
BRENDA BREWER: Thank you. Good day, everyone. Welcome to SSR2 Review Plenary Call #46 on October 4, 2018 at 14:00 UTC.

Attending the call today is Ram, Laurin, Norm, Kaveh, Denise, Naveed, Scott.

We have apologies from Russ, Kerry Ann, Boban, Zarko, Eric may be delayed.

We have from ICANN Org, Jennifer, Negar, Steve, and Brenda.

Today's call is being recorded. May I please remind you to speak your name before speaking? And I'll turn the call over to Laurin. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. After the role call, even though we are not complete, I just wanted to check again if anyone had any problems with Barcelona or if we're now all fine. It should all be fixed and ready by now. Alright. I take the silence as a yes. That's good.

We have here an SOI update. Jennifer and Brenda, is there something that you added in that I'm not sure about?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi. It's on every call. It's just to give team members a chance to let anybody know if there's been any change to their statement of interest and so on? Thank you.

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.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I just wasn't sure if there was something specific. Excellent. Then, we move on to item number two which is [inaudible] on the next [inaudible] approach to the work plan.

So, we're currently trying to go through the SSR1 recommendations, as you all know. We know there is some trouble with [inaudible] because [inaudible] outstanding. But, beyond that, we still have to deal with a lot of other issues, so it would be great to just get an idea from some of the members here on the call what they think about how we should progress this work plan or if they have any ideas how we would arrive at a good solution. I can hear clicking, but no one speaking. Is this just me or is no one saying anything?

DENISE MICHEL: Apologies. I got disconnected, so I missed what you said.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Did you want to say something about the work plan, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Well, I think we need to start fleshing it out as we start making more detailed decisions about what we're going to tackle and the timing of our work. I'd be happy to work on that with someone else.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Excellent. So, if you can go ahead with this, it would be great. Is there anybody who would be happy to help Denise, creating a skeleton or [inaudible] that we can discuss next week? I guess we have to take it into e-mail, and assuming that – or knowing that – we are not complete on this call, that might be better. Thank you very much, Denise. We'll take this to e-mail to make sure that the whole team has an opportunity to step in.

Anything else on the work plan from anyone? I see two people have joined while we were talking about it. So, if you have any comments on the work plan, how to tackle the work, what to do when, etc., please speak up now before we move on to the next item.

DENISE MICHEL: Is this an appropriate time to address the chair's request to [inaudible] to sign up to the [inaudible] facilitator is on [inaudible] SSR1 recommendation?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Denise, my connection is really bad. I understood roughly half of what you said. From what I understood, I think this is a good time to do that. Yes.

DENSIE MICHEL: Yeah. I think it is directly connected to fleshing out our work plan.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Is staff able to give us a current status of the sign-ups, what's covered and what's not covered, and who we haven't heard from yet?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. I can send out a link. I'll post a link into the chat there. There have been six members of the review team who have signed up to various recommendations, and from what I've seen here, there's about 10 or 12 recommendations that do not yet have any sign-ups. There's nine, actually.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, we'll post a Doodle poll asking. It seems that also ... I saw Kerry Ann, who is unfortunately not on this call, had trouble to [inaudible] sign-up on a technical level. So, I'm wondering if this is a general issue or was this something specific to Kerry Ann? I'm not sure if I take the silence as a yes or no.

DENISE MICHEL: Laurin, it looks like Kerry Ann [inaudible]. I see her name by [inaudible] recommendation.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Good. Perfect. Denise, do we have to say anything more, considering that looking at the Doodle poll ... I mean, there is a huge gap here, recommendation 13 to 19 on our Doodle poll, so this would be very good if someone could go ahead and [inaudible] for those ones. That would be great. Denise, is there anything else on the Doodle poll or the distribution from the leadership team that we should mention?

DENISE MICHEL: If we have a specific target, I think we were hoping everyone, all the recommendations would be covered by a lead facilitator by the time of this call. If perhaps we could agree that by the end of this week we would have people sign up to ensure that all the recommendations are covered. Number seven is also outstanding.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. That's great. Whoever is typing the discussion notes, could we put that as an action item, please? Okay. So, then, I think we go into the SSR1 recommendations review.

