
JENNIFER BRYCE: Brenda, did we lose you?

BRENDA BREWER: I apologize. Yes, you did. I need to unmute my line. I just wanted to welcome everyone to the SSR2 Review Team Plenary Call #45 on September 27, 2018 at 14:00 UTC.

Attending the call today is Alan, Eric, Jerry, Laurin, Mr. Matogoro, Norm, Ram, Russ, Denise, and Kaveh. We do have a phone number from 1425. Can you identify the last four numbers, 1425? Please identify your name. Okay, I'll look that up momentarily.

From ICANN Org, we have Jennifer, Negar, Steve, and Brenda. Naveed is joining us at this moment.

We have no observers that I'm aware of at this time. We have apologies from Boban. The meeting is being recorded. Please state your name for the transcript and I'll turn the call over to Russ. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I think the first item is to confirm that everyone has heard from Constituency Travel. If anyone has not heard, please speak up. Okay. Are there any additional announcements from staff about the Barcelona trip?

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.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, Russ. If I may, just a couple of things. First being as far as I'm aware, there's two members of the review team that will not be attending in person and that might change, but those are the latest numbers that I have. Secondly, I did send a note to the list this morning [inaudible] regarding the engagement session. So, we're trying to find [inaudible] currently that is scheduled because there are some conflicts. So, we're working with meetings team and we'll keep the team posted on options. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I see that we have a new dial-in person. I don't know who that is.

DENISE MICHEL: It may be me. I got disconnected and called back in.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. From [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I think that we have to figure out on a future call exactly how we want to break the time up in Barcelona, but I think that's all we need to do on that right now. Last week we started going through the SSR1 recommendations and taking notes. We skipped one because we felt that the questions that had not yet been answered were really

important to get answered before we do. But, we did two and three. We took notes on what our response will be there.

Looking at what we have, number four, [inaudible] four outstanding questions regarding number four, so I suggest we skip that until we get those answered and instead turn to number five which has no outstanding questions. Anyone have a preference for another approach? Okay, hearing nothing. Steve, today is your birthday.

STEVE: Yes. Thank you, all. It's a notable one. It's 50.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I knew I liked you. Today is my birthday as well.

STEVE: Oh, wow. Happy birthday to you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Surprise.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Happy birthday. We can't really sing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Happy birthday to you two.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I didn't realize we had a collision birthday paradox thing going on. We have another person joining from 3101.

KC CLAFFY: I joined a while ago. I don't know if that's me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I don't see you listed elsewhere, so that must be it. Okay. So, we're turning to recommendation five. It talks about the ... Go ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sorry. I just wanted to mention as well that all the questions for recommendation one have now been answered, so that's reflected here in the new document. That's in the Adobe Connect room.

I also just wanted to mention that for the review team members, on the leadership call there was a request to add the questions and answers into this document, so that's why it's a little bit more lengthy than it was before. But happy to take suggestions if it doesn't work. Just let me know and we can adjust the format of it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I asked her to do that because on the call last week I was flipping back and forth between the questions document and the table and trying to figure out which ones had outstanding questions. I know I haven't read the answers to question one since we just got them, so I suggest we don't go back to that just yet. If I'm the only one who hasn't read them, speak up and we'll do that. Okay, I'm not hearing anybody encourage that, so we'll add that to your reading for next time and we'll turn to recommendation five which ICANN tells us they implemented in two phases.

