, the meetings team are aware of the importance of this request as the SOs and ACs are [inaudible] the e-mail that went out yesterday from Russ on behalf of the team.

With that said, I'll pause for any questions and then I want to move on to the next item which is the engagement session. Does anybody have any questions?

Okay. Great. Well, thank you. The second agenda item under this Barcelona meeting session is the engagement session. We will need to put in a request this week if the review team wishes to have an engagement session at Barcelona. What that usually would be is a 60-minute session where the review team would present to the community your status and then obviously have an opportunity for the community to ask questions or share thoughts or feedback with the review team. I'm sure you're all used to this in some shape or form with your past

---

experiences. So I just wanted to highlight that we would need to get our requests in this week if you wish to do so.

So I'll pass it over to Russ. Perhaps you can facilitate that discussion. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. Given that we've just gotten started and we just sent the community a blog saying that, I'm not sure what else we would tell them other than what is in the blog at this point. But I'm kind of thinking that we ought to give the community an opportunity to talk to us. What do others think?

DENISE MICHEL: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead. And I see some people are typing in the chat room as well. Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: I think it would be appropriate to have a limited opportunity for general engagement with the community. That could take the form of a separate [one-hour] event, or we could consider adding an open-mic community engagement element to the end of one of our scheduled meetings.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think your suggestion is that we would carve out a piece of the Wednesday to do community engagement and then just announce that on the agenda so that at that point we would present our status where we are and then offer time for the community to talk to us. Is that correct?

DENISE MICHEL: That's one option. The other option is having a free-standing separate engagement event. Staff often puts you in a big ballroom up on a dais. You're laughing, but it's true. I'm just noting there are a couple different ways we could go about this, but in general I think since we'll be there it would be a good idea to have something discrete in case there are people who would like to have discussions or provide verbal input. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I see that Kaveh has typed that he agrees that we ought to have an engagement session.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Russ, if I can have my hand up?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. I didn't see any hands up on the screen. Go ahead, Scott.

---

SCOTT MCCORMICK: No worries. I'm in the middle of commuting right now, so I'm switching between this on my Adobe Connect and my phone on the phone here.

I agree with Denise. However, I think we should have at least our work streams down and announced as at least a draft for comment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I hope that we are pretty far along in what was laid out last week in terms of we are starting the SSR1 point and then we're going to revisit the prioritization of the others once the SSR1 part is done. But if there's no pressing need, we'll take them in the order of the ICANN SSR, DNS SSR, and future challenges. Hopefully we'll be further along in doing that work after the calls between now and Barcelona and then having done a full day on the Sunday so that we'll be able to lay that out and then say where we are in it.

Okay, so I'm not hearing anyone speak against doing an engagement.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I have my hand up, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I am sorry. Go ahead, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, just a point of maybe clarification. I'm not sure if I'm reading exactly what Scott was saying, but just in case there's a misunderstanding, I think one of the things that has come up is the

---

other review team reports that we were going to take a look at and potentially [inaudible] in. I think there was some discussion that, depending on what we hear about those reports or find in them based on the potential overlap, it may cause us to reconsider some of our work. Scott, don't let me put words in your mouth, but I guess I do recall there was some consternation about does that change some of the work items that we have in front of us. So maybe we just need to be cognizant of that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're talking about the CCT and the WHOIS 2 [inaudible]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Exactly, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So I'm not sure that we – well, if I understand the schedule right, we will have seen the CCT report next week. So then we can assess its impact. But it's not clear when before Barcelona we'll see the other one.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that's cool. Just one suggest I think I floated before, but just to submit it for the team in Europe, your consideration, was there is the webinar that people may or may not be able to make. And of course when you ask people to read things, you get varied results in how many people actually do it. But a briefing sometimes goes a long way or even just maybe a discussion point on a plenary call when we all are focused

---

up. It's just one way to say, "We've presented this to you." It's like having a lecture. You can skip the lecture, but then it's really on you.