As I said, [inaudible] start looking into specific recommendations. Staff, how are things looking with our answers? I know there was an e-mail on it, but just in the call, [inaudible] people haven't read their e-mails.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Yes. As you said, Laurin, we sent an e-mail to the list this morning. 26 questions at the moment do not yet have answers. Three

of these particular questions we have asked for clarification from the review team members who asked the question, so that's an e-mail to the list also. All the other outstanding questions, so the 23 remaining questions, we assigned the target due date of the 17th of October 2018 based on the fact that that is kind of the last day before people start traveling for Barcelona.

We did discuss this on the leadership call for the sake of those review team members on the call that don't participate on that call and agreed that it was important that we got some deadlines in there, with the caveat that the due date may change, because obviously it's dependent on the subject matter experts that are involved. In some cases, there's cross-functional teams that need to collaborate together, so it takes a little bit of extra time. If the date pushes beyond the 17th of October, there's a [inaudible] spreadsheet will obviously keep [inaudible] update that due date as appropriate, and obviously we're going to try and get answers to the questions before that 17th of October date. I'm happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Questions, anybody? Denise, I see your hand is up. Is that from before or is that new?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'm sorry. That's from before.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Okay. Good. So, staff, thank you very much. I hope we can get a lot of answers in. I'll quickly take my chairing hat off and quickly speak to this issue.

Essentially, I went through the documents with the [first ten], and essentially, only recommendations 3, 5, and 8 if I read this correctly have nothing outstanding. So, it is I think [inaudible] to do this without having [inaudible].

However, I think in some cases, there is just one question, for example, outstanding, what [inaudible] I think it might make sense to just push ahead and say, yes, where this is outstanding, this might be ... If this has not been completed, this is what we recommend for the future or this is what we put in our what has to be done in the future section and move on and revisit later. Do people think this is a good idea?

The reason for me saying this is that I think we will struggle, particularly this week and next week, to find questions that are fully answer and that we can really tick off. Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think for the sake of the SSR review moving forward, I think there certainly is going to come a point where we can't wait for pushback, answers, any longer. I think there certainly are some questions where we can discuss initial answers and then revisit it. I think we should take it on a case-by-case basis. And then some of the answers, frankly, that staff will provide will raise additional questions.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Okay. Perfect. So, then, let's jump into those. Currently, I see recommendation five has no questions and answers outstanding and recommendation eight as well. So, is everyone happy if we jump to five? I'll take silence as an okay. Okay, I assume that's an okay.

So, this was recommendation five. ICANN should use the definition of SSR relationships to maintain effective working relationships and to demonstrate how these relationships are used [inaudible] to achieve each SSR goal.

So, I had a look at the answers provided and the first caveat, and I think this will kind of resonate with KC [inaudible] about how can we actually assess it? So, we cannot really assess, in my opinion, if these relationships are effective.

We do have evidence that ICANN does or did try to establish these relationships but I don't see how we would measure at this point in time if these worked. Open for suggestions here. If it's still relevant, obviously yes, in my opinion. But, the recommendation mentions the maintenance of these relationships. But [inaudible] is the recommendation itself speaks [inaudible] never-ending process.

And the second thing, and this was my point of view, that it would be great when possible to have ongoing insight into these relationships. Obviously, some we might not be able to visit, so this wouldn't be in the document. This is exactly what I mean. We can see that they have made an effort, that there is some form of relationship. We cannot see if they are effective. Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Just an overarching question. Did staff e-mail to the list the background on these recommendations and Q&As or do we need to look at those online?

JENNIFER BRYCE: The table is in the Adobe room. There was no update to the table since the last call. I mean, I can recirculate it to the list now if that would be helpful.

DENISE MICHEL: That would be great, the table and the questions related to the ones we're addressing. That would be really helpful. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Any other comments? Norm, you wrote in the chat, so I assume you might want to say more about this. No? Matagoro, I see you wanted to type. Any of you want to make comments via voice? Denise, your hand is also up. Now we have two people typing.

DENISE MICHEL: My hand is old and I'm still trying to find the background material for these recommendations.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, it seems that Norm is okay with my comments, [inaudible] written down and I [inaudible]. I'm wondering, go ahead with what I

said because I didn't really see anyone disagreeing with my overall basic idea. Are people happy with it?

DENISE MICHEL: Could you repeat that, Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry, say again?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, I think I understood that you would want me to repeat what I said before. Yes?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, please.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, what I wrote down is we, as a team, cannot assess if these working relationships are effective. We see that there's evidence, though, that ICANN succeeded in establishing relationships with relevant actors. So, essentially, this is not what I've written down, but [inaudible] like that, is that essentially, it mentions the effective relationships or working arrangements. So, we know something exists, but I think what is lacking is a demonstration of how these are effective

and how to utilize. I don't think that really exists in an easily accessible format. Anyone? Any comments? Okay, then I'll [inaudible].