So, the question is did those two phases of the implementation have the intended effect? I'm not seeing any hands or any typing. Go ahead, Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: The only thing that [inaudible] recommendation [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can barely hear you. I don't know.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me now?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me now?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Now I can hear you like you're whispering.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: People are typing and they cannot hear you.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay. I'll try and type in the chat and probably ask for a dial-out.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. While she's typing, does anyone have anything else to say about recommendation five?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, Russ. Just as a procedural question, are the answers to the questions in the table here are references to other things? For example, we've definitely [inaudible] click on the link [inaudible] follow through. The answers are given in slides 13-15 of this previous presentation. Do we want to review those [inaudible] or do we want to say, based on the answer, we can't really say? How should we procedurally do this with the recommendations?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, we asked that these recommendations be reviewed before and this table was sent out, so I was hoping that part of the reading had been done. But, if you feel after that review you can't tell, then that's worth noting in our response. If you feel it was adequate, then we just note that and that's what we say in our response.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a procedural [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Essentially, I think we had a very similar discussion last week, at least if I remember it correctly, and that is coming back to that's a problem of measurement. So, here we see we have an implementation report or we have a [inaudible] briefing as an example, and it's [inaudible]. And this is very high level. So, again, it's a question of how much measurement do we require?

So, we do see [inaudible] happening. Are we happy with this? Should we make a note of we have [inaudible]? It seems things are happening. I'm coming back to this because I think this appears to be a more general problem that we'll be facing again and again and again, and I'm just wondering what level is appropriate here and what level of [inaudible] are we happy with?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I agree. Kerry Ann is saying something complementary to what you're saying in the chat. She's saying her only concern is that she can't tell whether it's continually used in the SOP as of today.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think that's essentially the same problem, that it's just we can see stuff happen on a high level, for example, but we cannot assess what actually happened, like [inaudible] because we just don't have the [ability]. I'm not sure how we can state that [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just to, at the risk of imputing something of what Laurin and I believe Kerry Ann are saying, it sounds like we can't say that implementation ... We cannot say that we know that the implementation had the intended effect, because in reviewing the material, [inaudible] perspective. So, that might be our finding. Essentially, that is my question. How far do we go? Do we say we cannot really assess it, or as a team, we say we cannot really assess it, so we need to kind of go back and try to at least get [inaudible] of something like that? I'm just [inaudible] coming in with [inaudible] because I think this will happen again and again and again, and we might want to, not in this call but maybe on list, think about what our [inaudible] at which point are we happy.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, Laurin, I think you're absolutely right and I think the degree to which we choose to dig into it has to do with the next row which is, is this still relevant, and if so, what further work is needed? And why or why not? So, what we've come to the conclusion is we can't tell if the SOP additions were enough. We just can't tell from where we sit. So, are we going to say this is still relevant, it needs more work, or are we just going to leave it at that?

KC CLAFFY:

So, this is where we're getting to the issues I had with the question at the beginning, and I said, okay, well, let's do five recommendations and see where we are, so I guess we're [inaudible], because I think this is where we need to try to characterize the perhaps subtle, perhaps not subtle, difference between is a recommendation written in a way that is amenable to measurement? Because I'm trying to put myself in the head of ICANN staff trying to prove that we've done this and I wonder if ... It's not clear to me and I wonder if it's clear to other people. What would constitute a good set of bullets in this box to make us think, oh, yes, that's [been done]? Could we come up with it or is the problem is that the recommendation is written in a way that it's very hard for anybody to do this, so it's obviously going to be hard for us to evaluate it. But those are two different things.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, what I hear you asking is was this written in a way that we or anyone else could measure?

KC CLAFFY: Yes, correct, could measure the progress toward accomplishing, which is different from did it have the intended effect or is it still relevant now?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, which is in addition to, I think, is how I'm interpreting your question.

KC CLAFFY: Correct. Exactly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Kerry, is that an old hand or are you trying to talk again? Okay. Eric and then Laurin.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I really want to resonate with what I think I hear Laurin and KC saying, but I'll start from my perspective. Maybe I'll say something that causes them to both jump up and down and say, "That's not what we said." But, regardless, I resonate with that. I think my perspective – and this is based on what I recall from various people saying things on the team for a while now is that we're really not supposed to do a whole lot of "this is how it should be done, we're going to do the work." We're basically a review team, right? So, I think, hopefully, that's something most people agree with because I think that's what I heard before.

But, when we come to a recommendation that can't be measured, then I think our assessment is sort of like ... It's obvious that we can't assess it. I think if we were to come up with a framework to do the extra work, I don't think that that's within balance.

