BRENDA BREWER: Hello, everyone. Welcome to SSR2 Review Plenary Call number 50 on the 8th of November, 2018 at 15:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Ram, Norm, Laurin, Naveed, Eric, Denise – and Zarko was with us, I believe he's still trying to join. We have no observers at this time. We do have apologies from Russ, Kaveh, Boban, and Mr. Matogoro. From ICANN organization, Jennifer, Steve and Brenda, and today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to Jennifer. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Brenda. Hello, everybody. Welcome. So an update regarding the face-to-face meeting in January-February. The Meetings team came back and said that because of the broad scope that we have given them initially, they haven't been able to provide us any quotes or information, but they suggested to speed things up, what would be helpful is if the review team could identify a date, a couple of dates even, where they can go ahead, and we can put together quotes for the particular locations that were discussed in Barcelona, which I believe were Vancouver and then D.C. and the Brussels office just to give some comparative pricing.

So if you all can discuss that, what would be ideal at this point is if we could get a set date or even maybe two sets of dates where you would – we can do a Doodle poll and get confirmations on the team, and then from there, the Meetings team can provide quotes. So that's what I have for the moment, so happy to discuss or take any questions.

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, thank you, Jennifer. I think – I mean you've already put the obvious action item in front of us, which is to create a Doodle poll to just check what times in January, February would work for us. I doubt there are any objections to this. If you have objections or comments, then please raise your hands. Furthermore, weren't we also discussing L.A., for meeting at the L.A. office, or has that been dropped for some organizational reason and I forgot about it?

JENNIFER BRYCE: From my knowledge, it hasn't intentionally been dropped, I maybe just hadn't included that. So I can certainly add that back in [inaudible] and that's no problem.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, perfect. Are there any comments on the face-to-face meeting for January-February 2019? Please either speak up or raise your hands. Naveed, go ahead, please. [inaudible]. Naveed, if you're speaking, at least I cannot hear you. Sorry, is [it on] me, or can other people hear Naveed?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I can't hear him, no.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: I can't hear him either. Could you put me in the queue, Laurin? Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. Okay. Naveed, could you check what's going on with your mic? And then while Naveed is checking, Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. To move things along, could we have staff please send a note to the list today and ask people to post to the list any conflicts they have in the month of January or February? Or actually, just send it straight to Jennifer, and then within 48 hours, the chairs consider that and start a Doodle poll with an aim to have this wrapped up in terms of our requested meeting dates that we want to poll on in the next couple of days. And obviously, the sooner we get this decided, the sooner we can make arrangements and save money.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Naveed, you still have your hand up. I've read you also wanted to talk about dates, so I thought [inaudible] discussing this matter. Jennifer, would it be possible to get that Doodle out today? Maybe with a deadline or like an initial deadline, let's put it by the end of Sunday this week. So with some luck, we will have some kind of picture of what is happening by Monday, so for the leadership call. Would that be possible?

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, Laurin, my apologies, I'm on the phone and now on Adobe, I'm in transit, but I think it would be – instead of it being a huge Doodle poll to poll for the whole month of January and February for three different locations, so if we could narrow it down a bit by asking team members in the next, say, 24 hours to let Jennifer know if they have big blocks of conflict, and then have the leadership team select some blocks of dates for people to do a Doodle poll on. I think that would make it a little more manageable. Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, Denise. That also makes sense. So my concept was essentially poll the dates first and see what's possible simply because we are beholden to the Meetings team as well as a variety of logistics for the location. My point being I'm not sure if we have to poll these locations already because we don't know where they will be able to accommodate us. So what do you think? Should we do dates first, or should we try to limit it down as you said? What do you think works better?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm open to anything, but I think which part of the world the meeting is held in will determine the – in part determine people's availability, so we kind of need all those dates and locations, which is why – yeah, thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, makes sense to me. So what's the proposed kind of structure of the poll you have in mind?

