

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So if we could have a roll call please. Sorry.

BRENDA BREWER: Yeah. Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR2 plenary call number 49 on November 1st, 2018 at 14:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Alain, Noorul, Ram, Eric, Norm, Russ, Matogoro, Scott, Denise, and Naveed. We have no observers at this time. We do have apologies from Alain and Boban. From ICANN Org, Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda. Today's call is being recorded. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to Eric. Are you leading the call today?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, I have the honor.

BRENDA BREWER: 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.*

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you. Okay, great. Well, everyone, welcome. I hope you all had a great Halloween and had lots of fun, didn't eat too much candy. So jumping straight into the agenda, we now have roll call done. If we can get an update from the staff in regards to January, February 2019 face-to-face meeting, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Eric. Hi, everyone. I can confirm that the Meetings team have received the request for the review team meeting in January or February of 2019. They've asked for just a couple of days to be able to investigate some options, and then we'll get back to you next week since most people were either traveling back from ICANN 63 or have taken a couple days' rest after [inaudible]. So we'll provide an update on the options as soon as we can, and please expect that to be next week. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Did anyone have any comments – okay, sans host. So, did anyone have any comments or questions about that in lieu of standing by? Okay, seeing no hands, moving on to the workplan. So, is it possible for someone to put the workplan up in the Adobe Connect room just so folks can look at it in case we want to chat about any aspect of it? But while that may be happening, so, I guess right now we have sort of a motion to approve the workplan so that we can send it to the board, and I see a link has been pasted into the chat room, and anybody who's interested in reviewing the workplan now that has not done so before, please feel free to open that up. But I think at this point, what we'd like

---

to do is get consensus on whether there's any obstacle to approving it. So asking the negative, does anybody have any concerns or comments who would like to address anything in the workplan before we stamp it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, there's a couple comments on the right-hand side that seem to be notes from team members to the rest of us. I think we should deal with those before we send it to the board.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Let's see. So, I see – feel free to – okay, so the first one is row 13, is an unattributed comment that says ICANN Org to provide a template for findings and recommendations consider changing dates. Seems reasonable since that's in the past. Do we have anything from staff on that? Oh, sorry, Jennifer, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to note that the yellow highlights in the document are items that staff flagged for the review team to take a look at before it goes to the board, so this particular one, yeah, the date obviously is in the past, and we just noted that there is a template that we can provide. I think we provided it before the pause, but [we can recirculate it as well] to help with this item. But yeah, it's really the date and the completion percentage that [inaudible] might want to look at. Thanks.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. So develop and adopt a template, I think, would probably have to be – [inaudible]. But yeah, I think if you wouldn't mind recirculating that. I do recall you sending it, but I suspect others may have issues digging it out of archived e-mail. That would be great. I think what we need to do as a team is expeditiously look that over and decide if we have any problems with it.

So, can I get a sense from anybody – can anybody indicate in the chat room or raise your hand if you'd like to say whether you'd like, let's say, longer than 24 hours to review that plan? At which point we can sort of flag it for the next call if there's anything. We don't have to decide it over the e-mail list, but making good use of the e-mail list. Does anybody feel like you need more than 24 hours to decide if we should adopt that or not?

I see no new hands. Okay, so in the spirit of moving forward, what I'll propose is that 24 hours from – Jennifer, if you don't mind, whenever you get a chance, sending that out, that would be great. 24 hours following the transmission of that e-mail, I'd like to add that anybody on the team that has any concerns or would like to discuss any aspect of adopting that template, please flag it on the mailing list so that we can put it on the agenda for next week. Otherwise, I think we'll probably go with the default of adopting it. Does anyone have any objection to that?

Okay, I'm going to really drive the hammer on these things. So okay, yeah, right, I see Laurin pointing out that as long as there's no discussion – yeah, that's exactly what I think as well. If anybody feels like there's anything worth discussing at any level of this before adopting it, then let's say so. Otherwise, if everyone's okay with it, then after 24 hours,

---

we'll adopt it. And then we can update the dates and the percentages at that time. Great, so, making sure there's no hands. No hands.