Then, the second bit, what I wrote is recommendation is still relevant because it is an ongoing recommendation.

DENISE MICHEL: Did we lose Laurin?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. He's dialing back in.

DENISE MICHEL: While we're waiting, do other people have comments on recommendation five? I think my one observation, to fill some air time, is I would agree with Laurin that the recommendation is still relevant today and that, in terms of further work that may be needed, I think that ICANN should be encouraged to continue the routine SSR reports and ensure that the sections that are related to relationships with other external organizations are highlighted and kept up to date. Laurin, are you back?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. I heard the last six words of what you were saying and I think you were expanding on what I just said about this should be demonstrated and listed in one spot if possible. Did I get that correctly?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Correct. I did. [inaudible] also said that, in my observation, I think it would be useful for ICANN to do routine SSR reports and ensure, as you noted, that these relationships are highlighted, relationships with external organizations and that they're kept up to date.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Perfect. With that included, are there any other comments or recommendations, anything else, on recommendation five or are we happy to move ahead with this? I will stake the silence as a [inaudible]. Chat is also fine. I can see KC is typing, so let's see, because she also got dropped. She might not be able to speak. Naveed is typing, too. Okay. Let's wait quickly for this to come in. Yes. This is a very good comment, indeed. What is affected? What is the [inaudible] be measuring?

My proposition on this would probably be to go into a more qualitative spectrum here because [inaudible] measurement might be difficult because these relationships might be different from [inaudible]. So, some might not be used as much but still be considered functional, for example. Would people be happy with this? Denise, your hand is up, but I'm starting to think again it's an old hand. Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. There's something wrong with my hand.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. KC is still typing. That's why we're waiting, because I feel she cannot speak. Okay, that makes sense. Thanks, KC. She is [inaudible] too much, if it's not really measurable. There seems to be a problem With

KC's connection. What shall we do with it KC? Do you want to provide insight into ... Oh, okay. KC is getting [inaudible]. There seems to be a lot of problems with the audio lately. Okay, [inaudible]. Let's revisit this later on.

So, the next recommendation, then, I'll just jump ahead, is recommendation eight which has no questions and answers outstanding. The recommendation reads: ICANN should continue to refine its strategic plan objectives [inaudible] availability. Clear alignment of framework and strategic plan. Okay, I have a look at that one, too. Unfortunately, I have to say, from my perspective at least, it is very difficult to assess the effectiveness overall. It is apparent that SSR is part of these relevant reports and procedures, but we cannot really assess what level of impact they have. I think [inaudible] was useful.

KC CLAFFY:

I'm back on the audio, but I'll go back to my comment later. I don't want to derail. Let's keep going.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Okay. So, with what I just said, any comments or ideas on did the implementation have the intended effect, where I essentially said it's really difficult for us to assess anything beyond that we see, that stuff is happening in documentation? Steve has a comment. I can see he is typing. While he is typing, anyone else have any comments? Matagoro and Naveed are also typing.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Laurin, can I speak now? Laurin, can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: Laurin may have dropped, but we can hear you. Why don't you go ahead? This is Denise.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. What I wanted to say, I'm trying to understand this recommendation. It says ICANN should continue to refine its strategy plan. It means it's been something that [inaudible] that ICANN has been doing already. So, is this really a recommendation that you are asking somebody to continue to do it and how do we assess that, that what they are doing now is exactly the same that they have been doing when the review team made this recommendation? I don't really see this as a recommendation in itself because asking something to continue means already [inaudible] been doing [inaudible]. I don't know what [inaudible] think about this one.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I hope this is working. Denise, you have your hand up.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Thanks, Naveed. That was a really useful comment. The way I read this, then, in looking at the material, I read the part of ICANN continuing to refine its strategic plan objectives as indicative of the rolling nature of ICANN's strategic plan development, that they had a strategic plan, they were in the process of developing an updated strategic plan while the

team was doing its work. So, that's the connotation that I brought to the first part of this recommendation. I think it would be worthwhile for this review team to consider whether there is a clear alignment of the framework and strategic plan, whether the goal of maintaining and driving DNS availability is clearly a guiding force and the content of the strategic plan and in a meaningful way. I think those are some things that the team can weigh in on.