Now, clearly, if we are able to come up with a way to do a measured assessment of something, then I think we should do that. We should document it. But, my two cents, I'd love to hear the team's feedback on this. This is just my perspective, is that when we come to a recommendation that we can't evaluate as being implemented, then that's our finding. We tried. We were not able to evaluate this.

So, for example, if they said we're going to try and do great justice in the Internet, then we would get to that and say we couldn't find a way to evaluate that and that's our finding, so we can't say it was successful. If they say we tried to do great justice, so we came up with an empirical measure of that, measured over the last five years and here are our results, then we could say, oh, yeah, we could look at that and come to agreement or disagreement.

But I think our function, to walk the fine line, is KC is exactly right, but I don't know how much of that falls on us. I think we should do best effort and I think my perspective is we should have the title to say we weren't able to measure this, so we can't say it was implemented or something that makes sense in that context.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Eric, I agree with what you said, but I think there's a second part to that and that is then we have to assess whether it's still relevant and

important and whether we should write a measurable recommendation or we say, “Eh, things have changed since then,” just moving on without a recommendation.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, absolutely. Sorry, I just walked past that. I was just talking about [inaudible]. Yeah. I totally agree with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry. I think [inaudible]. I think what Eric is saying is correct. Some stuff we just cannot assess and then we have to say, “Okay, look, we cannot do this.” But I think the questions raised by Kerry Ann, by KC, I think there’s a problem remains in that we need to establish at least a bit of an idea of how far we go.

So, for example, we have something we cannot really assess. We recognize we cannot really assess it. Is it sufficient for us to say we cannot assess it, or how deep do we go before we say we cannot really assess it but we see some evidence here? Then, as you rightly said, Russ, then we have to think about what do we do going forward.

This is why I’m trying to say I don’t disagree with what Eric says and sometimes we will have to say we cannot do it. But, at the same time, we have to kind of have a level of investigation as a team that we need to take.

Yes, exactly, Kerry Ann. Thank you. What you wrote in the chat. Yeah. How do we do this? How much do we want ourselves to check before we say we tried, we found something, and this is it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, what I'm hearing is no one speaking against the approach that says this wasn't written in a measurable way. We can tell that these additions were made to the SOP, but we can't tell whether they have the intended effect. So, now, we need to answer the second question. Is this something that's still so relevant today we need to make a recommendation? Okay, I see Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Can you hear me okay?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Broadly, these recommendations were not written ... Don't seem to be written in a way that were immediately or obviously measurable and staff doesn't seem to have created an implementation plan for these recommendations that proposed measurable results. So, for many of the recommendations, we're left with anecdotes and activities to assess whether there was implementation and whether it had some impact.

So, I think we seem to be coalescing around a meta recommendation that both the recommendations be written in a way that's more measurable and that staff actually do an implementation plan that includes metrics and clear objectives but can be measured and then write an implementation report against that. I think that would be useful.

Having said that, I think in recommendation five, there is a number of activities that have occurred that seem to be useful, and from my perspective, using their SSR responsibilities to define and maintain working relationships and articulating in their regular reporting how these relationships are helping them achieve their SSR goals is worthwhile and should be continued.

KC CLAFFY:

I just think that there is a missing logical hop if you go from was it measurable enough to assess, or to is it still relevant today, or is further work needed because I think there's a possible box in the flowchart there that says a more measurable version of this might be relevant today and here's what it would be, or not.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

What I took Denise to say is that in our write-up we should say that the things that did take place were useful and just because we're not writing a new recommendation doesn't mean you should stop doing those.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Thank you, Russ, for restating that. Yeah. Separate from this, I think the team may want to explore another recommendation about ICANN's working relationships to advance ICANN's SSR goals which may be a bit out of this discussion.