Okay, so moving on, I see 25 has a comment from Naveed, "Conduct further interviews as appropriate." Naveed wonders if we need to revise this deadline. Well, I guess what I would suggest is that it needs to be revised if we need more interviews. Does anybody have a sense that they would like additional interviews?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Sorry?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hello.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah? Who's speaking?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Naveed.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, Naveed. Did you want to speak to the comment?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible]. No. Yeah, I was actually working with the team to get me through. So [they] disconnected me without notifying it to me, so I was just checking. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Well, serendipitously, we're looking at your comment in the draft workplan on row 25 asking about further interviews. Would you mind speaking to that? Just to refresh your memory – oh, go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, which one are you talking about? [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: In the online spreadsheet, row 25 is conduct further interviews as appropriate.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And there's a comment that's attributed to you saying you wonder if we need to revise the deadline. And I guess –

---

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, because [inaudible] 0% done, and I was just wondering if we need to revise this because it says October as a completion date, and we have not done that. It is 0%. So maybe we need to revise this deadline somehow, because it's a workplan, we should not put something that is already passed and that is 0% done.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so there's lots of directions we could go from this. Does anybody have any questions or comments about that? While people decide, my two cents on that would be that we have this sort of problem of not knowing what we need in the future, so calling something complete that's open ended is difficult. Laurin, go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hi, everybody. I can't see the document anymore because I had to step out of my office. I also think we should just push that date back to something we think, A, is realistic, and B, gives us some leeway, because something might come up even when we kind of start drafting these that we realize while writing, oh, maybe we should clarify, maybe we should ask something, etc.

So I would actually put this around the time when we have the face-to-face so we want to start drafting. So maybe give us another two, three weeks after that, and that would be what we put as the deadline, maybe end of February, 19th, and kind of make a note that this is only if necessary. And that should be good.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Thank you. I see Norm made a comment in the chat room saying unless we are planning to conduct additional interviews, it is 100% complete. And I think [along] what you're saying was we don't know yet, right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, exactly. So I feel that we're probably done, but I wouldn't want to say, "Oh, we're done," and then come back to it. So I think it would make sense to just put it like four weeks after our face-to-face and make a note in the comments to say this is only if anything arises during [the write-up.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: How about we put it for the completion of Kobe? That way if we want to conduct additional interviews, we might do them at ICANN 64.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: That is actually the perfect solution, I agree. Let's do that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And Steve points out in the chat room that 100% doesn't mean it's untouchable. If something comes up [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [inaudible]



---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, go ahead, Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I was just wondering [inaudible] revise this [inaudible] Is there other item that are 100% complete and we have marked that otherwise? Because I think we should have correct information that corresponds to what is the current state of the review [inaudible] to list [seven days in time.] So if [inaudible] people are saying this is 100% done and we put it as 0%. So we need to revise this call and maybe [inaudible] review this call [inaudible] other items like this which we put at 0% or some 80% or 60% but which may be more than that or less than that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. So that is a very good objective. probably not the right thing to do on the call, but it would certainly be something that I think the team members, we should all do, perhaps offline. So I will go ahead and I will take that as a suggestion from Naveed. So correct me if I'm wrong that we propose another TTL on – time for the team to review this call.

So in other words, I would say by the beginning of the next plenary call a week from today, I'd like to suggest that everyone on the team take the initiative to look at this document, specifically in that column, and note your perspective on whether the percentages need to be adjusted, the percentage of completion. Because I do think that's important, and that's something that as the team, we've run into confusion about in the past.

---

In the past, we've had percentages there that were not fully discussed or not everyone was on the same page about, and because other people viewed this document, there wound up being some consternation. Yeah, so by the time next week, it's on everybody on the team to review that call and note whether they perceive a discrepancy in it. And if someone from staff doesn't mind putting that in the action items, that would be helpful as well.

