
BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you. Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR2 Review Plenary Call #51 on the 15th of November 2018 at 15:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Ram, Noorul, Alan, Norm, Scott, Zarko, Naveed, Eric, Denise, and Boban. We have an observer joining us today, [Ali Rosa]. Apologies from Russ, Kaveh, and Kerry-Ann. From ICANN Org, Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda.

Today's call is being recorded. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking? Eric, please begin the call. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thank you very much. Hey, everyone. Sorry for the awkward start. So, we've just done roll call. I guess [I see] SOI updates. Are there any SOI updates at this time, statement of interest? Okay, yeah, I didn't recall it being an action item there. So if someone could clear that up, if there is anything that needs to be addressed there. Otherwise, we'll go past it. We can circle back later if I've missed something.

The next substantive agenda item is addressing an e-mail thread – at this point, I think it's at least a month old – that was primarily, as I recall, between Alain and Boban, and maybe KC but I think maybe KC was just involved at the beginning and it kind of went in a different direction. Alain, if you wouldn't mind maybe raising your concerns because I think I've seen a bunch of back and forths on the mailing list and it looks to me like we may have reached a point [inaudible], so could we get a better understanding of what your thoughts are and if

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.

you have any concerns, please? Alain, if you are speaking, we are not hearing you. Maybe you're on mute or something.

Okay. Well, at this point, I think we've reached the point of [inaudible] on e-mail. It sounds like it's not clear what the concerns are, so I think the general sense is that we have otherwise ... I see Alain is typing. Sorry for the lack of background music while we watch the chat room. But I think it's important to put this issue to rest if we can, so that it doesn't linger on the list.

Yeah. Alain, I think that if you could maybe ... Are you having trouble with your audio? Would it be possible for you to speak to some of your concerns? Because I think rather than move past them and leave things standing as though there's an outstanding objection, we'd really like to see if we could come to a clear understanding of what your thoughts are and it's possible that e-mail is just not the right medium to fully convey it. And if you wouldn't mind speaking to it, I think it might be very helpful.

Okay. Well, then I guess we'll sort of take that as abstaining, so we can move forward then. I see typing again.

Great. So yeah, if you don't mind getting a dial-out, that would be great. Maybe we'll move to the next agenda item while that gets sorted out and we can circle back.

So the next agenda item is SSR1 recommendation work progress check and team to surface any issues. So I think there was planned to be an e-mail communication I don't think I saw about tapping people for taking the lead on certain things. So somebody please correct me if I'm wrong

if I just missed that e-mail. But there were a couple items that we were waiting on updates for from sort of the mid-October region. I hadn't heard anything about that, so I presume there aren't any updates but if there are updates, does anybody have any about issues that may have surfaced, resolution to items, close out SSR1 reviews?

This is staging to be a short call today.

DENISE MICHEL:

Hey, Eric. Apologies, I'm not in Adobe Connect. I'm in transit. Would staff be able to send out the list of who's the lead facilitator on each recommendation or a link to the Google Doc?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

We can share a link to the Google Doc in the chat room here so the list of all the people who have signed up to volunteer to each recommendation are in that Google Doc and we have an action item from the leadership call. On Monday, we'll work with you to develop a timeline and share that via e-mail which has not yet been done. However, the Google Doc is live and the volunteers are all listed in that Google Doc and they have been from the beginning. But I'll share a link into the chat room [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

No, Jennifer. That's great. Thank you. But I think what we were referring to was the direction to sort of start nominating people to actually draft our review, like basically each recommendation we discussed, having point people assigned to each recommendation to actually do the

drafting, not just the people that were interested in doing the evaluation. Did that make any progress forward?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

No. So, we haven't done that part yet because I didn't realize that it was going to be different people on that. So, like I said, staff can draft an e-mail and circulate that to the leadership team. The intention is to include a timeline for each of the steps that they'll need to be completed on the SSR1 recommendations text drafting. So, we'll get that to the leadership and then to the Review Team list ahead of the call next week.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Right. That would be great.

DENISE MICHEL:

Could you just use those Google Docs to create a list with the name of a person on the team and the recommendation number and name? And we'll use that list to fill out the status and who's doing what next. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, that would be great. Likely will be that the person drafted to hold the pen for the recommendations will be among those people where some of the recommendations are multiple people signed up to do the review, but certainly, yeah, I think that's a great starting point, and Jennifer, if you could help sort of [thumb] that work and get it to

leadership like you suggested, that would be really helpful because then we can move forward on that. [inaudible] there's I think a couple of them that we are just sort of waiting on, so [inaudible] those.