To reinforce, I want to make sure that, in my perspective, the team should not dismiss assessing recommendations because they weren't written in a SWOT format and staff did not provide any clear objectives and measurement. I think there is worthwhile work that the staff and community has done here that would be useful to consider and assess and I think we've already committed to studying measurable objectives in the future and I think we need to recommend that staff do measurable implementation plans as well. I would like to make sure we consider carefully the work that staff has done and its utility. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin, do you want to say the things you're typing in this book here?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Happy to. Essentially, I'm just wondering. I can see there is a lot of discussion about it, so people care. I'm just wondering, do we want to [inaudible] and essentially say we established a kind of protocol, so we [inaudible] say yes or no. Then we do question B. That essentially, we have a rubric by which we assess and we can do something along the lines of saying, "Look, this is a recommendation we cannot assess at all because there's no data." That's one outcome. Then we can say, "This is something where we cannot assess at all but we have some evidence of what happened," so it's like a kind of so-so. And the third option is this

is the recommendation where we could actually find detailed evidence that we can deal with.

For example, and I was just wondering, do we as a team want to have that kind of baseline and agree on that baseline to make stuff simpler going forward? That's essentially my question.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: By the way, also, I'm happy to go ahead and hold the pen on this if that is a problem. I'm just thinking it might be good to have some form [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin, Kerry Ann asked whether we should try and restate this recommendation, and I would add to that I think we should only do that if we think it's still relevant and further work is needed. So, that is an aspect of assessment we need to do, whether either it's overcome by events and it was relevant when SSR1 was done and is no longer relevant or we feel that it's a place where even if the recommendation was done, further work is needed. I don't think we want to write recommendations one for one for everything that's in here without saying, "Yeah, more work is needed," and there's consensus that more work is needed.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Absolutely. What I'm trying to say, and I think KC went in the same direction, is that this is like a [inaudible] process in my eyes, where we start with what do we have and then we assess. Then we have to say

[inaudible] then we don't have to do anything. But, if it's still [inaudible], then we have to think about it. I don't think we necessarily have to state everything. It's more a question of what do we do in these cases, and that's why I was wondering, do we want some kind of discussion on list or have some form of a baseline document of questions we want to go through. That's all.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. So, does anyone advocate that we write a follow-on recommendation about further work?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible] speak to that. I think that my personal [inaudible] is that would be a mistake and the reason is that, one – and this is just my perspective, so I'm happy to hear if people disagree and to go with the team's overall perspective on this. But, one, this is just one of the several things that the team has to do in our review, and if we were to [inaudible] or enhance the recommendations of SSR1, I think we should be informed by them, but our job is to come up with recommendations that are valid today.

So, certainly, if some of them have long-term value and we want to carry them forward in our recommendations, I think that's great. But I think we're getting very narrowly focused on what was done many, many years ago and we're conflating it with what we think should be done today. I do think is the recommendation still relevant today is a good commentary on each of these recommendations, but the extent to which we start to then evolve them or enhance them, I think our time

is better spent looking at the SSR Review charter that we have and going over that more holistically. Maybe then it makes sense to come back and look at these recommendations and see, after we've done our full review, whether we want to put them in the broader context of what we've found and maybe there's pure gold here, but I think if we start off by iterating on now, we among other things, risk a confirmation bias. But, we certainly are spending a lot of time on these instead of on the other review items that come after the SSR1.

So, my two cents would be I think we should do a targeted review of these recommendations. We should fill out very concisely the questions that we've laid out for ourselves. Did they, is there? And then we should move onto the other things and then we can always circle back when we do our recommendations. That's my two cents.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yes. I'm certainly happy with that. All I'm saying is we should agree as a team to do it in a certain way, and so we kind of don't have the problem every week where it's like how far do we go to assess it. So, I'm totally happy to essentially just say, like Eric said, let's focus on the future and that's it. And if the team is happy with that, that's great. I just think we should have an agreement on what we do. That's all. I'm not saying we have to [inaudible] every time. I'm just saying we need this ... Like, what Eric said is fine. We just have to say, "Yes, this is what we do and this is how we act every time," and that's it. So, essentially,

just to ensure consistence. That's what I'm trying to say. We just have to be consistent and that's all.