Okay, so that was 25. So 26, Denise has as note. I know it's not in yellow, but the draft summary note of key findings, key findings refer to the findings – okay, so that one is not a question. I see. So that's why it's not yellow. Got it. Okay, 26 to 30, approve findings, assemble draft recommendations using the designated review team template, cross-check draft recommendations with scope and bylaws.

And there's a note, there's a question, "ICANN Org adjust start date." So, I guess that – alright, hold on a second. Anyone have any comments or questions about that? Nobody's raising their hands. Okay, so prepare the draft report section, approve findings. I guess we are in the process of approving the findings of the SSR1, so maybe we're already in process on that. Does anyone feel that we are not – by discussing the SSR1 – as you might have noticed on the mailing list, there's actually a couple ongoing discussions about that now and other workstreams. Does anybody feel like that date needs to be adjusted? In other words, have we not started yet? I don't see any hands, and I see Laurin's assent. So maybe can someone from ICANN Org clarify the question to make sure we're addressing what it means? Yeah, Jennifer, please go ahead.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. I guess this is to your previous comment that if the review team have already started this and you just want to look at the percentage date to make sure that it reflects how far through the process you are with that. Because at the moment, these three are zero percent.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: And I realize [21st of October,] [inaudible] it's a short time period for these three, so you just want to make sure [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so that's a fair point. It seems like basically, this item is implying that we will be done approving our findings in a week, by the next plenary call. And I've noted just in a couple e-mails back and forth, it doesn't look like we've all 100% agreed, but we're not there yet. Do we feel like a week is enough time? Laurin, go ahead, please.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Why don't we just move that again to the face-to-face? Because that's when we will draft the final stuff and then everything will be agreed. I know this is far in the future, but I think that probably makes most sense. We can just say we're nearly done but we kind of – again, kind of put it back there so that if everything comes up, it's fine so we can put a high percentage to indicate, yes, we're [inaudible] right now, but we might have to adjust the [inaudible] when we actually write –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, let me make sure I read back what I think you just suggested. So you're suggesting you push the date out. [You said to the same.] You said the percentage, but I assume you meant the date, so make the date sometime in the future. You mean like ICANN 64, but then put the percentage at some high number like 90 or something like that? Is that what you're suggesting?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, exactly. So we indicate it may be done but that there might be final agreement, etc. to be had because we still have sometimes these methodology discussions that we have not fully resolved and where I'm unsure if we can actually fully resolve them via call. So I think that would make sense, essentially like the last [inaudible] interviews, just –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I'm in favor of that. So I'll put it to the team right now. Does anyone have any objection to moving the completion date to ICANN 64 date and to listing the percentage for approve findings, row 28, to 90%? I see no objections, I see no hands. Silence is golden. Okay, so that's the plan then. Of course, these things can change, so there's nothing set in stone. But what that also means is that the completion date for 29 and 30 also needs to be pushed out to a similar degree.

And certainly, assembling draft recommendations and cross tracking draft recommendations with scope and bylaws has not begun, and that stays at zero. So keeping those dates on the same tier may or may not

---

change. But – so row 28 is 90%, rows 28, 29 and 30 will all be completed – aim to be completed by Kobe. Any comments or questions? No comments or questions. Fantastic.

Okay, so moving on. So now under workstream 2, inward-facing, [formerly] ICANN SSR, and according to the mailing list, we may change it again, but currently, the workstream formally known as ICANN SSR, currently known as inward-facing. Rows 34, 35 and 36, ICANN Org has posted a question, “Adjust progress for each of these considering start date?”

So this one, unfortunately, I think the people who are most authoritative for this are not able to be on the call, so I'll note that and then I'll go to Naveed. Go ahead, please.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Hello.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hello.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

---

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I was just trying to understand what we just decided about this. For example, 28 through 30, are we saying that we're going to push the date of the finalization to Kobe of all of these? Like it means from 28 to 30, from for example 39 to 41 and so on, all of them will be [booked] to be finished to Kobe? Are we saying that?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We're saying that only currently about 28, 29 and 30. That's what we were just talking about. The prepared draft section under the SSR1 workstream.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. [inaudible] what is the reason of pushing this?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: There was no specific reason about pushing it except that we didn't have a good example for when we were going to stop talking about it. I guess I made an anecdotal reference to the fact that the e-mail list right now has at least one discussion going on about fundamentals of the SSR review, so I personally am not sure that we can claim that we'll be done right away until we resolve those issues, and I think [sadly] the people who are discussing them may not be on the call right now.