DENISE MICHEL: I would suggest first Jennifer send a note to the list in the next hour saying, "If you have any big conflict in January and February that you cannot attend the meeting, please send them to me." Then have her collate those in the next day and send them to the leadership, and then we'll give direction on constructing a poll that has meeting dates in January and February, and locations, was what I was thinking.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I see, Eric, you have your hand up as well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I just wanted to double check. How long of a meeting are we anticipating? How many days?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Staff, have you done any planning on that specifically?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi. So I think in our planning, we were going to provide costs for two and three days, so I don't know if a team has a preference to [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I feel – and please comment, everyone on the call, my point of view is probably three days is better considering that we all will likely to

have to fly in. Norm is saying in chat minimum three days, and I actually do share that point of view, because with flights and coming in and out, yeah, I'm thinking we might even need four days as kind of going into Norm's direction. Any comments on that?

Okay, so I guess none. Then let's do the following if everybody agrees. Jennifer, if you could, let's go ahead with Denise's plan that she kindly outlined, and like leadership team, will take this up as Denise said. And then I think we will have a discussion about the length, but I think currently like three days is like a good starting point, even though like I said, I feel maybe four would be better, but I know this is getting difficult for people to accommodate. So let's maybe take this one off the call.

Norm, I see you're typing, so I'll quickly wait until that is through. Yeah, okay. So Norm also thinks maybe four days is better. We'll discuss it. Jennifer, if you could send out the initial note. Is there anything else on the face-to-face people would like to discuss, or can we move on?

I cannot see any hands, but I see Naveed is typing, so again, I will wait for that. Okay, Naveed is saying, "[Prefer if the date includes] two days of weekend, it will be easier for people to take days off." Yes. I think this is something we'll do after the e-mail and [see a] bit more data, what's possible. Would that be okay with everybody?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Now Jennifer is typing too. Jennifer, you can also speak.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, I will be, thank you. I was just going to say to Naveed that that kind of information is useful, and I'll ask for people to include that kind of preference in their notes [inaudible] any conflicts that they have as well.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Excellent. Thank you so much, Jennifer. So I think we can then go ahead with no hands showing and all the chat comments addressed, so we can go to agenda point two which is the e-mail thread that has been kind of coming back regularly on [what's our methodology] for accepting the SSR1 recommendations.

So there were a variety of comments by Alain, who is unfortunately not on the call. There were comments that were somewhat in agreement by Boban, and I think Kerry also raised some and she's also not on the call. So I was just wondering if people could kind of state their positions on that, what they see as potential options for us to deal with the SSR1 recommendations.

I think there is somewhat of an agreement in the team. Please correct me if I'm wrong. And some of it has been quite kind of [difficult.] And now I hear myself twice, which is strange. Okay, anyone, any comments on the e-mail thread, SSR1 recommendations, or would you prefer we moved it to the next call when the people who have been voicing this kind of stuff are actually available?

Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Alright, I'll take the bait. So I think this conversation over e-mail thread has exceeded the point of diminishing returns, and I think we've tried to schedule the last three calls to have the people that were discussing it on to discuss it, and they haven't been here. So I think at this point, I personally don't understand the objections, because I feel like they're rehashing things we've all talked about on the team already, so maybe it's more of a minority report, and I think we should just move on.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I see your point, Eric. I'm just wondering, shall we do something on the lines of – for the next call, put it on the agenda with for clear note this is the last time it will be put on the agenda. Either people who have these objections are there and voice them clearly and concisely or give an e-mail before, and if not, we essentially consider it done. Because I agree, it's really difficult for us to address this if the people who have issues are never available. And Naveed, I can see you have your hand up. Please go ahead. Naveed, I cannot hear you again.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Can you hear me now?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. So to me, this is a very delayed task already as far as the review team is concerned. I think we need to move on, as I said. So we have discussed all the issues in detail, and there is no way we can all agree upon what needs to be done and to which depths we need to analyze this. I think what was available and what was given to us, we [have evaluated] that and make our recommendation or note on that.

When we write on this, if somebody has to draft something specific to it, that person or member is welcome to do that. To me, we need just to finalize this, and we'll work on the real stuff that we need to do otherwise.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Thank you very much, Naveed. So summing this up, as you also prefer to move ahead. So I'm just [putting in the room,] Zarko's also saying we should address this. My point of view is, as I said, I would say if [these] people are okay, give them one last chance underlining this is the last chance next week, and we just jump over it right now so we can actually kind of move on with this call.

