EN

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hi, everyone. Should we start with just a quick tour of the table and then we can start chatting.

Do you want to start down that end?

BOBAN KRSIC: Hi, this is Boban Krsic.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

ZARKO KECIC: Zarko Kecic.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Danko Jevtovic.

BECKY BURR: Becky Burr.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

FRANCO CARRASCO: Franco Carrasco.

WENDY PROFIT: Wendy Profit.

LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Naveed bin Rais.

RAMKRISHNA PARIYAR: Ramkrishna.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric Osterweil.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin Weissinger.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Brilliant. So we asked -- we thought that -- The Board thought
                         this would be a good opportunity for us to have a meeting.
                         There is -- there was no specific agenda or intention behind it
                         other than to say it would be good for us to chat and see if we
                         can -- anything we can do to help and how we're getting on.

                         That said, we understand that there is a little bit of concern
                         being expressed about the CCT review and the
                         recommendations, so I thought I'd just kick off by seeing if I can
                         handle that. I don't particularly think it's necessarily going to be
                         useful to spend the whole meeting discussing it, but I'm happy
                         to give it a run for a while.

                         So just to sort of level set for you so you're clear what happened,
                         we got a bunch of recommendations from the CCT review 37, I
                         think. Of those 37 recommendations, we've accepted six and
                         asked org to come back with the costings of them, et cetera. A

bunch, I think about 13, we have referred to the various parts of the community that the recommendations were pointed at because they're the ones that need to discuss them and to deal with them. And in respect to the balance, we've put them into pending, which absolutely does not mean that they're rejected. It means that we've got some work to do to figure out the best way of dealing with them, and we have some particular questions about whether the data that's being recommended to be collected is necessarily the right data. But we have not rejected those recommendations. We just want to see some more work on them.

I think it would be fair to say that perhaps -- not perhaps. I think it would be fair to say that the communication, the way it was communicated, could certainly have been better. We have arranged to have a meeting with the -- to meet in Marrakech with the CCT folks to chat things through with them. But at a bigger -- at a higher level, this actually indicates what is, in effect, a real challenge for all of us, and that is how do we deal with these recommendations when they come in this sense. We have, say, 37 recommendations coming from the CCT review. We've got 100-something recommendations coming -- that come from Work Stream 2. We're going to have a bunch of recommendations from you. We're going to have a bunch of recommendations from ATRT3. And it's simply not feasible for

the Board to, you know, accept and implement all of these recommendations without doing the costings and budgeting and prioritizing them, because otherwise we'll just -- we'll drown. And the days of having, you know, an increasing amount of money that we can just go, "Oh, that's okay; we'll spend that on this," are gone. So we're now in a situation where we have a flat-lining or a leveling budget, and we need to ensure that we handle these things properly. That is not in any way intended to be an opportunity to -- to walk away from recommendations made by the review teams, but we would like -- given that we've acknowledged and accepted that this is an overarching problem for everyone, we'd like your help to try and solve that problem if we can. And we think that this working group -- The CCT one is done; right? We think that this review team can be a really useful review to help us to decide how we do it.

So if we can help you to -- to come back to us with recommendations that are prioritized, and if we can help you to do -- if we can provide you with a bunch of information that helps you at least to do some rough costings -- and I say "we" meaning org -- we can ask org to do that -- at least some rough costings so that we can see what we're talking about when it actually comes to making these things happen, we would be really, really delighted to do that with this team because it's the

running review right now. And if there's a way you can help us, that would be fantastic.

I'll stop there. Happy to chat about it further.

Russ, over to you.

RUSS HOUSELY: So, Chris, I totally understand where you're coming from, but I think that the six months was not handled well. And that is a really important piece that you didn't address at all.

The bylaws basically say at the end of six months you'll either tell us why you didn't tell staff to promptly implement or direct staff to promptly implement. So since you did not direct staff to promptly implement any of them, I can only interpret that as rejection.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I -- I acknowledge that. Our advice is that what we have done -- our advice from ICANN Legal is what we have done complies with the bylaw. Having said that, I also acknowledge that the six months -- that handling the stuff in the timing of the six months, you know, it was left until the -- until the last moment to handle. And I acknowledge that completely. But in respect to complying with the bylaw, the Board's very clear position is that we have

not rejected the recommendations. We have accepted the ones that we've accepted and passed through the ones that have gone off to the community.