So it's hard to know when we'll finish. Nevertheless, as far as approving findings go, I think our sense was we're mostly done with that. we did a lot of good work face-to-face and we've had a bunch of good conversations on e-mail. So while we're not done done, we are close, I think the sense would be from me anyway. And so the suggestion was

let's put these dates far out. [inaudible] we can always pull them back in if we think, but we haven't started 29 or 30 yet, [it's just] 28's almost done in our opinion. That sound like a fair assessment to you?

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Okay. Yeah, sure, as long as – what my question was as long as we don't put all of them together, like I thought we're doing it for all of them, we're going to push all of the approved findings and all that in one place closer to Kobe. That might be difficult for adopting them and cross-checking the bylaws and all of that. So I'm proposing that they should be one by one because the [inaudible] the recommendations [inaudible] scope bylaws and all that. So just we need to keep in mind to do that one after another and not all at the same time.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, that's absolutely a fair point, and I think the idea was just to sort of put it far enough out that we expect to beat the dates. And I note that Norm posted in the chat room that maybe using the interim face-to-face meeting as an endpoint instead of Kobe makes more sense. And I'd personally think that's fine, we just don't know exactly what that date is yet.

But I think maybe the meta comment to both of those comments, yours and – to Norm's and to Naveed's is that we can finish those things tomorrow even if our expected completion date is ten years from now. So it isn't like we're limited by that. So we shouldn't feel constrained that we have to take – we don't need to use Parkinson's law to fill up all the time between now and whenever those dates are.

---

Nevertheless, if the sense was we should stagger them and aim them closer, why don't we aim them at the face-to-face when we know when that is? And we can stagger them if we want but continue to make progress on the way. How does that sound? I see a plus one from Norm.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Sure, I agree.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. So then if staff wouldn't mind noting that – I don't know if that's an action item or what, but a finding. And I see Laurin agrees, and I see Russ is typing. Okay. Well, so moving on – so I'm going to move on. I'm going to look for hands in case somebody feels like they want to jump in, but scrolling down, looking for more yellows.

Alright, so all the way down on 78, under draft report, there's a yellow. Adopt report format. And that one expired on Halloween, a very spooky date. So adopt report format has not been done. Does anyone have any suggestions or feeling about – so, sorry, jumping back, Russ has suggested that we use mid-February so that we can finish. Yeah, anybody object to mid-February for the previous date discussion? How about mid-ish February? Can we use mid-ish February? That's my new favorite part of every month.

Okay, so let's do Valentine's Day for that date for now, mid-February. It's sort of nice. Okay. Adopt report format, and ICANN Org has flagged that we might need to adjust that date. And I don't think we've even remotely begun discussing this. Correct me if I'm wrong, anybody. But I



---

would propose that we push this to the face-to-face meeting as well, or mid-February to follow Russ' suggestion.

Again, we can absolutely adopt that report format before the completion date and go from zero to 100% at any time, but as our face-to-face meeting is supposed to revolve around drafting in some way, shape or form, it seems appropriate that that might be the place where we adopt the report format. Anybody object to that? Naveed, go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

It's not about the same thing that you're discussing, I just want to point out that at line 50, actually, I've put a comment earlier which is not yellow at the moment, but I think that there is still some confusion around that. [I did not see that while] me and Denise were working on this document. So there's kind of an inconsistency in presenting the dates that we are having here. If you see the workstream 2, it says "Review, analyze" and all. [inaudible] for example, 15th January. And the other things start after that. Then you see the workstream 3, it goes up to 30th November. But part of this is [ended on] 15th November and approved findings start after that. This is not inclusive of, for example, conduct investigation, but in other, it's inclusive for example in workstream 3 or 2, or if we see workstream 4. So I'm not sure if [inaudible] consistent.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. So, does anybody have any comments or questions about that? Does anybody feel that we need to homogenize these dates? Because in looking at them, in reviewing and analyzing, to your point, Naveed,