Would we be alright with that? I know people want to move, and I agree with that. Okay, I see no objections on that, so let's put that in action items. Oh, Denise is typing. You can also just speak if you want.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Hi. I agree with you. I think we should also ask those that would like to discuss this further to try and put a more fulsome discussion on

the e-mail list. I've read the e-mails and I don't quite understand what they're proposing exactly the team do as an alternative to what we've decided. So if we could ask those interested in this issue to clarify their alternative proposal so we could understand in advance of next Thursday's call, I think that would be useful too. Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Perfect, Denise. Thank you very much. This is more or less in line with what I wanted. Eric, you also had your hand up. Please go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Not to belabor the point and not to be cantankerous on this, but I see in the chat room that some people are underscoring, without calling out names, that there may be some rationale that supports this concern. Does anybody on the call feel like they could speak to that concern? Because maybe we can have the discussion now. And if someone feels like they can sort of represent what the concerns are and we can adjudicate it, then we can move on. and if anybody later says, "I wish I had been on that call," that's sort of really [not that useful.]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Is that a reasonable move forward? I only say this because it's been at least a month that we've been trying to have this discussion, and if the parties don't join the calls, we can't have this discussion. And I'd just

hate for SSR1 to be delayed any more than it already has been. That's just my concern.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Thank you, Eric. So I can't really speak to it because I have to admit I did not understand all the concerns clearly. [Let me see.] So I assume you and Denise, it's the same more or less. Naveed also kind of mentioned [more for] going forward. I'm just not sure if anyone here – is anyone here who would be comfortable to speak to this, or would you prefer we just cut this off right now, move on in the agenda and do it next week?

I think I shouldn't ask [or] questions. So if no one's raising their hand, I assume no one can raise any points, and we will give it one last try next week and then consider it done. Zarko, I see you're typing, so please go ahead, also via voice if you want.

Okay, so that makes sense. So would you be able to raise anything, Zarko? [But besides your microphone, you don't feel like it?] Okay, so it seems that there is not really a possibility to have a discussion, because people [inaudible]. So let's do it in the plenary, let's send one last e-mail, because I think then we really tried to address these concerns and no one can claim otherwise.

So I'm assuming this is done and we can move on to the workplan, which is agenda item three. So workplan has been going around quite a lot. Jennifer kind of posted the link to the Google doc there. [Members were] so kind to adjust some [inaudible]. Jennifer was so kind to remove

EN

the workstream we decided to not pursue further, and there was ample time now on the e-mail list to check this.

I think [as my last] comment, I want to reiterate that we all know this is an important document but that we are flexible in adjusting those times, and probably there will be some [times that will be adjusted] in the future. Are there any comments on the workplan on the call?

I cannot see any hands. Would the team members present please indicate if possible – oh, no, now we have someone. Okay. Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Actually, I'd like to have Naveed go first, he may have an answer to this question I was going to ask.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, yeah, that makes sense. Sorry, I haven't seen Naveed's hand yet. Oh, yeah, now I see it. Naveed, please go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Can you hear me?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. [Thank you.]

EN

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. So I tried to spend some time during last week on this document, tried to adjust some of the dates, especially the time we're looking [inaudible] workstream five. So I want the team members to have a look at that, especially because I tried to push the drafting [inaudible] and I tried to give that more time and push it from January to February rather than it was after each workstream finalized [inaudible] there to be done. But I just tried to push it, as I mentioned in the last call.

So I'd just like the team members to have a look at that from that perspective and give their feedback, because we had some time from workstream five schedule so I tried to utilize that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Thank you, Naveed. I think, Denise, this is probably what you wanted to comment on.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Again, thank you, Naveed, for adjusting the dates. I think they're fine with me, and I want to underscore what Laurin has said and what we've been saying about this workplan just to make sure we all have clarity on it. We'll be sort of adopting this and posting it on our wiki and sending it to the So and ACs and the board with the note that this is currently our workplan. As our work evolves, we will periodically update it as needed.