Okay. So, I think that basically is a progress check for SSR1. Does anybody else have any thoughts or comments or questions or any updates on anything from SSR1 before we move forward?

A thunderous roar of silence. All right, this is going to be the most productive call. Boban, go ahead please.

Boban, if you're speaking, we can't hear you. Maybe you're muted. We are not able to hear you. Okay. Boban's going to dial in for those that are monitoring the chat room. While he dials in, anybody else have any comments or questions? Does anybody know any jokes?

DENISE MICHEL:

Since we have a little bit of dead air, perhaps Jennifer could remind people about the Doodle poll and answer any questions people have. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Oh yeah. In fact, that's a really good idea. It's not on the agenda. That's right. So, the Doodle poll went out. There's been a little bit of discussion about people being able to spill it out or not, but this is a reminder to people that we have the Doodle poll that is in circulation for identifying when in the January/February timeframe we are mostly, if not all, available for face-to-face meetings and where that would be. Has anybody not had a chance to look at that yet? Or has anybody had any

issues with it? I know Kerry-Ann had raised some issues on the list. Anybody else have any problems with that?

And it does give some clarification to Kerry-Ann's questions from staff on the list, so hopefully those were helpful for anybody [inaudible].

Boban, have you been able to connect back in yet? Or Alain, have you been able to connect back in yet?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

I suspect Brenda is connecting with one of the two of them at the moment and [inaudible], so it may be just a minute.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. Well, the next item was basically an item that Boban was going to lead anyway and that would take us to AOB so I think we are kind of necessarily [blocked]. Unless anybody has any separate other comments or questions as sort of like an AOB, pre-AOB, [inaudible] session.

So I think the important takeaway from the meeting so far is that dialing out is a very good option for these calls, just FYI for people.

Well, while we wait, I think it's really unfair that we get notified when the host leaves but we don't get notified when the host arrives.

So does anybody else have any perspective on going all the way back to item number two, Alain's comments or questions? I mean, is anybody else on the team supportive of the perspective that he was espousing

that could maybe speak to it or is it really [inaudible] that Alain has a perspective and it wasn't really shared elsewhere?

BOBAN KRSIC: Hi, I'm back. Can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Boban, yes.

BOBAN KRSIC: Hi. How's it going? Yeah, got it. So just go forward and then I will come back to the topic [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, we're at any of the previous items that we were [hanging] [inaudible] on, so it could be if you had a comment about the SSR1 recommendations or the e-mail thread, or even if you could speak to the ICANN SSR work.

BOBAN KRSIC: Okay. Only one question. Is anyone working on SSR1 and on the work stream one or what's the current status of it? Because I had some concerns about the methodology and I sent mail to the list about it and there was no feedback yet.

And I also talked to Laurin last week about the process itself and how we can move forward or what we have to do, what about the

methodology, is it the right one, what about the outcome of the review of SSR1 recommendations. I have some concerns about it and I'm not sure if it is the right way, and if it's not, how we can correct it because we take a look at it on a high-level approach, I'm not sure at the end if it's the right thing that we had to conclude yet.

So, my question is should we invest more time on investigating something? Because we have no evidence. We have nothing. We have only some references and there are still outstanding some questions. Or should we move forward to the second workstream and say, "Okay, stop it," or write it down and say, "Okay, that's the level and we don't want to go deeper inside and don't want to investigate more until we do it now." So yeah, that's some questions that are in my mind and I would really appreciate if you can help me to understand better how to work on it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

BOBAN KRSIC: And I have echo, echo, echo.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I think that's a very helpful starting point for discussion. So, I see Žarko has his hand raised, so Žarko, go ahead.

Žarko, if you're talking, we are unable to hear you.

BOBAN KRSIC: I think he has the same problem. I think the bridge doesn't work fine, so I think he has also to dial in.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think anybody who has comments be prepared you need to dial in and maybe we can make a note to staff that we're having, again, audio issues with Adobe Connect and maybe there's something we can sort of work on in the background between this and the next call.