---

nominally complete after conducting investigation and relevant interviews, and that might be fine. We might have data from those that is gathered by the time we're reviewing and analyzing. But I think also read some of the other items on our agenda today, SSR3, outward-facing, whatever we want to call it, or DNS SSR outward-facing, is currently undergoing a lot of reconstruction, so it might be hard to know exactly how it's going to shape up.

So my sense would be – and I sort of propose this for the group for your perspectives as well – is that SSR3 is probably going to undergo some large changes, and the dates and percentages are probably going to have to shift as a result anyway, like the things that I don't think we know right now.

So, Naveed, did I capture your perspective in my response? [I notice that] some people might be having trouble hearing the audio, but did what I say sound like it –

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

It's part of what I said. I'll just give another example. For example, if you see the workstream 4, the approve findings, we'll start working on approve findings after the date of almost everything is over. You see [21st December, 21st December, 21st December] is the cutoff date of all of the above. But here, we are including the review, analyze along with when we are approving the findings. So I'm just wondering in workstream 3 for example, how did we decide to continue review and analyzing while we are approving the findings at the same time? You see what I mean? So there's kind of inconsistencies [inaudible]. I don't

---

mind if we are consistent throughout and use the same approach, but there seems to be some inconsistency in how we are putting these dates.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. Understood. How about we push the completion dates for the workstream 3, we push them all out to mid-February? Would that make sense? Noting again that we can obviously complete things before the completion date has occurred. Laurin, go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

The [point was that] the approve findings, [the assemble] recommendations and the [inaudible] draft recommendations for all of them, I think we need to push them later towards [the end,] and they should not be tied to the workstream working on that and finishing their work. They might finish their work, but it might take some time [while we sit together,] including other members who are not part of that workstream, share with them, and then start approving those findings. So I think in any case, we need to have a gap between working on a particular workstream and starting to approve and checking the bylaws. So maybe we can get all of these and push them towards a later date and not tie them with the completion of the work [inaudible]. Because I see it difficult to achieve anyway.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. Thanks, Naveed. Laurin, go ahead, please.

---

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Thank you, Eric. What I would propose – I think we are spending a lot of time on this workplan that is actually flexible as Steve’s already underlined in the chat. So I would recommend or propose this. Naveed, if you just go into the document and you suggest the dates that you think are appropriate, you can just put like “Naveed’s suggestion” behind the dates so we know what's going on. And if you can do that, then Jennifer can send it around, everyone can look at it, we will all be happy with [your] proposal, and then we’re done with this.

Because I really think we have substantial work to do also on this call today, and I don’t think anyone – as long as we don’t go too crazy and we err on the side of caution, when it comes to setting dates, so rather pushing them back a little bit more as I also said in the chat, I think we’ll be fine and we should just be moving on, because we’re essentially taking time from the stuff we should be doing, like substantially by discussing these things for so long.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Thanks, Laurin. I can certainly do that, but why I'm specifying it here is that I believe that this workplan is an essential part of this work to be reviewed and it’s going to be presented at the earliest to the board. So it’s better that we are consistent. And since I'm not [inaudible] I'm just asking the question to get my [inaudible] clarified, like what we are thinking, why we are putting these dates. Because this is going to be reviewed again by the board. So I'm happy to do that anyway offline and maybe share the update document with you all.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Thanks, Naveed. So I see Noorul Ameen's given a plus one to this idea as well, and so unless anyone has any other comments or questions – I see KC has also agreed and has suggested that the leadership do more work. Yay.

Yes, and Kerry Ann agrees, and KC also notes the holidays are coming up. So to Laurin, to one of your subpoints, yes, we will sort of need to move along, especially as we start to lose productivity as people start going into holiday mode. So Naveed, looks like you got the duty, so please go ahead and update those dates as you see fit, as Laurin asked, if you don't mind annotating what it was that you changed so that they can be reviewed.