The elements in the strategic plan, are they clear? Are they measurable? Have the activities and work towards objectives been clearly stated? Are they publicly available? Are they kept up to date? I think those are some of the things I think the team may want to address in this recommendation. Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Thank you, Denise. I hope I'm not dropping out again. So, this would I think make a lot of sense. It would probably not be a direct assessment, but an assessment of what's going on around it, at least as I understand it. So, this is something we can put into our action items for recommendation eight. So, then, rather than having no questions and answers, we will have questions and answers going forward.

As I'm taking this on, I would say that I will push ahead with this now and I'll come back to you next week. Would that be okay for everybody? Good. Okay. I can see one yes from Denise.

So, Denise, I have trouble with connection all the time. Can you speak to recommendation 10?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Thank you so much. Sorry, I'm dropping out every few minutes. That would be recommendation 10, which I believe we have got a lot of answers for already, so it might be a good one to take.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, recommendation 10, for those of you who don't have Adobe Connect status, I'll read it. ICANN should continue its effort to step up contract compliance enforcement and provide adequate resources for this function. ICANN also should develop and implement a more structured process for monitoring compliance issues and investigations.

I think on number 10 there are still questions and answers out – answers, rather, to questions outstanding. Some would not suggest we address recommendation 10 at this point, although I'm happy to discuss some of the issues involved. I think it's up to you, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, I might have a different version than you. I have no questions and answers outstanding in my version of the document. I'm not sure if we're dealing with different versions here.

DENISE MICHEL: Perhaps.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It might be that some people have an older document because I reached out to make sure that the one I'm using was the most up to date and I don't see anything outstanding for 10.

DENISE MICHEL: I see the updated one. Yeah.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, can you speak to it, Denise, or would you prefer we move to the next one?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Yeah. Actually, both. I would say it will take a little bit more time to go back and review the cited report that the staff believe is [pulling] responses to this recommendation. So, I would suggest we put this one, hold this over for next week and discuss it then.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, perfect. So, this is [inaudible], then let's have a look. We said recommendation 10 next week, recommendation 8. We did develop some open questions during the discussions which I will review. Recommendation 9 was one that I looked at. [inaudible] outstanding, so that's also not a good option. Let me see. Recommendation 7, I had a quick look at it. Again, we had one answer outstanding. I think that one might be discussable if people are happy with that. So, recommendation

7 was ICANN should build a [inaudible] SSR framework in establishing a clear set of objectives and prioritizing its initiatives and activities in accordance with these objectives.

There is one answer outstanding which is answer to question five which indicates that ICANN will approve [inaudible] process for establishing updated SSR priorities and objectives. Where has this been published? Was there a mechanism for community review of the process? If so, please provide links. So, this answer is outstanding.

So, I had a look at this, and [inaudible] before, [inaudible] can see if steps have been taken, that it is very difficult to accept and practice if this has been realized. And if [inaudible].

So, what I wrote down, it is difficult to assess if, in practice, this has been realized. However, it is apparent that the necessary steps to achieve this recommendation as far as we can observe them has been taken.

Essentially, for the recommendations and relevance, I would say, yes, this is still relevant, that we definitely need clarification. This has been made more [inaudible] many questions before.

Question number five essentially refers to one of the things that I think definitely would be very important, as in that this would be an important step to address this and if that didn't happen, I think that would be one of the main steps that should be taken. Any comments on that? Okay, silence I take as people are okay with it and [inaudible]. Okay, I will take that as a yes.

So, let's [inaudible] answer to question five [inaudible] recommendation seven comes back and then we can finalize that because people appear to be happy with this one to start with. [inaudible] to say anything? Okay.

Going [inaudible] recommendations, six has multiple questions outstanding. Four has multiple outstanding. Two, one also. Recommendation three, I think we discussed that one before – or not? I think this has to be discussed, right? Matagoro, go ahead. I'm sorry, I didn't see [inaudible]. I cannot hear you if you are speaking. Okay, there seems to be a problem. Matagoro, in case you [inaudible] your audio or whatever, just interrupt me. I see you're typing. We'll wait for the message.

So, while Matagoro is typing, staff, it appears that essentially of the 10 that we have here, either we discussed them or there's so many questions outstanding that we cannot really do much with them, so it would be great if you could send around the same thing for the recommendations 11 [inaudible] so that we can try to identify those that we can discuss next week [inaudible]. Would that be doable?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

That's fine. We are happy to do that. I just wondered if you could provide some clarity. We [inaudible] out for the next 10 recommendations. So, with the Doodle poll, how is the discussion going to move forward?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: With the Doodle poll, as I said, we only have answers from [six] people from now. Our team is much larger. So, what I'll do is ... It was already noted in the action items. I will send an e-mail out and remind people to please fill this in because we are missing quite a bit in the 11-20 range. So, if it's not too much work for you on the staff side, if you could also send out actually the rest as well. If it's too much work, it might make sense to actually send out 20-28 first because we have volunteers for all of them.

