
BARCELONA –Engagement Session with the SSR2 Review Team
Monday, October 22, 2018 - 00:00 to 00:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

MODERATOR: ICANN63 Barcelona, Engagement Session SSR2 Review Team, October 22, 2018. [AUDIO BREAK]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hello, I'm Russ Housley, Chair of the SSR2 Review Team. I'd like to go ahead and get started. Could somebody close the doors for us, there's quite a bit of noise. [AUDIO BREAK]

So, this morning's session I'd like you to think about two questions as I go through the rest of the slides. When you see what we have put together for our way forward, think about whether this covers all the topics you think it ought to and is the material and focus of the team what you think it ought to be. If not, please come to the mic at the end.

So, the agenda is we're going to share with you where we are, our scope, our terms of reference, where we are on our working timeline, and then talk a little bit about outreach and how you can provide your input.

Our team was reconvened in August 2018, after being on pause since October 2017. We had a face-to-face meeting in Washington at that point. We welcomed some new members and said goodbye to some folks who had resigned, and selected new leadership. I was selected as the Chair and we have three Vice Chairs. We reviewed the work that

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.

had been completed up to October 2017 and updated our scope and the terms of reference. We updated our workplan and are moving forward with substantial work at this point, and we encourage the community input throughout our work, and I really appreciate you coming to listen to what we're doing at this point.

The updated scope in terms of reference that we produced at that meeting in August was shared with the community and sent to the Board, and it's available on the Wiki at the URL on the slide. It describes basically our focus of our work, which is absolutely guided by the ICANN Mission and the requirements in the bylaws, actually Section 4.6c, that is the one that calls for the SSR Review to take place every five years.

The document also has the timeline we put together, the responsibilities of the leadership and the members, how decisions are made, how we're going to conduct our work, and our commitment to have outreach throughout the process. The work follows the description, and on the slide I've quoted a piece of the bylaws, that's why it's so long, because that is actually guiding the way we're doing the work and all of the words actually are important, so that's why we put the whole thing on this slide.

So, looking forward, we have come up with four work streams. Three of them are required by the bylaws and one of them is a "may" in the bylaws. The first one is the SSR2 must look at the recommendations that came out of SSR1 and assess whether the implementation had the intended effect. The second thing we need to do is look at ICANN's key security, stability, and resilience activities and see whether they are on course. The third thing we need to do is look at the impact of the

security, stability, and resilience of the DNS and in particular the way ICANN contributes to or facilitates that. And the thing that we 'may' do, which we intend to do some of, is look at the future challenges.

We have laid out a very aggressive timeline. We did all those things that I already talked about in terms of updating the scope and the terms of reference, the work plan and the outreach plan. Those were done before the meeting. And we started the first workstream, as well. Here we're going to have several face-to-face meetings of the team and we're going to have the outreach to the community that is here, this session being part of that. And then before the meeting in Kobe, we plan to finish gathering the facts and create a draft report. So we're trying to put this together in one meeting cycle and then by Kobe, do face-to-face presentations on what's in that draft, and get it out for public comment right after the Kobe meeting. The bylaws require a 40-day public comment period on the draft period, get those comments back in after the public comment period closes, and produce the final report and send it to the Board before ICANN65. So, that's our plan.

We very much want your input. There's a bunch of ways you can do that. One is you can input to us electronically through the email that's on the slide. I will warn you that that's publicly archived. You can provide comments at the engagement sessions like this one, or you can become an observer to the review team if you contact the MSSI Secretary, they can set you up to participate in all of our phone calls, and so on. Or you can take a look at our public Wiki.

So, for those who have downloaded the slides, there is some additional background material, including who is on the team and so on, but I

don't want to go through those slides, I'd rather here from you. So, some of the review team is here to help with any questions or input you would like to provide. The mic is open. [AUDIO BREAK]

Is there anything in Adobe? No? Okay. Well, if you have no questions or comments, thank you for your time. Go ahead.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks very much. This is Heather Forrest, Chair of the GNSO. I just wanted to take an opportunity while we're all here together to ask how the group has managed to regroup and recommence its work following the action taken by the Board this time last year. Has that significantly disrupted the work? Are you able to pick up where things left off? Has it had an impact? I think this is important for the SO/AC leaders as we anticipate, let's say as we attempt to learn from that experience.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I'm one of the new members, so the impact for me is somewhat different than the folks who were on the team, so I'm going to let one of the people who was on the team before respond to that. Norm, how about you take that one?