I'd like to give you a TTL of seven days so that – actually, if you don't mind, Naveed, if you can do this within 48 hours and then send it to the list, that way if there are any concerns or there's any consternation about that, people can be [inaudible] in two days when you complete and we can discuss them on the list, and if it doesn't reach parity on the list, then we can discuss it on the next plenary call. Is that fair?

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

[inaudible] do that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Alright, so we have a 48-hour TTL on this, at which point I hope – if an action item could be made that there'll be a note to the list so people can be prompted to look. Hopefully – Naveed, I'm sure you're

---

going to do a great job, but on the off chance someone has a comment, we have a little bit of time.

I see a note from KC, an offer to [inaudible]. Oh, so offer to other people look at – okay, so I thought maybe – so KC, I was suggesting that maybe just Naveed take the first pass, just go open loop on it, and then we can sort of close the loop with the team afterwards to see what we all think. That way, there's fewer iterations if that's okay. Alright, great. Thanks. And Laurin, no worries. Everyone knows –

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

I think internal, we already decided that the team is going to work on the [percentage] column, so I think I'm expecting the other members would review that column anyways.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. So if you don't mind noting what it is that you've updated, I'm sure people will be able to look at what you've touched, and in the event that there's any consternation, we can iterate on e-mail, and if that fails, we can talk about it on the plenary. Does that make sense?

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, great. Alright, so I'm scrolling down looking for more yellows. There are no more yellows, so it sounds like we'll be doing a little bit of

---

surgery on this document in the coming day/week, so we'll have an opportunity to [do] this exercise again potentially in the future. So, does anyone have any comments or questions before we move on?

So I'll note that we have not approved the workplan because we are iterating on it, just for complete clarity, but that we expect to make progress soon. Okay, update on SSR1 recommendations work to date and outstanding. Okay, so there's been a lot going on about the SSR1 recommendations. I'm trying to remember which of them currently are outstanding.

I think there were a few that we were not able to address, but have we got – so it's unfortunate that the biggest discussion item about this on the list was between three people, two of whom are not on the call. So I know KC was involved with that, but I think it basically was more like she was commenting about something else, and then an SSR1 discussion started.

So, does anybody have any perspective on SSR1 recommendations that they'd like to share? And at this point, we've done a lot of work in the face-to-face that we had in ICANN 63, and we're getting closer to a drafting stage, modulo anybody have any concern? Yes, Russ notes that there was a mid-ish October announcement. I assume there has not been any update that would change our standby on that. Has there been any update publicly about anything that would change our standing on anything?

I'm assuming silence means no. Okay, yes, so we are definitely waiting for some of our recommendations, but I do believe that the other

---

recommendations at this point, everyone feels that we're solidly on the same page, modulo the discussion that happened on the list between some people that couldn't make the call today. Is that an accurate reflection to everyone on the call?

Okay, so that's really good, I just have to note that having been on the team for a long time now, that this is a massive milestone, that we made tremendous progress, and so to those of you that have been on the [inaudible] with me on the three-hour tour, we should all feel really good about that. And for those that have joined, hopefully you feel good too, but it's been a long road, so everyone deserves a pat on the back for our impending success.

From there, I'm looking for hands to see if anybody has anything to say before we move on to internal SSR, which I'm not sure we can actually move on to, because I think we would need Boban for that and I think he had a last-minute apology they sent in. Is that correct? Is anybody – is Zarko on? Zarko, are you on the call? Yeah, I think our key players in this are not on the call today.

Okay, well, I'm going to move on then, and we'll probably have to circle back on internal SSR when we have a better quorum. But we might be able to talk about reviewing external SSR topics, the [artist formerly known as Prince.] So KC, did you want to talk to that, or did you want me to talk to that? Would you talk to that? Putting you on the spot, sorry.