BRENDA BREWER: Excuse me. May I just inform you all it is always best to use the dial-in feature that is on the first screen that we start with. Just for audio issues, it does help if you dial in versus using your microphone, so I just wanted to let you all know that. But Alain is on the phone now. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you very much, Brenda. Okay, so I think before I go to Noorul, I just want to channel the chat room. So Naveed typed a comment that – Naveed, feel free to correct me if I'm wrong – I'm just going to [inaudible], but the two cents would be to move away from SSR1 recommendations, and essentially, move on with our work because we may, in my words, not his, reached the point of diminishing returns. And

I see Norm agrees with what Naveed said, maybe not necessarily if I've mischaracterized. Okay, Noorul, please go ahead.

Noorul, I believe you are muted based on the phone with an X over it.

NOORUL AMEEN: Hello. I think Alain is on the line and I think it's his turn. After that, I will make my comment.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Alain, Noorul has deferred to you.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. Can you hear me now?

BOBAN KRŠIĆ: Yes, we can.

ALAIN AINA: Sorry to bring you back. On the SSR1, especially [inaudible] came back, that after all this long thread, and I see here from the leadership that we concern has been not well understood. For the meeting before Barcelona, one agenda item in Barcelona was [inaudible] and I did a follow-up on the e-mail, but it looked like it was not understood. So maybe the [inaudible] be dismissed and that [inaudible] move on. But [inaudible] of issues if not understood by this team, so [inaudible] we can just move on.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. So Noorul, go ahead, please.

NOORUL AMEEN: This is regarding Boban's comment regarding the ICANN SSR1 discussion. I think we had a very productive two-day conference during the LA meeting. We had discussed different aspects of risk management, handling procedures and things like that. So I think it was very useful for the review operations and we have to proceed with that findings I feel. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, that is a very good point. We are definitely trying that. Thank you very much. Žarko?

DENISE MICHEL: Can you put me in the queue, please? And also, could staff let me in to the Adobe Connect room? My request is not being approved. Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh yeah. Žarko, go ahead. Žarko, we are not hearing audio if you are talking.

Still nothing, Žarko. I see you muting and unmuting, but we're not hearing it. Okay, Žarko was Alain. So Denise, since you're next in the queue.

DENISE MICHEL:

Sure, thank you. So, I agree with Naveed's comments. We've been doing a lot of research and due diligence for about a year on these recommendations and the fact that many of them have not been implemented or implemented only partially makes it more challenging to assess the impact. Nevertheless, I think the team collectively has done a reasonable job in doing its research and due diligence and crafting with the understanding that there is imperfect implementation information on many of their recommendations doing our best to provide a high-level assessment. So, I also agree with Naveed and support the direction that we're moving in.

Having said that, there are 28 of them and not all recommendations are created equal. I'm completely open to doing additional research on some of these recommendations if team members feel it's warranted and I would suggest that they continue down the work plan we've laid out for SSR1 implementations, have people do initial write-ups, pull them together, take another look and if there are areas where we feel like more research, more discussion, more input from the team is needed, I feel like we've got the flexibility to do that and this is speaking to Boban's comments. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thank you, Denise. That is very helpful. And I've put myself in the queue and I'm the next one so anyone else, please feel free to jump in. But taking my hat off and speaking as just a team member.

I agree with this and I want to point out having done, I would say, a fair amount of evidence-based research and investigation, that the perfect is always the enemy of the good and what I mean by that is certainly if we were full-time investigators and we had carte blanche to do a deep investigations, we could certainly garner evidence and do very deep digging. But as with most things, we only really get what we're given and we have to basically make assessments based on inputs we're given.

So we've asked for – I just want to refresh everyone's memory and bring people up to speed, new members that weren't there for this – we've asked for how did this work, how did that work, got briefings on it. We've asked follow-up questions and gotten responses to a lot of those. And if what we've gotten isn't enough to do anymore analysis than what we've done, then we have to do the analysis that we can with what we've been given. Our job is not to linger on SSR1 for N years. It's to make progress.

And so I'm sympathetic to a lot of the comments that I've seen on our list and heard on the call today about trying to get deeper understandings of things and to find deeper ground truth. But it's maybe not realistic to expect that as a volunteer review team, we're going to get much more than answers to questions we've been given. So I would propose that we put this to a straw poll of the people on the call now for those that would like to move forward.