KC CLAFFY:

Thank you, Eric, for adding that point which helps me say what I mean which is I agree. We can't go back and rewrite all these. That's why I felt the question was missing because I think it's incomplete to just say, "Is it relevant or not today?" or, "Was the recommendation implemented?" I read the CCRT report and the CCRT report says that the things were only partially implemented. That's a finger pointed at ICANN, that you didn't do the right thing. You didn't do a sufficiently good job. And I don't think there's room in these questions as is currently stated for ... They did as good as I could do if I were trying to measure a [inaudible] or something like that. I think there needs to be some because [inaudible] keep coming up and we're only at recommendation five. Was the recommendation amenable to a measurement? And if there's some way we could have that aspect of it or maybe we just, as Laurin says, consistently get it every time we talk about relevance, the measurability aspect, it's just not the same dimension as [inaudible].

So, whatever it a way that we can be consistent about that, capture this issue that I'm concerned about and not rewrite every recommendation, I'm happy with.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that sounds perfect. KC, I don't know, I really appreciate bringing that ... I think I failed to see it as clearly before [inaudible], so would adding just sort of a sub row or a row between the two of, say, basically our view of the recommendation itself or something like that, say this recommendation did not lend itself well to measurement or something so that we can basically say it wasn't implemented, but who could implement it? Something like that.

KC CLAFFY: Maybe. I mean, unfortunately, I don't have the answer here. I just have the question because I want to capture Denise's comment that, well, maybe they could have done more to create some kind of framework about measurement themselves if we think that, but that's what [inaudible]. For some recommendations, I might think they could do that and some maybe not. I think we're going to get into too many weeds if we try to go to ... So, I'm not sure the right way to approach this. I'm sorry to bring a problem and not have the solution, but I'm happy to go with rough consensus on what other people think about capturing this issue.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, what I'm hearing people saying is the recommendation was not written in a way that was possible to measure. However, useful activities were done and ICANN should continue to report on how relationships meet the SSR goals, but it's really hard to tell if the SOP is

being used throughout ICANN. That said, we're not going to write a further recommendation. Is that what people are saying?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So, I kind of wonder if what we're saying is that when the recommendation is written well and the implementation we can address, we're not really of a mind to say anything, like, "Oh, this is a really well-written recommendation." I think we're mostly talking about the negative. It's like when we get to a recommendation that looks a little bit hard to evaluate or hard to even decide how to implement, we kind of feel like we should say something.

So, in the event that we only want to say something for the second of those two cases, may not mean we have to phrase the question, but in looking at what we have, did the implementation have the intended effect? If we wind up saying no [inaudible] how do you conduct the assessment, that could be the part where ... And this would be something we'd have to agree to, just as a convention on the team, but that's where we could say this recommendation did not lend itself well to being implemented or evaluated. Therefore, we were not able to blah-blah-blah. I mean, we could give the out there, instead of just saying [inaudible].

So, in a sense, if all we're doing is outlining the negative of the two cases, then maybe we just have to be diligent about putting that in the box that we have.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I think the point that useful activities did take place is the way of saying while we can't say if it had the full intended effect, we don't think it was a waste of time, but we're moving on is how I interpret it, what the group said. Go ahead, KC.

KC CLAFFY: One more thing. When you read the CCRT report – and lots of people are going to read the report in this way. Recommendation one, was it implemented? Recommendation two, was it implemented? Recommendation three, partially implemented. Recommendation four ... That's how I first read the CCRT report. Okay, how many of these did they take [inaudible]? It looks like we're going to have more than three answers. We have yes, no, partially and then we have a fourth answer, which is we don't want to say they did do it, we don't want to say they didn't do it, we want to say something else. That's why I'm worried about the [inaudible] questions having yes or no answers and not covering this issue. We're going to think about the people who are going to just read the report for the binary or ternary answer about each recommendation. What are those answers going to be? What are the [inaudible] of answers we're going to [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree there's got to be gray area. Kerry Ann? Kerry Ann, if you're talking, we can't hear you. In fact, you're muted. Hello?