Now, that in itself is an interesting -- and again, you know, help required. If you guys are going to be making recommendations that are not within the Board's remit but are within a bit of the community's remit, we need to figure out how to deal with that because what is the status of that recommendation. So if you look at some of the CCT review recommendations, they are "The GNSO should." Well, yeah, but we can't do that. We can't make them do that. So we need to figure that out as well.

So I acknowledge that you're entitled to your reading of the bylaw. Our reading of the bylaw is different. But we're clear that we believe that we have not rejected the recommendations and that -- and we need help to move forwards.

Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So as a follow-up, I haven't heard anyone be upset that the recommendations that were directed to community, that that's what was done. It's the two other clumps, the pending and the six where additional study needs to be done. Because the --

especially the six, the feeling is that's what the six months should have been answering.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just let me say, I agree the six months, that's a very fair point on the six months.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thanks. This is Cherine. I haven't spoken to the group for a while. Before I address that, I would really like to hear directly from the leadership of the SSR2 team what is your current concern? Because I -- I heard it secondhand, that as a result of the CCT RT, all the other review teams are now concerned that this is a new era of the Board; that recommendations are not being taken seriously or not being adopted. So I hear this secondhand. I'd like to hear it directly from you, and then I'll talk about the money side, if that's okay. It would be helpful, if that's all right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So each review team member can speak for themselves, but I would summarize it as looking at the way it was handled threw cold water on our enthusiasm. Like why should we put any time into this.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Sorry; this is Kerry-Ann. I'm a member of the SSR2 Review Team.
                         I think in addition to -- I think just to put it a little different from
                         Russ in terms of just cold water, I think we -- I have been part of
                         the review team from the beginning, and we have been having, I
                         think even with the new members that have joined, has been a
                         very dedicated and --

                         [Child making sounds]

                         Sorry. I was able to keep him down when I was beside him.

                         I think it's been a very highly professional team that has very
                         skilled persons on it.

                         So I think it's not a matter of just cold water on it. It's that based
                         on the recommendations given, I think our concern would be
                         cherry picking. What would be the criteria that would cause the
                         Board to decide to implement or not implement -- as you have
                         said, you've picked six, but why this six and not the other six? I
                         think additionally, this review team has been consistent with
                         every public engagement that we're going to try to ensure that
                         our recommendations are very clear and very specific. So we
                         have been very consistent with our approach. But I think at the
                         end of the day, I think we will be curious, and I'll put the

question back to you, what was driven not just the idea of putting it back as to clarification, et cetera, but what has driven the selection of the six, and why has it not been a selection of all with streamlining implementation? I think that's a different approach. If it is that you need clarification, I think for every other review team that is still working that would be a better message coming from the Board. If it's a matter that, yes, these six are implemented -- implementable immediately, the others cannot be because we need clarification but it is the intent to review and see to the best of our ability how we can implement, I think that is the concern that I picked up, and you could probably clarify.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I ask Becky to -- I think Becky specifically wanted to respond to that.

BECKY BURR: I do because I think that's a very fair question, and I think the document, the scorecard, the response is very long, and you have to get all the way down to the bottom of it.

The six that we accepted and asked for org to tell us -- give us some costing and implementation information I think is pretty

obvious. The ones that we sent to other parts of the community with the authorization and authority to deal with them is also.

The ones that we put in pending, we provided and articulated an explanation for why we put them in pending and most of them were about data collection. Specifically, the recommendation that certain kinds of data be collected to evaluate whether there is an increase in competition and consumer trust.

The Board agreed, clearly agreed, that additional data was necessary. But the Board had serious substantive concerns about whether the data that was being requested would actually deliver the kind of information that would be actionable. That -- The Board and a significant part of the community had those concerns.

So the Board directed org to engage somebody with specific expertise in that area to identify the kinds of data that would, in fact, help get to the bottom of the questions that we wanted, and that -- and to evaluate our ability and the availability of this information and figure out how we could get it.

So there wasn't -- I mean, there was not a rejection in there. There was an affirmative embrace and an affirmative direction to organization to -- to acquire expertise and figure out how to respond to the substantive point of the CCT recommendation that additional information is necessary.