Alternately, I would propose – this is me putting my hat back on – that we maybe do, actually I rescind my proposal to try and channel what I think Denise said. If there are recommendations that people feel like we

should linger on, things that maybe we do want to do more digging on or somebody in particular wants to do more digging on, I would propose we call those out specifically. But otherwise, I'd also like to suggest we move forward with the SSR1 write-up so that we can move on to, like Noorul said, we did the ICANN SSR briefing a year ago and it might be nice to go back and finish that up. So I'll finish up the question queue and then maybe circle back for an action on that if it doesn't get [inaudible]. So Žarko, I see you're next in the queue. Go ahead.

ŽARKO KECIĆ: Yeah, I hope you can hear me now.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

ŽARKO KECIĆ: Okay, great. I fully agree with Alain and Boban were writing and I would like to remind you that I mentioned something like that even in Barcelona meeting and I'm reading what Naveed is saying, that we will get more information by going on other sub-topics. That was my suggestion then and that is my suggestion now. And what I would like to raise is that they cannot support SSR1 recommendations review to have so negative tone and to have, I don't know, 60-70% of findings that 60-70% of recommendations were not implemented. That's totally wrong and I believe that we didn't look right things over there.

ICANN should recommendation #1, let me find that somewhere. It says ICANN should publish a single, clear and consistent statement of SSR

agreement and limited technical mission. And we said they didn't do that. They did. Our job is not to judge is that good or not. Our job is not, is that for Pulitzer Prize or not. It is something that is requested and it's done. And I got answer in Botswana that it says single and they have a few revisions of that. Yeah, but a couple recommendations later, it says that statement should be reviewed. So what we are going to do about that?

So I don't agree that we did a good job and I don't agree that the methodology is good and I don't agree that a lot of recommendations were not implemented at all, so I am not supporting this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Thank you, Žarko. Laurin, you're next.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Can everybody hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, good. My big question with this is how are we moving forward? And I think that's what we have to think about. We have done work on the SSR1 recommendations and from my perspective, what I can see is that a lot of it is still in draft mode, right? We haven't actually written it

up and I feel that maybe the good way forward would be to say let's actually look at the document, let's see what we actually want to write.

So for example, Žarko's concerns, I think are valid and it's a question not only of a yes or no, but also a question of language. So there is a big language between us saying, "Oh yeah, this was implemented but we have noticed that X happened and that might not have been so great." This doesn't mean it wasn't implemented, but it means there was something in the implementation that could be done better or that going forward should be addressed if possible, for example. So that's one point on those things.

The second thing, I think what Denise said having the ability when we actually go back in and look at the recommendations and the test to say, "Oh, there is actually something that's in there," or "I'm not completely happy with this," which [inaudible] allowed that and do that. But I see to do that properly, we actually have to look at the record and the actual text rather than just open up everything again. But rather, be like, "Okay, let's check it out. Let's see are we happy with the amount of information given? Is there something we need to get to?" And likewise, I think by moving also into other directions we might be able to fill in some of the blanks as well.

So, my main question is how are we moving forward on this, addressing the concerns but also not kind of fighting back completely and throwing a lot of stuff we've done out the window?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Thank you, Laurin. Naveed, you're next.

Naveed, it looks like you might be muted. We are still not hearing you, Naveed. Did you by any chance not dial out? Naveed, I think you might be having audio [inaudible]. Feel free to put your name back on the queue. Denise, you're next.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks, Eric, and thanks, all, for this robust discussion. I think it's really useful.

So I think it's useful to separate the methodology from the initial input and conclusion that reflected in the current document. We may well as a team disagree what's initially written in the Google Doc in terms of the conclusion of the assessment and there's a fair amount of objectivity involved in assessing these fairly high level recommendations, many of which have not been fully implemented: what we say, how we say it, how we assess it open broadly to a lot of interpretation.

And I think as Laurin said, having a more fulsome write-up and then going through them as a team and working through disagreements of how we ultimately assess that and whether we say it's implemented or not implemented is going to be an important part of our work. But I think at this point, for me, it's really important that we understand and hopefully most of us agree on the general methodology.

Would Žarko be able to expand on his comment that he does not like the methodology that's being used, and specifically, do you have suggestions of specific things that you would like the team to consider

doing in addition or differently as we move forward on the SSR1 work?
Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you, Denise. Boban, you're next.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah, thank you. Well, what one question could make [inaudible]. So I would like to jump in and I think Laurin's idea is not the [inaudible]. So I would also propose to start initially to write up the document, but we should also describe at the beginning what were the circumstances here so that it was only a high-level approach, that we have not a lot of information because when you ask me from [your] perspective, my stomach says, "Okay, there is not enough information or evidence to say that's the right conclusion to check the requirement of the fulfillment of the recommendation."