Okay, so I'll start, and KC will correct me when I go sideways. So in looking at the external SSR topics and looking at the future topics – and



---

this was in some number of e-mails that were transmitted to the list. There was a lot of overlap between the future work and the external SSR work, and there was a lot of discussion about whether the items that were flagged as future concerns or future issues were actually current or present issues or if there just needed to be a perspective change.

So it would be worth the team's time taking a look at the document. I believe – Jennifer, is that the one that you just posted, the workstream document? I'll pull it up real quick. It is. So the document that Jennifer just posted in the chat – thank you for that – it covers a lot of work that KC and I took on, which essentially, if you go down to workstream 4 on page – I think it's seven, or if you go down from page seven to page ten, basically, a lot of the items have strikethroughs.

And the idea with the strikethroughs is not to say that they're irrelevant or less relevant tasks but that we felt that they likely belonged in workstream 3, and based largely on observations that maybe they were less future and more current, or that they at least needed to be addressed in workstream 3.

So my recollection, the extent to which it's correct, as a refresher or information to other people on the call, is that in the past, we had looked at a lot of the items in the future, and we realized it was hard to know what future items would be versus items covered by other workstreams until the workstreams decided what items they would cover.

---

And one of the reasons that we put the future on more of a backburner after Kerry Ann did a lot of really hard work was that we needed the team to sort of weigh in on whether these items were items for the future or not. And in fact in looking at a lot of the things that were left there when we've sort of put it on the backburner, they did in fact seem like they probably need to at least be considered as relevant or not in workstream 3.

So most of the items there have strikethroughs through them now, and that was what we did as a result of saying they often go into workstream 3. So, has anybody looked at that or is looking at it now, and are there any comments or questions about that? You might note that some of them – and again, this is under the work items, [there is a focus.] Some of them do not have strike through them because our sense was that they did indeed seem to belong where they were.

Kerry Ann, I did not , because I was absorbed in stuff with the little one yesterday. Sorry. Kerry Ann, would you mind speaking to it on the call? No, I'm talking to Kerry Ann over – okay, [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY:

Okay, I do have audio and I did read the comments from her, although now I have to go find them. And we had an exchange about [inaudible]. She said she saw the changes that Eric and I made, she has no major objections. And Kerry Ann, say something on the list if I'm reading it wrong [inaudible] something later.

“I've been rethinking the approach that we took and [wanted the following.”] And just her [inaudible] some suggestions here. Maybe at

---

the end of the research and review under [each] workstream, we can identify specific future challenges based on the research in that workstream.

So maybe instead of what Eric and I did – I mean, what Eric and I did might apply to more than just putting stuff from four into three, but it may be that as we – now I'm riffing off what she wrote in her mail, my understanding is that as we go through each workstream, we might find that there are certain things in the workstream that are more future, forward-looking, and we may have less concrete recommendations to say about them, and we could put them all into some workstream four that's about future stuff.

So then her number two, "We would then provide a more broad generic future challenges section [like the] topics we've identified and maybe include something on AI. As I – I, Kerry Ann – can anticipate in the coming years, this may be incorporated as a monitoring tool for DNS abuse." KC totally agrees with that.

Number three, "Then in our findings, conclusions, recommendations, we can include specific recommendations for those future challenges identified." She made one more minor comment about that Eric and I – and Eric had mentioned a few topics were left in workstream 4 that might be more, again, what we consider to be future. We don't have specific, concrete things to say except maybe ICANN should go fund a study on this.

And Kerry Ann said, "I think this workstream would be populated based on the review from the other workstreams." Right, so that's consistent

---

with what she was saying earlier, is that this idea of a lot of things we saw in four are really more present, it may also be the case that as we go through one through six or one through the other workstreams, we find things that we thought were present but they might be more future, and we kind of decide what goes in future as we do the work, not right now, I think is her point.

No, okay. No, she's saying, "No, okay." [I'm] worried I got her thing wrong. Okay, and Russ is saying [quantum is future. We agree that quantum is future. I don't know if – was quantum in] workstream 4?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's under [inaudible], Russ.