So I encourage team members to think of this as a living document and [be engaged.] And our work progressed exactly as we have it mapped out, but there may well be changes and needs for updates. And I would

note that other review teams have updated their workplan, I don't know, 10 or 15 times, a lot. Hopefully, we don't have to do that, but I would propose that we give people just one last day today or night to offer any additional comments on this and then consider it our first post-pause workplan and post it tomorrow and send it out to the community. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you, Denise. Naveed, I can see your hand is still up. Is that old? Yes, I assume that's old.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, I'm done.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Then let's go ahead and do what has been recommended. Jennifer, would you be so kind of to add an action item, remind the team immediately after this call that they have a final 24 hours to check this over? There were no objections raised during this call. Please, if anyone has objections, raise your hands now or add it to the chat. If not, I would say Jennifer, please send out this e-mail after the call, and then by the end of tomorrow, this thing will be officially adopted for now. Everyone good with that?

I see no objections, so then that is done with said action item put in, and we can talk about the Work Stream report template. Anyone who wants to comment on that? I just posted where it is. It came in the e-mail

EN

[inaudible] SSR2 review, SSR2 8th of November agenda. It's at the bottom of the e-mail. If anyone has any comments, please go ahead.

Just to make sure, are people able to access the document? Oh, [inaudible] thank you very much. As no one is saying anything, I'll give a rundown [inaudible] proposed workstream report structure. We will say what the topic is, we will summarize the relevant research in point two. Point three will be the analysis and findings. In point four, we'll speak about the motivating problem, so essentially, [inaudible] what's the effect [or issue] that the recommendation is intending to solve. And then obviously, finally, number five will be the recommendation itself.

There's a bit more text there that's not on screen, so I'll go over that as well, which is like, okay, what's the recommendations, what are the findings that support it, what's the rationale behind it, [where will the] recommendation impact, essentially, and then we talk about how it could be implemented or how we propose to implement it. There will be in the end a measure of success. I think this is one of the results of our SSR1 recommendation assessment. We give a priority of that recommendation, and then we speak to the consensus.

So now I see this was updated, so [inaudible]. Okay, Naveed, please go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. I just want to ask if we think that this structure – while I have no objection to the structure of the document as it is now because it's very high-level, but would that be an evolving document and the structure? We're not freezing it, right? So if we think later something is needed,

then we can discuss it and add to it. This is my assumption to this proposed structure.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is also my understanding, that this is like our current version, a bit like the workplan. If we see we need to adjust, we probably can adjust. Are there any other comments or ideas regarding this document? Denise, please go ahead. Denise, if you're speaking, I cannot hear you.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Hi. Yeah, I think overall, the structure is fine. I think some of the details are likely not appropriate for every drat recommendation [to] come up with an issue we tackle. For example, we already have an overarching terms of reference that obligate us to provide recommendations that are in the scope of our review. We don't need to address that as a rationale for every action item we include in there.

Similarly, noting how a recommendation is aligned with the mission again. Then it gets into some of the details that we don't really need to address. It also gets into some details on implementation that depending on what the recommendation is would be premature. There may be some recommendations where we give guidance to, say, staff and recommendation that staff come up with an implementation plan after considering the following five factors. So I think we need to – I wouldn't recommendation that we adopt the overall structure and continue to consider the more detailed bullets that are posted under rationale, implementation and measures.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you, Denise. That sounds very sensible, and this is also how I understood this document to be. I can see, Eric, you also have your hand up. Please go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. So then just to be completely in violent agreement amongst the vice chairs, I sort of read the document differently as kind of just the way you were describing it, Denise, and so just to sort of say it in my own words, so there's a third voice saying I think the same thing. I think that the blue topic areas, the topic summary [below it] make sense to sort of guide us, but I think, one, this whole document is there for guidance, not there to restrict us.

But two, I think under, for example, recommendations where we're talking about – I think all of that is just there to help us form our thinking. I Don't think we should feel that that is constraining as to how we should write up our report. I think our report or our recommendations will all take their own form, [our workstream work.] So I think this is just to sort of tease the thinking out, and then [we're to] sort of write something that's impactful.

And I think to make something impactful, I don't think we necessarily have to follow the template. So I think [to] completely agree, I think this should be taken as, "How do we structure our thinking?" We should write however we think it makes sense. That's my opinion.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thanks a lot, Eric. Denise, your hand is up again, or still?