So I think we need more staff at one or the other recommendations, so I think we will see it at the end when we start to write the report for work stream one that there are, I'm sure, five, six, seven, eight recommendations where we need more information to say at the end, "Okay, that's our conclusion." So, I'm okay with this approach.

I would also say regarding the timeline itself, let's start with the report, write it down, and I'm okay with the methodology as I've said, there are not a lot of information to give a qualitative approach to be sure that's the right answer or the right conclusion at the end. That's my concern in this.

So, I think one or the other recommendation, it would be good if you have more information regarding some evidences to come to the conclusion. Yeah, that's my point but I think we should start to write the report and then we will see what happens at the end.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you, Boban. So, I'm next and so I'm going to cut the mic lines off after Naveed. I'm sorry, after Alain who just jumped in, so please no more hands after that because I'd like to make some progress as we're starting to wind down on time. And I will defer to Naveed because he made it into the queue but he was ahead, so Naveed, go ahead please. But my name is the last one in current the queue, so please [inaudible].

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: Hello, can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay, so actually, a couple of warnings. I think there is a kind of misunderstanding between our members and we are not going anywhere with this. Some of us are questioning the methodology that we are taking, some of us are doing the same for the understanding that we are getting. That's all right. But all the comments that I hear so far are very generic kind of things and they can be applied even if we have another three months. Still those comments can be valid. If we are

saying that somebody is not investigating enough or not having deep enough, there's never an answer to this.

And specifically, as I see this, we have had some questions that I am assuming were agreed upon. We put this to the staff and we get their answer for some of them and for some of them, they get delayed. Based on that, what information was provided was and what we get as the presentation of the implementation of SSR, we made a view of whether something was implemented partially, or fully, or not at all.

So, I think that is fair enough at the end of the day if you make something like that. We are not going to make another one year of research into what was implemented and what was not in detail, we might be wrong. That's why I said in the process of investigating more [work stream] we might find that what observation we had, for example, recommendation one might not be valid and we correct that at that point so there's no point of hanging over this issue again, time and again.

On the other hand, if we still think this matter has to be resolved here and now, then we can have a call for volunteers for the members and can make a small team who wants to have more investigation on the issue, and the rest of us can move on with the other work team. So this is what I had to say. My audio was somehow not working, so I thought I should connect and make my point clear. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yes, that was very helpful, Naveed. Thank you. Laurin, go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, this is just a quick coming back to one of Boban's comments and I think what we need to do with these recommendations, one of the top things in my eyes is to exactly speak to the issues we had in affecting them considering our resources and how this will feed into our own recommendations. I think that's a huge part of what we have to do and that's really important. That's essentially everything I wanted [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thank you, Lauren. Alain, go ahead, please.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. I think that we have to [inaudible] to ourselves. I see this [inaudible]. I don't agree with this [particular view] or I agree with this particular view but I don't agree with this. So I think, please, let [inaudible] report. We are here to do a review and one important thing when you do a review is to have a [inaudible] will not only apply for SSR1 review, all the other [inaudible] are also going to do a review. We need to apply methodology so let me [inaudible] ourselves because when we [inaudible] should not be only focusing on SSR1. If you are willing to do the other workstream, we have to agree on the methodology. We have to agree on the methodology. We have to agree on the [inaudible]. We have to agree on the flow of the [inaudible] before we can make a judgment. This is the work we are supposed to do is to get access to data [inaudible] and make a judgment [inaudible]. So [inaudible].

Allow me to go back. [inaudible] staff. Okay. We have the new people. We have staff, etc. So I think for me, one of the things [inaudible] was that we didn't discuss and say, "Okay, now that we [inaudible], what is going to be now our methodology or how we are going to approach? Are we speaking to the [inaudible] sub-team or how are we now [inaudible]?" From this, we just keep going and then we decided to go with some questions and [inaudible] if they say yes or no. [inaudible] we have never had proper discussions from these [inaudible] for SSR1, for Internet SSR, for this [inaudible] methodology. We have never done that, for example. So, I think, for me [inaudible] but it will cut off when we move on to the other workstream.