JENNIFER BRYCE: It makes sense. We can just do them all at the same time.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, that would be perfect. So, then, we can do this. Now that Matagoro's thing is in, I will read it because I'm not sure if everyone can see it. Matagoro says, "I am having a challenge on the way we are reviewing these recommendations. We are just assessing wording from the document. Do we plan to have time to assess what was the situation before these recommendations and ask what changed after the recommendation? In that way, we will be able to give [inaudible] recommendation. I support Alan's advice in his e-mail."

Denise, you have your hand up.

DENISE MICHEL: No, I have a different issue to discuss, so please, come back to me when you're done with this. Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Obviously, I will reply to this in that this problem, Matagoro, I see as well. That is why I always try to underline in the one we look at is that we see documentation of some effort. It is really difficult for us to assess those. How we can do that I believe would be more appropriate potentially to discuss in the call maybe next week, so that everyone is on the same page and we can maybe exchange some material beforehand. Does that sound good to everybody?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Staff, could you be so kind and add an action item for having a discussion or preparing a discussion on this for next week? Denise, you have your hand up. Matagoro, you, too, but I assume that's old.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I just wanted to make sure that we clarify action items that the staff is listing.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, absolutely.

DENISE MICHEL: Could you please reflect that Denise volunteered to help with the work plan and ask for other members to volunteer, so we have a small group that can work on fleshing out the work plan for the review team's input?

And if you could clarify the third bullet that the chairs have asked team members to sign up to SSR1 recommendations by end of day October 5th, chairs will ask people if we don't have all the recommendations covered. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Perfect. I'm seeing it's 10:53. I'm being mindful of the time. We essentially went through I think the ones we could go through with some essentially being quickly discussed and more questions having appeared. So, is there any other business for this call? Jennifer, I can see you have your hand up. Please, go ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. It was just to ask for some clarification because you mentioned you wanted another action item. I just wasn't quite sure what it was. It was right before we had this discussion about the updates that Denise made to the action items.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Essentially, if we look at the chat, Matagoro wrote something about what's our methodology for assessment and we agreed on the call to put this to a more proper discussion next week so that everyone can

chime in. So, it would be great if that could be out of that [inaudible].
Does that clarify?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you. Perfect. Okay. Is there any other business we have to deal with? Any points to be raised? I can see Naveed is typing, so if anyone else apart from Naveed who doesn't have audio has anything, please go ahead and we'll come back to Naveed. Okay. So, this is Naveed volunteering to work with Denise.

I note no any other business, as no one – oh, no, Denise, I can see your hand is raised again. Is this any other business?

DENISE MICHEL: It's an old hand. Sorry, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Perfect. Jennifer, you also have your hand up. Is this from the question?

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's just to review the action items at the end of the call. I'd like to read them out for everybody to confirm that they're correct. But I can wait until any other business is done.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No. Perfect. I think we have no any other business. People had an opportunity to raise anything and haven't, so please go ahead to confirm the action items [inaudible] on the call.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, thanks. So, the first action item, Denise and Naveed volunteered to help begin drafting work plan skeleton to be shared with the review team for input. The second action item, Laurin to send an e-mail to the team to ask for more volunteers to help Denise and Naveed with the work plan draft.

Chairs have asked team members to sign up to the SSR1 recommendations via the Doodle poll by end of day October 5th. Staff to send an update to the SSR1 recommendation table document to include recommendations 1-28 which is all the recommendations to the list.

Add an agenda item to next week's call for the team to discuss the methodology regarding assessing SSR1 recommendations and defining SMART recommendations.

That's it. Please let me know if there's any edits or additions to that. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sounds good to me. Anybody else? Any comments? I can see Matagoro is typing. No, he's happy as well. Okay. Thank you, everybody, or your time today. Again, my apologies for my terrible tech problems today.

I'm not sure I can do anything to sort them out. So, [inaudible] and I see Denise is typing. Denise, if it's anything, let us know. Otherwise, thank you very much, everyone, for joining the call. Thank you for your time. Speak next week.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]