MATAGORO: Yes. This is Matagoro.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes?

MATAGORO: To the best of my understanding, I think we need to go to future recommendations and I remember from the previous session, [inaudible] declared that some of these recommendations [inaudible] and what we can do as a review with that, we just [inaudible] the interpretation of ICANN staff and assess the extent to which the interpretation has been implemented, and from that direction, we can also have ... We can be in a position of having [inaudible] what we need to recommend. So, I think that would be my view on this discussion. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I see hands from Kerry Ann, Eric, and Laurin. Kerry Ann first.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Hi. I did a dial-out. I hope you can hear me better now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. Much better.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I agree with Matagoro. I also agree with KC, but KC is the only ... I think what you said and what Laurin said, the only caution I have regarding

that gray area, I would be hesitant to try and rewrite the recommendation to improve on it, to rewrite the recommendation to make it better, even if it's ambiguous, only because we were not there to see all the information, so without consulting with the SSR1 team to ensure we understood what they meant and the fact that this was done so many years ago, so even their own [inaudible], I would rather lean towards just stating that it's not as clear as it could be. We've seen measures being taken.

If under our review we discovered something very similar, I think we could probably make a [inaudible] to say that [inaudible] recommendation in SSR1, but these are our recommendations based on our assessment of what we're seeing here, which is I wasn't sure if you understood what I meant, that the relationship [inaudible] when you look at this table that was developed in the document shared in the link, it's really about how does ICANN relate to all the parties that are part of the SSR environment? And when we do some of our reviews, based on the topic we selected, we may see some relationship gaps as well. We could refer to that document to see if something was done under that for SOPs for them to actually adopt, and if not, maybe [inaudible] additional relationship to be added to that document.

So, that's how I [inaudible] the correlation. I don't know if I'm clear. But I think the message I just wanted to come across is that I will be really reserved to try and rewrite or rephrase any of the SSR1 recommendations.

[DENISE MICHEL]: I totally agree.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, then Laurin.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I have a proposal and it's based on what I think I hear people saying, so it puts a caveat there that maybe I'm misunderstanding. But, how about this? Taking a page out of building database schemas. Let's have, potentially ... This is my proposal. We have a table. So, as KC said, some people can go through the tables, yes, no, maybe so. Let's set up a table of the recommendations we were able to assess. Let's have another table of recommendations we were not able to concisely assess, so that you look at one table and you get your yes/no answers and maybe, too. I don't know. And for everything where we thought there was just too much mud in the water to do a straightforward yes/no or maybe even a maybe, we have another table and the table basically will be implicitly indicting certain recommendations as not great recommendations without actually saying that. These are the wild card recommendations.

There are a couple things I think that might be beneficial from this approach. One, we probably don't want to get in the business of saying SSR1 or a previous review team didn't do a good job, but we're kind of looking at recommendations and it sounds like a lot of us think maybe they didn't do a great job on all of them.

So, it will sort of underscore that when review teams do reviews and they produce recommendations that may not sort of stand up when new review teams have to pick up a new mantle, then it will fall on, “Hey, we’re a new review team and we don’t get what the old review team was talking about. We weren’t there,” to Kerry Ann’s point. But we don’t have to say it was bad or we’re going to do it different. We’ll just say we couldn’t really figure it out and we’re trying.