KC CLAFFY: Did we –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's in four still.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. We agree, Russ. or at least we no longer see it in four, because the way he's texting here, he says, "Previously identified in four."

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I don't remember where it was or it wasn't, but it's currently under new dependencies, new crypto systems, and it says PQ instead of quantum.

KC CLAFFY: Right, Russ, it's not going away.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, well, so KC, thanks for that summary, and I do believe that that was largely held as the right belief in the past when we've talked about it, so I think – does anybody have any objection to that perspective? Essentially, figuring out what the future concerns, threats, issues are after we've done a pass through workstreams one, two and three? The other ones. I see Russ is typing, Russ approves that.

Okay, so silence is golden. Okay, great, so I think we've actually come to the end of our agenda, which I'm surprised by, but that's great. I'm going to stand by for typing to complete. Okay, take care, Russ. Be safe. So we've reached the end of the agenda, and now it's time for Any Other Business. Okay, cool, I do not see any indication of other business to be discussed, which is fantastic.

KC CLAFFY: Wait. KC has a question, although it probably was covered before I got on the call. I saw a mail from Alain earlier about the SSR1 stuff. Did that get talked about earlier in the call, or are we punting that to a future –

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, since Alain and Boban, the two – I mentioned this earlier, but just kind of in passing, since Alain and Boban gave us apologies and they're not on the call, I really wanted to put that to bed, but neither the participants are on.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Was there anything you wanted to add in their absence though?

KC CLAFFY: No.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Because I know you sort of started off, I wasn't sure if you were heavily into it though.

KC CLAFFY: No, I'll go read it more carefully. I just wanted to make sure I didn't miss anything that was talked about.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, no, I think we really need to sort of put these issues to bed when they come up, but it needs to have the participants onboard. So I think we may want to send a follow-up note to the list asking them to please

---

be prepared to put it to bed on the next plenary call or finish it up on the list before then.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Alain asked for some clarifications on the list.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, great. I'm done.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Any Other Business? Okay, great, so if we could review the action items, please, someone from staff.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. Hello. So the action items I captured, staff to recirculate the template for the findings and recommendations to the review team, and then review team members to flag within 24 hours of the e-mail distribution any objections to adopting the template.

Second action item, by the beginning of the next plenary call, review team members to look at the percent completion column in the workplan and note whether they think they're accurate or any changes, which is the column G.

---

And then the third action item, Naveed to update the workplan with suggested dates and recirculate within 48 hours to the team for agreement or discussion on list ahead of next [week's] meeting. And then I took a bunch of notes from the discussion which I can share with you, Naveed, as well to incorporate the comments that were discussed during this meeting.

And then I think I need to add another one here. Somebody was going to send a follow-up note to the list regarding Alain and Boban's comments. Or do you want me to put it for discussion on next week's call?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: If you don't mind putting for discussion on next week's call, then we can try and resolve it before then and obsolete it. But I think basically take both approaches, if you don't mind.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And I see Naveed has his hand up, so when you're finished, Jennifer. Naveed, just when Jennifer finishes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I'm done. You can go ahead, Naveed. Thanks.



---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Go ahead, Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I just need to ask if we have or we plan to have some kind of outcome document for our face-to-face meeting in Barcelona or it is not required as per the previous [inaudible]. I'm not sure what we have been doing [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So in the past, we have composed communications after we've had our mains, like when we restarted and after earlier meetings, so yeah. Jennifer, I'm sort of having a senior moment. In the past, have we relied on staff to do a draft of that, or have we drafted like a blog post? I can't remember who has usually started with the pen on that.

JENNIFER BRYCE: We have an action item from the face-to-face meeting for staff to draft that blog post, so we'll circulate the draft for the review team in the coming days.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thank you. Naveed, does that sound good?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, thank you.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:                    Alright, great. Well, then I think we're done, so thanks, everyone. Let's be cognizant of the e-mail on the list – I'm saying to myself – but [I've] got a couple things, and if nothing else, we'll talk again next week.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:               Perfect. Thank you very much, Everybody.

JENNIFER BRYCE:                   Thanks, everyone. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**