So please, I call on the leadership to really help us. We must agree on the methodology. We must agree on [inaudible]. We must agree on the possibility of who is [getting] what, etc. Otherwise, the way it's done now, [inaudible] to really help us. We start work [inaudible]. We find out [inaudible], so please, please, please. [inaudible] , I may be wrong but I think let's do the right thing at the right time. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. Thanks, Alain. So, I cut the mic lines off, so I guess I had time to make these comments and now it seems like maybe I'm reacting to the last conversation but it's just a really good segue. I do recall this team spending a lot of time discussing methodology. I remember we had a document that we all iterated over. I remember there was a lot of back and forth. I don't recall there being this much consternation over it. That's fine. Certainly, people can develop opinions over time and raise

them. I think it might not be completely genuine to say that we haven't discussed the methodology because we actually have artifacts.

While Alain was speaking, I was actually trying to dig through the e-mail to find out when the dates were that we actually discussed this, and sadly, I was not able to do that in parallel but I believe it was before October. But nevertheless, there was a lot of back and forth. There was a Google Document and, in fact, I remember providing some commentaries myself and I believe KC was heavily involved because we had a lot of discussions about scientific methodology then.

So, I'm sensing that people may want to reanalyze the methodology that we used for SSR1, but I'm also sensing that some people have a sense of moving forward.

I want to circle back to something that I heard Naveed say, I believe – and Naveed, please don't let me put words in your mouth. I think this is what you said but if I mischaracterize you, please say so. I believe one of Naveed's observations was that in moving forward with the other work streams, we might uncover information that is informative to our review of SSR1 and I think that may not be an objective. It may just be a [inaudible], and certainly, I think we have reached the point of diminishing returns on this discussion.

So, I would like to put a proposal for the team right now to make a decision. How many people would agree with moving forward with another workstream, tabling this one so that one, in parallel, we can settle the methodology again? So, anybody that has specific concerns about the methodology which is part of a published document, please

raise them specifically on the list while we move forward with the ICANN SSR workstream.

And two, any outstanding questions, as I recall, we did go through all of the SSR1 recommendations together and so concerns about a finding for, say, recommendation one might have been easier to ingest at the time when we reviewed it as a team. But nevertheless, maybe if people have specific concerns about our findings while we move forward with the next work stream, maybe we can put it to the team for those of us that have concerns about various either methodology or recommendation language, that we raise that on the list.

And I'm sort of looking at the chat room which is now going faster than I can read. Let's see. Those are changing, do this as a team, already said. Okay, so there's different views about how to do this but I'd like to put forward a request using the Adobe Connect room's agree/disagree button which is right next to where you raise your hand.

I'd like to see how many people would agree with setting up people on the list to discuss methodology again and to discuss specific concerns they have with anything that's been put down for recommendations in SSR1 while we move forward with ICANN SSR work and then we can circle back to SSR1 later, either next after ICANN SSR or at the end or before the future, we can discuss that later, but basically moving forward and coming back to this later and that would be a clear direction, anybody with any concerns, to make those concerns clear to people on the list and have a substantive discussion. Can I get support or non-support for that, please? Or would someone like to suggest a different approach? I see Naveed, your hand is up, so go ahead.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Actually, I was just thinking and I mentioned this in my last comment. Why don't we set up a small group of two or three people who seem to have a better understanding than us of the problem that they see with this methodology or whatever approach that we are taking and they can suggest to us or propose to the group what needs to be done while we move ahead with the other workstream so that can also be done if somebody thinks that, again as you said, it should be the co-create one that can be realized. But actually, with the resources that we have, I would not want to see that the outcome is the outcome of the previous SSR workstream, that we need to outsource this. So that I would not support anyway.

But if somebody has a group of people among us and not all of us are on today's call, so if they can form a sub-group or sub-team suggesting to us what needs to be done exactly in a more concrete way, I would welcome that. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thank you, Naveed. Okay, so now I see in the chat room, Žarko, you said that you don't think there is a methodology. Is that because you can't find the link to the document or you don't think the methodology is substantively a methodology? I see Žarko is typing back. You can also talk if you want.

There is no document. Okay. I guess I thought there was one. Perhaps I'm wrong. Does anybody else remember discussing the methodology

SSR1 recommendations document or is that just a figment of my imagination?

ALAIN AINA: Eric [inaudible]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, go ahead. Denise, can you hold on? I think Alain wants to talk.