So I wonder if we want to consider making it an agenda item to say somebody who has done the review of it or someone who attended the webinar, here's what we heard. And hopefully everyone has had it, but like I'm going to have a partial conflict with the webinars, so I'll have to catch up on them and stuff. So just a thought of if we really want to make – I know it's going to extra efforts – but as far as making sure people on the team are aware of what's in those reports. We may just say, "Hey, everyone do your homework," and then we'll revisit it on the plenary call either briefly or in raw detail, and just be sure it doesn't adjust our FOV or our work plan. That would just be a suggestion.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

That makes sense to me. I think we take them each in turn. Hopefully the CCT one sooner and then the other one after both of the webinars have happened so that as many people who are able to attend a webinar have done so.

Okay, I see Kerry typing that she agrees. [I don't see any] hands. Go ahead. Hi, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Thank you. I have just another quick comment. I think it is really important and we should really try to push for having as much engagement at the meeting as possible. Due to the [long pause on everything], I think we should really try to go to the community and try

---

to get as much interaction with them as possible even if it slightly impacts on how much work we can get done just so they remember who we are, what we're doing, and to reestablish that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, Jennifer, I think the summary of that is that, yes, we want to do engagement. And we are willing to carve out a piece of the Wednesday to do it in the room you have already requested, or you can go ahead and schedule another place. Hopefully, it will be between the Sunday and the Wednesday, not making the trip longer for anyone.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My understanding is most of the engagements are usually on Tuesday when you get the ballroom model. Is that right?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I believe so.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Okay, so Norm agrees, as he just put in the chat room.

All right, I'm going to pass this over to Denise. I hope we can finalize the comms outreach plan. We've been talking about it on the mail list. Denise, you want to take us through that?



---

DENISE MICHEL:

Sure. We actually don't have a synthesized communications plan. We talked very briefly about it, but we really haven't gotten too much more details or input on the e-mail list to actually call it a plan.

Generally, the review team put together a broad overview of their intentions of communications and outreach, stepping off the communication tools and activities that are noted in the Terms of Reference and Scope document. Normally, the plan would cover the types of interaction that we're committing to but also discuss the specific opportunities for engagement with the community [with] the different groups that we would interact with and general timing of our efforts. And we have a list of potential groups to engage with outside of ICANN if the [inaudible] merits it. And we can also bring that into the communications and outreach plan as well.

But at this point, we actually don't have a final draft of a communications and outreach plan. We have the work that was done before the pause, and that's where we sit. If there is anyone else on the team who is interested in helping finish out a draft communications and outreach plan to put on the list, I welcome the opportunity to work with them [and] Kerry-Ann. I think we only need a couple days to put this out on the list.

Unless people have other suggestions or comments they'd like to raise right now, what I would propose is that Kerry-Ann and I and anyone else on the team who is interested in helping share some, trade some drafts and then put something up on the list for people's consideration early

---

next week. I'm hopeful that this is something that we can [fairly] straightforward and we can come to an agreement on, on the list. But if not, we could hold it over for discussion during our next call. I welcome people's comments on that idea. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That makes sense to me. I think if anyone has a different view or wants to join Denise and Kerry-Ann with the drafting, please speak up.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm happy to lend a hand if necessary. Just e-mail me. As soon as I'm back from this conference, I'll be more able to help. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Thanks, Laurin.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see Kerry-Ann has asked whether we want to consider incorporating the stakeholder mapping that we did in DC into the comms plan. Given that she wanted to help write it, we should let her.

DENISE MICHEL: Sounds like a good idea, yeah. Great. Good idea.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right, we'll put this back on the agenda for next week, and hopefully we'll all have something we can get behind and post.

---

Okay, the next thing on the agenda is to start working on the SSR1 questions and recommendations. We had a list of questions that were not yet answered at the time that the pause happened. So I think we want to go through those first. I think staff prepared some slides for that. Who is going to take us through those?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hello. So, correct, there's a number of slides here that contain all the questions that are still outstanding. I'll highlight just like this part on the screen that these are also on the briefing materials page of the wiki. There's quite a few of them. They're organized by the briefing, the clusters if you will, of how the recommendations were put together.

The ones that are on screen just now are the general questions. Then, for example, here are the questions from the CTO briefing. So I don't know how you want to do it. I know you were wanting to focus on the first couple of recommendations. I don't know if you wanted to [take] those questions first or what the best approach would be. We can also give everybody rights to scroll their own slides if that would be helpful. There's just quite a few questions.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yeah. I think the thing we want to figure out is when we're going to get answers to the questions so that we don't tackle a recommendation before we have the responses to the questions that are related to that recommendation. Do we have a feel for how long it's – I just heard a bling. Did I drop, or did somebody else?