NORM RITCHIE:

Yes, I'd say yes. So it's almost a year that elapsed in there, so there was a lot of momentum that we had to regain. At the time of the pause I think we were actually rolling pretty strongly, we were making a lot of progress at that moment, and we just had, it was at Abu Dhabi. We

were ready to engage the community there, and then that obviously did not happen. So yes, there was an impact. The other thing that happens is now a year lapse, so some of the work that has been done, we're going to have redo some of that, because there's another year in there. A lot has changed and there has been new work done by ICANN and in the community itself that we have to now meld in to our assessments.

HEATHER FORREST:

This is Heather Forrest, may ask a followup question? Could we have feedback from you in terms of not just the impact, which you're describing there, but what can we collectively learn from this in terms of how we deal with the ICANN Board?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Anyone want to take that? Go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC:

I'm Zarko Kecic and I'll try to answer your question. There are two parts to that; first we struggle with scope, and I believe that making such review teams needs to have a scope developed before the team is established. Otherwise we'll run into the problems that we had, and go back and forth, discussions about scope. And another thing that I believe was not handled, managed well, we should discuss about problems, not just to make a decision about that. So, there was lack in the discussion between the review team, Board, community, representatives. So, I believe that's the way to go.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I'd agree with that. What was required, I think, was a dialogue, rather than formal letters going back and forth. ICANN is community, I understand where everything is open and transparent, sometimes we overdo that, and I think just a simple dialogue would have saved a lot of problems.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Yeah, I would agree with both of those comments. I think in terms of things for the SOs and ACs and their Chairs to consider is that there is an obligation also, of course on the community and the SO and AC groups to respond to request for input and to have engagement and discussions if they see any issues that need to be addressed. Formal letters, sort of after the fact, have not proven useful and there has been quite a bit of confusion. There is also, frankly, quite a hardship on the volunteers, many of whom are unable to spend two years doing a review instead of one year.

So, pausing us for a year has been quite challenging, I think, for many members, and I think there's a lot to learn from the unfortunate series of events that occurred with this review. I think chief among them

would be the sort of tightening up the rules and guidelines and bringing more clarity to what it means to be an independent community review team, what our responsibilities are, what the Board's responsibilities are, what the Chair's responsibilities are. And I know, Heather you have led a number of discussions and efforts to bring more clarity and more guidelines to this, and I think there's still a ways to go on that. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Hi, Alan Greenberg. Just as an aside, when the Chairs were given the task of addressing whatever the issues were and restarting the group, I don't think any of us imagined it was going to take a year. We didn't quite plan on putting that kind of effort into it, either. So, for whatever it's worth. I'd like to talk a little bit about scope. The draft specific review standards that ICANN put out a year or so ago, in response, or a little bit less than a year now, partly in response to the perception that there were scope difficulties in SSR2, created an interesting scope setting process prior to the review actually starting. It would have taken a significant number of volunteers a year to set the scope.

And in the public comment that followed, I have never seen such a universal set of comments from across the community all saying, "no." Spending a year with another 20 people, or whatever it was going to be, just did not seem to be the way to do it. There was also some concern, I was among them, of a body getting together to set the scope that someone else will then have to carry out, I had just a little bit of concern. And I'm wondering, how would we find the middle point? You know, the bylaws give you certain details, certain specifics. You, then, have to refine them.

And I should say for those in the room who don't know, I'm chairing the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team, so I've been going through the same sort of things. I'm just wondering if there is some in-between method where a review team is responsible for its scope, but perhaps goes out for an informal, not a public comment, but a discussion with the people that chartered the members, to say, sort of, are we on the track, these are the difficulties we're having, where do you think we should put our focus. It's something less formal, getting community buy-in on it, and then it would be a lot harder for the Board to say you're not doing it right.

So, I'm just putting that out. Certainly just giving it to another group ahead of time I think is a dangerous way to go, and both time consuming and putting extra strain on the community. So, just something to think about. I welcome any comments.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yeah, I think that the startup process is quite difficult and to start up, stop, and start up, is even more. So, maybe putting together as part of the guidelines an engagement point that just focus on, "This is the scope that we develop, and this is with work plan that we're going to follow to achieve that scope," would be a very reasonable thing and a fresh start. Anyone else got any thoughts on that? Okay, alright, I don't see anybody forming at the mic line, so thanks for your attention.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]