So, if we have a table saying here’s what we could evaluate and here’s our evaluation and another table that says not really sure this was our best effort, I think there’s a pretty clear message there and it keeps people from doing a [inaudible] filter and missing [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yes. I think essentially I wanted to propose something very similar and just coming from a different perspective. When we go recommendation by recommendation, I think it just makes sense to say just state in [inaudible] like we could measure, not measure, to some extent measure the intended effect. And that’s it. I think that’s a very good procedure. I think it’s essentially what Eric said as well. It’s just in a different type of ordering. And I think that would work and I would be happy with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. What I heard Eric propose is breaking them into two tables, easy to measure, not easy to measure, and then when easy to measure saying whether it was fully implemented, partially, or not at all. What I hear Laurin proposing is just going through them, but as the first sentence about each one saying whether it was possible to measure or not. Kerry Ann?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry. Can I just reply to this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. Go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think, to me, both of this is the same. It's just how we present it. I think if we present a final report, we'd probably have to do it in order and then we would have to write it, but obviously for us doing [inaudible] tables that Eric proposes are probably easier to do. I just think in the final presentation we might have to [inaudible] recommendations we're given.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry Ann, your hand is up. Is that an old one?

KERRY ANN BARRET: No, it's a new one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, go ahead.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [So, Laurin's clarification]. Eric, I agree with you that we need to have some separation of which ones we think we could have measured and which ones we couldn't. The only caution I would give to the team for this where I sit is to split it in a clear table and if someone else, let's say from the SSR1, [inaudible] up that table, they would probably say, "No, no, no. You guys got that completely wrong?"

I'd rather it be where we do present it, even if we do a working table, to kind of help us sort it as we go along. I'd rather when we actually write up the report to lean towards what Laurin said in terms of, okay, that's an introductory statement for each of them, just to say that, "Hey, we reviewed this. We tried to [inaudible] measured or not. This is what our assessment was." But split it into clear tables. I think we may have a few hit or misses and I think we'll be able to cover ourselves better by having it written in a paragraph in terms of what we think about, rather than a clear divide like that. I [inaudible] good for a working document to help us write, but I think both Laurin and Eric are saying the same thing. It's just the presentation, as Laurin pointed out, that would be more cautious about.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin is supporting that in typing. So, we have about ten minutes left today. I think we have collected our thoughts on recommendation

five. Based on how long that took, we don't have time to do another one. What I'd like to propose is that, going forward, for next week, that we do a Doodle and we ask people to pick a recommendation that they will prepare a strawman response for the group to consider and that basically everybody does, picks, say, two. And if no one has picked a particular recommendation, we can assign a name so that everybody has got some work to do and maybe by having someone present a proposed straw man, we can go through these more quickly than just saying, "Well, what do people think?"

Does that seem like a reasonable thing to do for next week? I'm going to ask staff to prepare a Doodle with just the recommendations so then people can check the ones that they want to take the lead on for presenting the straw man and we'll go through them, hopefully, more rapidly that way.

Okay. Turning back to the agenda, then, I think we just did the next steps for handling recommendations. Is there any other business we need to cover today?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Russ, I have a hand up. It's Kerry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I didn't see it. Go ahead, Kerry.

KERRY ANN BARRET: Just a response to Matagoro's comment. Matagoro, I think when we each pick whatever recommendation we'd work on, we should – I recommendation, as you probably pointed out, we should take into account the work done by the previous subgroup. I think it would just be ... It's more like a recommendation to everyone that whenever you do pick one, to kind of start it – I don't know if everyone saw Matagoro's comment in the chat room.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. That was the intent. That and the responses to the questions when we get them together. Okay, not seeing any more hands. Jennifer, can you walk us through the action items?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. Thank you, Russ. The two action items I just captured there are staff to prepare a Doodle poll of the SSR1 recommendation and then review team members to select which recommendations they wish to take the lead on developing a straw man proposal for.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. And on that Doodle, please leave off the three that we have done.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We'll just mark them as done and not up for picking. Thank you. Alright, we're going to end a couple of minutes early then because I'm sure we cannot get through another recommendation in seven minutes. Thank you very much for joining. Denise, you're raising your hand. Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Just a really quite note, since we're trying to move through these recommendations more expeditiously. I count around 30 or so questions that haven't been answered and all have a target date for when staff expects to answer them. I would just, once again, reinforce how important it is for staff to prioritize these, questions from 2017 and at least provide a target date of when they will be answered so we could then plan our assessments accordingly. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, thank you. Happy birthday, Steve.

STEVE: Thanks. You, too, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]