JENNIFER BRYCE: No, you didn't drop. I can answer that question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: What I would say is that the approach that we would take to this is pose the questions to the appropriate SMEs within the organization and then ask them to give us a reasonable date to when they think they'll be able to answer the questions. Because MSSI can't provide that information. I'm not sure how long it's going to take them to answer some of these questions. But that's how we would do it. And then we would come back and make sure that the team is up-to-date with those. When I say a reasonable time, I think that SMEs also understand that this is a priority for the review team. So we would make sure they're to get answers back to you as soon as possible.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I see hands from Naveed and Kerry-Ann. Naveed first.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, hi. Can you hear me clearly?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

---

---

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Before we start discussion on this SSR1, I see all the slides of the questions and recommendations, which I saw before as well, but what I remember was there was a discussion that these questions I don't know at what stage these questions were asked to the ICANN. It was prior to the pause or this is something new. I'm still not sure. But one of the comments or what I understood was that the SSR1 as per ICANN staff was that all recommendations were implemented. So do we have [proof] in terms of answers to those questions [in that term]? Or it's just [about] the communication between ICANN staff and the review team about what was implemented and what was not and these questions were basically formalized at a later stage? In order to understand this, I want an answer to this thing. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry-Ann and Denise?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's a similar observation from Naveed because there are two things I wanted us to focus on out of it. One, the recommendations that are on this slide that we've highlighted [our things], I would like someone to clarify things that we did we're not satisfied [were done] which is why we're asking the questions, or are these key recommendations that we think required [answers]? Similar to Naveed, I'm not sure [the report] was taken on the SSR1 report slides that are on the wiki page. They do reference things that I believe were done based on how the recommendations were written. If Steve could help us or [Elizabeth]

---

because [I don't know] if our assessments will be looking at those documents that have been posted to say: yes, no, they're not good. They did answer the recommendation and they've met the recommendation. But are we asking additional questions outside of what the SSR1 team had recommended as an additional layer of their recommendation by asking additional questions?

The slide that they do have for the SSR1 Review, ICANN had flagged things that I think they've done. For example, with publishing a single and clear and consistent statement of their remit, they have on it what they think they've done. Then I'm not sure if our question is now an additional layer because you're asking since the version developed in 2012 SSR1 answer would have been based on the SSR1 recommendation. So it would be, I guess, a late date. It wouldn't be something that's current. [Is the recommendation asking for them] to make it current every single year?

I'm just trying to see how we're doing our probe to confirm whether or not recommendations were done because I'm not too clear on our approach. I don't know if I'm clear. I haven't had good coffee yet, so let me know if I'm not clear and I'll try and clarify.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Denise, you're next.

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry, I was on mute. Would Steve or someone like to address Kerry-Ann's question first? Did anyone on staff have any additional...?

---

STEVE CONTE: [There we go. I guess I was on mute also].

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, please [Steve].

STEVE CONTE: Sorry, I've [got the dog] this morning. I heard Kerry-Ann's question. I think there's [inaudible] I don't know if I'm the only person to work on this, so I think it is a takeaway for staff and I think we can look at it. It kind of goes hand in hand with when to get an answer, when everyone's expecting an answer off these questions too. So I'm happy to take a look at it and happy to work with the staff because, as I said, it's not all OCTO, SSR, [or items]. There's a good portion of it. I'm not passing the buck on that but want to take a holistic look on that and make sure we grab all the questions, all the answers, and then [talk] them through strategically and make sure you develop all the answers that you need.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My understanding, Steve, is that these questions were asked as part of the "did the actions taken have the desired effect" which we are supposed to answer as part of our review.

Denise and then Negar.

---

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Negar, was this related to – are you answering Kerry-Ann’s question as well, or should I go?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah, actually, Denise. I just wanted to elaborate, sort of build up on what Steve had pointed out because the recommendations go across multiple departments so obviously we’ll have more SMEs involved than just Steve also to look at it.

In regards to Kerry-Ann’s comment, part of the reference to what has been done since [the recommendations were implemented] a few years ago falls into what Russ just stated, which is has the recommendation had the intended effect if it is still indeed relevant and to see what has been done since then. Part of the answer to what has been done since then seems to me to be part of the research and investigation that the review team is going to be conducting into the subject matters that they have elected for the review.