DENISE MICHEL: Old, sorry.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So [that I take as a result]. Norm, please go ahead.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, hi. I'm struggling to understand what "motivating problem" means. That's kind of a new phrase for me. Maybe someone could describe what that is. Does that mean discussion or conclusion? I don't know what it means.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think, Eric, you have your hand up, so I assume you would like to explain that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think, unfortunately, I have to, because I think I'm the one that caused that text to show up there. So I suggested some text. I'm not married to it, but what was there was something about hypothesis that was not actually the proper use of hypothesis. So I just suggested we change it to something that actually made sense. Seems like I missed and I proposed something else that doesn't make sense. So that's bad on me.

But what it looked like the section was trying to capture was why was this work investigated, like why are you doing this. And so maybe it should just be "motivation" or something like that if we want it at all. So that's not to defend the text, it's just to explain it. I'm happy to do whatever the team wants.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, so why don't we just call it "issue to be addressed" instead of "motivating problem?" Because I think this is essentially what it is, right? What do you want to address, what are we trying to solve? Would that be an acceptable edit?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, [inaudible] the workstreams are probably covering a very broad area, so that may be difficult to try and summarize it like a big workstream all at once maybe, but whatever people want. I just want to remind this is the workstream template.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so I can see we're a bit unsure on that one. Naveed, I can see you're typing. If you can, you can also speak.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'd also suggest that we don't need it. I mean we have section one is a topic, section two is a summary, section three is analysis. By the time we get to section four, if you haven't been motivated for the problem, it might be too little too late. So we might also consider yanking it out.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So Naveed is proposing [following] statement as another option. So I think this is really difficult to do on the call, keeping in mind the time. Following proposal, we're already sending out another document for review, so generally, we're fine with the document, I think. [We want to] discuss the motivating problem.

Should we essentially, I think, between Denise, Eric and myself, we should probably add a little header to this document so that everyone is aware what the idea behind it is, and we [inaudible] kind of talk about this, so I propose we come up via e-mail with like one or two sentences to explain what the idea behind this document is, we send it out to the team, then people can make proposals, and hopefully, we'll wrap it up via list in, I don't know, 48 hours. Would this work for everybody? Denise, I see you're typing.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. I've been taking notes in the draft and changing it as people make suggestions, so I'm happy to take the pen, do an updated draft, share it with those who have been offering suggestions, make sure that we're all aligned on an updated draft, and then get an updated draft out to the list to give people a final opportunity to make any changes and then consider it a [guide.] Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you so much, Denise. That is great. So staff, I'm not sure who is typing right now, if you could please add the action item that Denise will

hold the pen, we'll send it out the people who have been vocal today, and as soon as these edits are all in, it will be distributed [so that] people will have some time to reply and to adopt the document. Anything else on the document, or can I move on? I do not see any hands.

So let's go to item number five, which is the DNS SSR workstream discussion. I think KC and Eric, this is essentially your territory, if I'm not mistaken.

KC CLAFFY: KC is here.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Excellent. So I don't mind, KC, you want to start? Eric, do you want to start? I don't know if you have agreed anything.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I don't have a change from last week, but Eric and I went through the future workstream stuff, and we basically tried to fold in things from the future workstream that seemed more closer and more imminent. We also talked to Kerry Ann about it, and Kerry Ann was fine with it and also suggested that maybe some of this process of what goes in the future workstream versus the present workstream is the kind of stuff that might fall out of more or deeper discussions about the things that are in each workstream, not just three.

So I guess we're still waiting for the team to give some feedback on whether they agree with that, have any objections, see anything that we should not have moved to three, or additional things that should be in four. Or can we just kind of declare this done for the moment and move on? Eric, is that about right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that's about right. In fact, I think that's exactly right. I think we just want to make sure that before we start down this path, that everyone's had a chance to look at it so that nobody feels like it's the wrong direction after we've invested some time in it. So we kind of wanted a, "Hey, team, this is what we have. Take a look, and silence will be golden and we can move forward." So this was our sort of touchpoint for that, I think.