ALAIN AINA: Can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Okay, so I think, as I said, I call on the leadership to help us really look at it because the way it is going and active [inaudible] push in to people, I will not suggest we go there. So if you think that we have the issue to address, I would suggest that we have that [inaudible] form. Read that right now. You type, you [inaudible] this and the way it's going, I don't think this is going to be productive.

And then back to methodology and I said earlier, there has been a review. Your review will be accepted or not based on methodology so we need to have methodology for the review [inaudible]. Then for each [inaudible] substream, we may now have specific methodology there.

So I think the first thing we are supposed to do is first we agree on the workstream work to be done here [inaudible] is to have to say, "Okay, following our general methodology, this is how we apply this methodology for substream 1. This is how we apply for substream 2..." Then we will be [covering], generate methodology to apply for our review and we all agree this is what we are going to do and we stay on scope for our methodology. Then for each workstream, we may now adapt and apply the methodology for each workstream. I think this is how we [inaudible] work something that [inaudible] that let's not only [inaudible] SSR1. The methodology and [inaudible] issue will come when you move the next work item because how are we going to [inaudible], how are we going to conduct the work there too?

So please, I don't know if I'm making any sense here but it may be other people may [inaudible] my point, which I'm not clear enough.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So I'm going to jump in because we only have a couple minutes left. The methodology for SSR1 is in the document. The document that we're assessing in actually contains the methodology that we discussed as a template and then we applied it, so if you look at Recommendation 1 and then you look at the text below it and then you look at the sections below that, did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted? Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why? That was our methodology. We put it into the document, so every one of these recommendations is represented by our methodology and this is what we adjudicated ourselves on the call.

And in regards to the comment about we should have one methodology for all of our workstreams, I think that that's false logic. All of our workstreams are doing different work. The methodologies we would use to assess them would necessarily be different. If we had a generic methodology, it probably wouldn't apply, not to everything. Or it would be so diffuse that it wouldn't actually have any teeth for the thing that it was actually being used for.

So, in fact, when you do a methodology, it needs to be task specific. So different SSR workstreams are going to require different methodologies. Alain, I see your hand is up. We have one minute left. If you would like to go really quickly, I think we can but your comment about the leadership taking this one, yes, the leadership will take this on and we will circle back with the team after we've had a chance to discuss.

So Alain, last words.

ALAIN AINA:

Yes, thank you for giving me the chance to [inaudible]. I guess I just said it and what I said and you did repeat what I said, but you are putting like I was wrong. I said for this review, we need to have a global methodology for the review.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

And I disagreed with that.

ALAIN AINA:

For each workstream, then the thing working [inaudible] to follow the guideline of this [inaudible] to develop the specific approach and methodology for how they will do the work, I think they will [inaudible] something. But I just want to make sure that we are going to agree and elaborate on people that are trying to push the [right idea] so I think we agree we need a common approach for the review.

Then for each work, [inaudible] different but we need to have [inaudible] to develop a methodology. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. So we're out of time and I think this will be something we can pick up on the list to discuss, methodologies and how they're applied and how they're constructed. It sounds like great fodder and as you suggested, Alain, I suspect the leadership team will have a lot to discuss about this.

Staff, I know that we're over time and I actually run to another meeting so if you'd like to summarize the action items, if you could do it quickly, that would be awesome. I'm sorry to put you under the gun like that.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Eric. The action items I captured, just two of them. The first one, staff to work with the leadership to outline next steps and a timeline for the SSR1 recommendations text in a Google Doc, and add on a [inaudible] text field to the Google Doc. And the second one probably comes first, leadership to discuss SSR1 methodology concerns voiced by the Review Team members today and circle back to the team.

So please, I'll share these via the e-mail and feel free to share any other additional action items on the list as well. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think we also need an action item. Those who are suggesting changes to the SSR1 methodology, there are people who were not on this conference call. Some lines were hard to hear. Can we please have an action item that people who would like to see changes in the methodology post those specific changes to the e-mail list to help us as a team consider and come to an agreement on that? That would be really helpful. I'm not quite clear in my mind everything we need to consider and what some team members would like us to do.

And then also, Jennifer, could you take an action item and just remind people of the deadline on the Doodle poll so we can move forward with choosing our next meeting time and location? Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Okay, got it. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

All right, everyone. I look forward to seeing a healthy discussion on the list. Talk to you soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]