With that, Denise, back to you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. I guess circling back to what Naveed mentioned as well or Kerry-Ann, the table that the staff created earlier in the review team’s work with the intention of tracking who made the request, the date of the request, the anticipated completion date, relevant notes, and the actual answer to the question – and this is a table I’ve shared on the list – and the completion date would help put the question in context and it



---

would also help the review team members have all of the questions and answers in one place.

I'm pretty well versed in finding things on ICANN.org and on the wiki, and even I'm having trouble putting everything together. I understand staff grouping things according to what meeting the question was asked in, but some of the questions asked in a meeting that was under the umbrella of Subgroup 2 is directly relevant to our due diligence and our consideration of and assessment of SSR1 implementation.

So taking all the questions from the different parts of the wiki and Google Docs and putting them in the table that you already created and having all the questions there, identifying the topic, would really make it much more useful for team members and enable us to quickly find the answers, consider it, ask any follow up questions we may have and would also enable us to track when we would expect to get an answer so we could also calibrate our work. I think it's pretty important. I think if I'm having trouble finding all of the questions and answers and related material, many team members are as well. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So can staff take that action? Do you understand what's being asked?

[JENNIFER BRYCE]:

We can take that action. Thanks.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. And you're going to do the best to figure out when we can get answers to each of these?

[JENNIFER BRYCE]: That's correct.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So I think with that behind us, we are able to turn to the recommendations and at least get started maybe on one or two in terms of understanding where we are. In preparation for this, I asked people to take a look at the first five just to make sure that we had enough read and digested to be able to go through this.

We have outstanding questions on one, but I'm hoping that we have enough information to determine whether we are able to determine whether this was met and whether it is still something that's relevant today and then what we need to do to answer whether the intended effect has occurred. So, Denise, you have your hand up.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, actually it was an old hand, but I always have questions if you'd like me to start the questions. No, I'll take my hand down and I'll [slip] the question in Adobe and let Eric take this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Go ahead, Eric.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

My hand is from before, but the question still lingers. I think we saw a bunch of those general questions from a couple slides ago and we're looking at the recommendations now. I just wanted to say something I think is congruent with what Naveed put into the chat room which is we've done a bit of the review before and the questions I guess I thought we were asking were what were those outstanding questions that we didn't get resolution from.

I guess from my perspective the implication of that if that was what we were actually asking is maybe we should make sure that any review that we've done of SSR1 where we have gone through questions and we have made an assessment that we should just decide are we going to start that over again or are we going to pick up where we left up. I guess to just summarize, my perspective – and I might have just imputed this to what we were actually asking so it might be my bad – was what were the things we still didn't know, we're still waiting for answers on? That would mean that we had asked these questions before.

So to Naveed's question, we did do an interactive back and forth with various people on staff at ICANN doing a review of what recommendations had been implemented, what the status was, how they had been implemented, etc. So we should probably just decide are we going to pick up where we left off, are we going to re-review that, are we're going to start from scratch, etc. Because the ques I saw a second ago looked to me a lot like where we started at the very beginning but not what was outstanding. But then again, that could just be my mistake.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you, Eric. My understanding was that the list we saw was the questions that had not yet been answered. If that's not correct, Jennifer, please clarify.

JENNIFER BRYCE: No, that's correct. The questions are the ones that have not been answered.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I don't think we're starting over, Eric. I think what we're trying to do is get the whole review team up to the same speed that the people who did the work were at so that we can determine whether we have consensus on whether the intended result has occurred in the implementation of the recommendation or whether it has become irrelevant due to things that have happened since SSR1.

Okay, so do people feel they need the answer to the questions related to Recommendation 1 to even make a judgment as to whether this first recommendation has been tackle and adequately? I see hands from Naveed and Kerry-Ann. Naveed first.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I see this as a two-dimensional thing. One could be like the original response or the action that ICANN org might have taken as a result of these recommendations as they [inaudible] since 2013 up till now. So this may be if we provide these recommendations to ICANN or, only these recommendations, what would be their response? That could be categorized in a table, for example.