KC, don't let me put words in your mind, but I don't think we sort of cracked it open yet and started working on it. We really just wanted to make sure we did this with the proper order of operations.

KC CLAFFY: Correct.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Cool. So if anyone on the call has looked at it and has comments, I think we're definitely all ears, but presuming that other people have lives and other things in their lives besides SSR2, which is hard to imagine, but I can do if I stretch, maybe we can put a TTL on this and say within X hours or X days, people will have spoken up if they have any

EN

concerns, otherwise, the workstream will begin on its merry way. How does that sound?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I cannot see anybody raising their hand. I think it would make sense to kind of send this to list a bit like with the recommendations methodology, even though this is not to say that we have been dragging this as long. So I think you've done a great and quick job. So what's the action item you're proposing?

Do you want to also kind of have a read through, make sure it's all like you want it, and then KC or Eric send an e-mail to the group at large, give a deadline for people t review, and kind of say, "Okay, if you have any issues, raise them, if you're happy with it, let's go ahead?" Is this what you're having in mind?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I kind of want to make better use of the plenary calls than to sort of [emitting] those as a result. I'd like to sort of make the call right now, and maybe we can put [inaudible] sort of a summary item so that anybody that's –

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, because we sort of did what you're saying, Laurin. We did that last week.

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, exactly.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I am aware.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so I think at this point, participation in the calls is important, so someone feels like, "Oh, I wish I'd see an e-mail to that effect," to KC's point, we did do an e-mail. To sort of the broader point, participation is critical. So I'd say [that this] is the call. I'd say, KC, what do you think about us saying like 48-hour TTL? If nobody has sort of emitted sort of a constructive comment that causes us to pause or change things in 48 hours, we move forward.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I can deal with what Laurin is saying. I appreciate what you're saying, Eric, and I would like this to be over, but in the interest of process, I'm also fine if it says you have to make a substantive objection on the list and we can try to hash it out on the list, and if there's something that we can't hash on the list by next Thursday, we can revisit it on the call. Otherwise, we declare it done before then.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. [No, I'm with that.]

KC CLAFFY: Or – we don't discuss it on the call, it's done.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yeah, I agree with that. I just didn't feel like we needed to send an e-mail to sort of have that agreement. I felt like we could have that agreement verbally. And certainly, discussing things on the list is a good idea, I wasn't trying to push back on that. Sorry.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. And I may not be on the call next week. I may be on an airplane. So I will certainly respond to any issues on the list before then.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So just [so we] understand the action items, which is you will send like a final final notification to list that if no one raises anything substantial within the next 48 hours, this thing is adopted, because I cannot see any issue being raised on the call. Is that correct?

KC CLAFFY: I can do that. I'll do that, Laurin. Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Good. Jennifer, or Brenda, I'm not sure, would you add like the action item? But again, this is only informative. If nothing comes in, this will be approved, so this is the kind of summary of this discussion. So we want to approve, we just give another 48 hours for people to check and make sure. Is this fine with everybody? I can see – yeah, I have a [inaudible]

EN

from Naveed and Norm. I also think this is a good idea, so if anything serious is happening, we can do it. Otherwise, no. Good.

Which means point five is dealt with, which brings us to agenda point six ,which is Any Other Business. Does anyone have Any Other Business to raise? Please go ahead [inaudible]. Calling again, Any Other Business. Anyone wants to – oh, yes, Norm, please go ahead.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm just wondering if we received any feedback from anybody. Since we've started to improve our outreach and communication, I just wonder if it's not been reciprocated in any way. But like I haven't seen anything, I wonder if anyone else has.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I have not. Please, anyone else, go ahead. Okay, we have a no from Naveed via chat. Norm, your hand is still up. Do you want to continue on that point, or is that all? Okay, I see no further hands. Again, if anyone [wants] to raise anything regarding Norm's point or Any Other Business, please go ahead. Otherwise –

DENISE MICHEL: Laurin?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yes, Denise.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Since we have a few minutes, I think it'd be useful just to do a status check on the work on SSR1 implementation writeups. [inaudible] give people the chance to raise any questions or issues they have with the write-up, clarify who's holding the pen if there is any confusion on that [sense,] review what our target date is for having the full drafts of our assessments for each recommendation done, kind of stop and check on SSR1.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: And then perhaps people – yes, go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No, sorry, I thought you were done. Please finish.