---

The second is what is the response and was it as a result of the questions that are with each of these recommendations as made by the review team? Because these questions can be changed, updated, modified. This is more related to the understanding of the review team as [inaudible] the recommendation or as [they interpret] the recommendation.

So there might be two dimensions of this. So I just want to have the team members' feedback on [whether] also see it from the same perspective or these two are the same things that we're talking about. Are we talking about one single table or two different [instances]?

The answer to the first one, like the ICANN response to the recommendations, or [is it the] recommendations as they interpret. [I might want to leave it there. That's why I am asking this.]

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I don't see this as two separate tables, so I don't understand where you're going. What I think our job is to say what was done to implement the recommendation. Very short statement of what that was. And then we have to decide if that is still relevant. And, if so, we have to assess whether we have had the intended effect. If the answer to that question is yes, we simply state that it had the intended effect. And if it did not, then we have to decide whether this is something that we want to write a recommendation in our own report to say, "This was a previous recommendation. You didn't quite get all the way, and we recommend you finish it." Anyway, that's how I see it. I see Kerry-Ann and Eric. Go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Hi. Just to address Naveed's question first, and then I'll say the comment I had. I agree with Russ, Naveed. [inaudible] right now while I'm in the meeting I have both sheets up. I have the slide from SSR1 recommendations and the questions from the Adobe chat up. And I think one of the things we were actually evaluating is if you look at the reading of the report itself, not just the [inaudible] recommendations from the SSR1 report, the logic as to why they recommended ICANN to publish a single, clear, and consistent statement of SSR remit is to see what ill that was trying to address.

The questions we have in the table on the Adobe chat room is to address that ill. Okay, you published it in 2012, but since then the idea was for you as ICANN to have this consistent statement. If it has been updated, ensure that it's publicly available. Ensure that persons can see it. That's why in the 1.2 question that's asked in the table it's now saying based on the definitions you published before, since then have you kept it updated and ensure that it's in the document. Because the ill they were trying to address with Recommendation 1 was that when you look at ICANN's documents on your website, you couldn't see what the SSR remit was. So the recommendation back then was to enter that going forward. Not just a one-off. [You've got it] in 2013 and it was done. It's to make sure that behavior was corrected.

I don't know if that addresses your concerns, but the idea is to look at both things as complementary, not necessarily as separate exercises. But it's to fix what ill was the recommendation trying to correct. And

---

---

we're now looking to see, "Okay, you've implemented it, but has your behavior changed?"

The original question why I had my hand up was, Russ, how are we documenting this discussion to ensure that it could begin to feed back into the report? Just based on Eric's comment, there would have been some research done. So there should be some notes from the original team that reviewed some of the [SSR1] recommendations. Because as we're signing off on each recommendation to pick, yes, we're satisfied or not satisfied and we have further recommendations, I'm just wondering who is recording these [inaudible] discussions. Not just the notes from staff but actually saying, "The team agrees that recommendations were met subject to the answers of the questions in the table and we now recommend this." I'm just trying to see how are consolidating the comments for the purpose of writing a report given that we're trying to just push [through, I'm not sure] how we get things done now. [I hope that's clear.]

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yes. My thoughts on that were if as we addressed the discussion for each of these, we would ask a person to take the pen to write down the consensus we had reached so that not all the writing would fall to the same person. That was my thought. I'm open to any other thoughts. But I still see a hand from Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, thanks, Russ. If I'm confused on this one, then that's totally fine. Feel free to help me understand. I guess I heard some of the things that

---

Naveed was asking and I heard some of your responses, Russ, and I heard some of the comments from Kerry-Ann and it left me feeling a little confused even though I was there for a lot of this. So I totally leave it open to the possibility that I'm off, but I guess I thought I heard Naveed suggesting that we have some kind of tabular representation of per recommendation a number of elements about it, including what you were talking about, Russ, like we think it was implemented properly or something. That seems like it makes sense to me. So maybe everyone agrees on that and I'm bringing this up [inaudible].

But one of the comments that I do think is worth bringing up is if there is some kind of a column, either literally or figuratively, about, yes, this was implemented, I don't believe it's sufficient for us as a review team to simply say, "Yes, it was implemented." I do believe we need to illustrate the logic that we used to assess that it was implemented. It isn't that I think that should be long, but I think it should be transparent and archival.

So I think when someone looks at our report some number of years down the road, even if it's SSR3 or later, I'd love for them to know why it is we were satisfied with a recommendation's implementation. Even if it was just everyone on the review team agreed that this looked right, then there's some sort of consensus statement. But if we just say yes, it's hard for someone down the road to know why we thought it was yes. This may not seem like a big deal, but just from archival writing I think it tends to be really important in the future.



---

RUSS HOUSLEY: I want to respond to part of what you said. I do agree we need to write a short statement of what was done to address each of the recommendations, and I think I said that earlier. What I was questioning about Naveed is why we needed two tables, not why we needed a table.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yeah, like I said, I'm perfectly willing to believe that I was confused. Nevertheless, I do think that saying....

RUSS HOUSLEY: One of us is. I'm not sure which.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm putting the couching statement there in all honesty. I'm perfectly willing to believe I'm confused on this one, but I just do want to underscore that I do think that it would be really tempting to just say we put a checkmark next to a recommendation because we liked it. But I think we should just remind ourselves at this stage and others that our report is archival. We should expect someone might read it years into the future, so the more context we give even around simple checkboxes like, "The reason we think it was implemented well is a straw poll or here's a methodology." They'll probably vary a lot, but I just want to encourage us as a team to just remember as we write that this report is intended to be archival. Again, I don't want to make a mountain out of a molehill, but I do believe that this is important in archival writing.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I see some things in the chat room that are agreeing with you, Eric, that we need to do more than just a checkbox. Naveed, you have your hand up.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, the work I meant is that there might be a perspective of the ICANN org that needs to be registered as an outcome of those recommendations which as the review team members we might completely disagree but we need a record of what they did like in a tabular form. Like this is the recommendation, this is what they did, irrespective of the questions that we actually made or asked. Because these questions [what I meant] may not be as [inaudible] the understanding or the perspective of the ICANN org. So I don't mind having one single table but as long as the perspective, even if we disagree, of the ICANN org is registered properly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so I think we're in agreement about the information that needs to be captured and we were only discussing format. So I see that we're down to three minutes left on the call, so what I'm going to suggest is that we move to the action item wrap up. And now that I think we have a common understanding of the task before us and a better understanding of how we're going to format it, I think we should take this work, maybe the first one, let's start with SSR1 Recommendation 1, to the list and see if we can make progress on it. If not, we'll tackle it on the call next week.

---

[DENISE MICHEL]:

Sounds good.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Staff, would you take us through the action items and the any other business part of this? I guess we don't have time for other business.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Absolutely. The decision reached that I recorded is the team decided to hold an engagement session with the community at ICANN 63. Action items: ICANN org to plan the engagement session. In the event there is no availability in the schedule, we know that the review team is open to holding the session during the meeting on the Wednesday.

Denise and Kerry-Ann, with Laurin's help, to prepare the draft communities and outreach plan for review team consideration. And the outreach plan to be re-discussed next week.

Staff to ensure that all of the questions the review team has asked previously are posted in one table along with answers and expected completion date.

Staff to pursue answers to and provide expected completion dates for all of the outstanding SSR1 questions.

The review team to take the SSR1 Recommendation 1 to the list for discussion and on the agenda for next week's call if it doesn't get resolved on the list I think is what I heard.

I'll stop there for any questions or comments. Thanks.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, if it's resolved or not on the list, I think we will want to make sure in the plenary call we capture what consensus emerged on the list, so it will be on the agenda either way.

Okay, we're at the top of the hour. Thank you. We'll see you on the list and then on the call next week.

KAVEH RANIBAR: Russ, I had my hand up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I missed that. Go ahead, Kaveh.

KAVEH RANIBAR: I'm sorry. I just sent it also on the chat. Very quick AOB, if I may.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

KAVEH RANIBAR: It's basically from the face-to-face I remember I had this action item to inform the board that basically the new Terms of Reference would be sent to the board and SOs and ACs [inaudible] only. So I just wanted to make sure [this was the task] because I know there were some discussions afterwards. But that's what I recorded so I wanted to be

---

proactive on that. I wanted to check with the team that everyone is fine with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think they are. The TOR that was posted yesterday. Is that what you're asking about?

KAVEH RANIBAR: Yes. Okay, [inaudible]. Okay, thank you very much.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. All right, thank you, all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**