DENISE MICHEL: Could staff please post in the Adobe chat access to the list that has the facilitators for each of the recommendations and where the drafts are? And I would suggest just for the sake of keeping this top of mind and on track that we do a quick status check on this work at each call. Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you very much, Denise. I'll just read out Norm's comment in case someone cannot see the chat. So he is waiting on some input from Scott on a few items. So the ones I'm dealing with seem doable as they are

with the limitations we all are aware, and our date for finalizing according to workplan is the end of November. I mean finalizing a first drat at the end of November.

So I think it's good you reminded us of that, Denise, and I think we will – Jennifer, if you could, or Brenda, I'm not sure, if you could be so nice to put this issue on the leadership's call agenda so [we will] follow up on that. And any other comments on the SSR1 recommendation [writing?]

I do not see any. Is there Any Other Business, or can we go ahead and confirm the action items? I see no hands, I see nothing in chat, and I do not hear anyone speaking, so I assume we can move to agenda item seven, which is confirming the action items and decision reached, and there are quite a few today. So staff, please go ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. So yeah, they're pretty lengthy today. So action items, one, staff to send a note to the list asking the team to send any personal conflicts or preferences for the January-February face-to-face meeting within 24 hours. Then staff to send collated summary of conflicts to leadership team by the end of this week with the aim of sending a Doodle poll to the team early next week. Locations to include Vancouver, L.A., D.C., Brussels.

Number three, leadership to send a note to the team noting the e-mail thread regarding SSR1 recommendation methodology will be addressed again on next week's plenary call. Those with questions or concerns should be ready to address this agenda item on the call. Staff to recirculate the workplan to the list prompting team members to check

over and raise any objections within 24 hours. Unless objections are raised, the workplan will be considered as adopted, noting the workplan is a living document to be updated as needed.

Once adopted, staff to circulate the work plan to the SO and AC leaders and board on behalf of the SSR review team with the review team in copy. Denise to hold the pen on the updated draft of the workstream report template based on comments from team, and share with the team for final review.

KC to send an FYI email to the team noting the summary of discussions around workstream 3 and 4, shared during call last week, and members should raise any issues on-list, and then the SSR recommendations work to the leadership agenda for discussion.

Is there anything else I missed or any edits to the action items?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I see Denise is typing. I think we wanted to have a 48-hour deadline on the FYI e-mail by KC. Did I kind of make that up in my mind, or did we say that?

KC CLAFFY: She said it. [inaudible] I'm sending an e-mail.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, but are we giving people 48 hours to do that, or [we'll be leaving] it open?

KC CLAFFY: Oh, that's up to you guys. You did say 48 hours, as did Eric, and I said I don't care what the time. You guys figure it out, I don't care what the timeline [is.]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So in the interest of getting things done, I would definitely [like a] deadline on it.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. And you want it to be 48 hours? Okay.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: We can do 72. I'm okay with either option. We can [inaudible] so maybe 72 on that one just to be fair to everybody.

KC CLAFFY: Honestly, guys, if somebody comes in next Tuesday or Wednesday with an objection, we're not going to refuse to deal with it. So my inclination is just to say –

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, okay. [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The spirit of it was mostly like everyone's deadline-driven. If you say, "One day, we're going to look at this," no one will look at it. If you say, "We're going to move on in a day," people say, "Oh, I have a day a look."

KC CLAFFY: Yes. Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So that's all it is.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. [Then shall we just] say by the next call? Because [I see this is] underling correctly, like we're coming up [to a weekend] and maybe people want to read it. So let's do it by the next call. Is everyone happy with that?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I'll do that.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Good. Awesome. And I think that concludes everything we wanted to discuss, so thank you, everybody, for the call today, and we'll speak again next Thursday. Oh, no, Denise is typing. Oh, no, just thanks. Okay, have a great day, everybody. Have a lovely weekend. Bye.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Bye, everyone.

KC CLAFFY: Thanks. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]