I think that gets lost in the translation, and I think it's really critical for people to understand that we weren't pushing it off. We looked at it and we said, yes, information is needed. We've got to figure out what the right information is, and we dedicated resources to getting it.

So, you know, I know it's not -- I know it's not ideal, and I think that point on the six months and maybe we should have used the six months to do that is totally fair, but I just want to say if you -- I know it's a long document, but the explanation for why we put things in "pending" is actually in the document.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think Denise was next, yeah?

DENISE MICHEL: Responding to your question.

I think -- the resolution was posted when most of us were flying, and we've had a very busy schedule and many of us haven't had the time to look at it. We had discussion with the CCT review members who are here in Kobe, and we haven't had a chance to discuss it as a team.

The Board's commitment to come back in a very purposeful way and take further action on the pending recommendations does

not come through in the resolution. It -- Given the hundred percent Board adoption of every recommendation in a community review before the IANA transition and the stark contrast with what the Board has just done with the CCT review raises broader questions about the Board's overall commitment to this -- what was, in terms of the IANA transition, held up as the community reviews are the most important account -- you know, a very important accountability mechanism. I think there is broader issues that are raised here. But in terms of our work, I think there are many intersections with topics addressed to recommendations in the CCT review and in the SSR2 review.

A Marrakech discussion is a long time away. If the Board has more explicit plans and concerns substantively about these recommendations, it would be much more useful for this review team to understand them now as we're drafting a draft report. If you have more specific request for parameters or intentions with respect to these recommendations that have not been approved, I think it would be really useful for this team to hear them now, as we're drafting now and through May, a draft report to come back to the community and to the Board.

And budgetary considerations were raised I think several times in the Board resolution. Getting more granularity on what that means and what the Board's tests are when it comes to budget concerns I think also would be useful. You know, part of the, I

think, concern about, reading through the resolution, was that, again, before the IANA transition the Board accepted everything. If it was the responsibility of another entity in the organization, the Board accepted the recommendation, noted the responsibility of the other organization within ICANN, directed -- sent it to them, asked them to address it, directed staff to support that activity, asked for regular reports on the progress of that activity. If there were budgetary concerns, the Board previously, before the IANA transition, accepted the recommendation, transferred funds, or they noted it was too expensive and it needed to be included in the next fiscal year budget.

There was a much stronger, clear signal from the Board of a commitment to the recommendation and the community reviews. And I think that has certainly gotten lost, perhaps, for the community in the resolution that was crafted.

Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I know Cherine wants to respond, but he wants to hear everyone first, and that's fine. But I just also would like us at some point to move on to some other things. So I just want to flag that before we go on. So carry on.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is Naveed, a member of SSR2 Review Team, one of the new members that joined after the resumption of the team.

Actually, I have two points to make. One is that I see that what happened with CCT Review Team. There is some part of, I think, the process that did not work in that as I see because there should have been, as I expect, some communication prior to the finalization of report between the Board and the review team, like in terms of draft report and the liaison, that Board liaison that should have been there on the review team.

So I see that if there are, like, 80% of the recommendations at the end that did not get accepted, the process did not actually work as I see this. Because when we don't expect the recommendations to be in the pending state, right?

The second remark is about this budgeting because I see when I read the Board resolution about those CCT review team recommendations, even those who are accepted, it is written on top of that, that even accepted subject to the costing and implementation feasibility kind of that. So it means they are not even accepted in total. And the others, there might be something more than just costing.

So what I see, like, when we made these review teams and all and the next review is expected, like, in five years' time, so we don't -- or we are not obliged to implement all of them right

away. But just putting them pending, like we might have come with something other than pending status. I'm not sure about. That could solve the problem. Like, it could be implemented in first year, second year, third year of the round or anything like that. This is what I want to understand. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Anyone else apart -- before I pass to Cherine to respond? Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: You wanted to -- before I do, you said you had a couple of points?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, no, I wanted to move on and just finish this.

CHERINE CHALABY: Time-wise, what's the priority in terms of this topic versus other topics?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: 20 minutes. Let's get this done and move on.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. So what I heard starting with the comment about cold water and the six months is that what I hear from you is that, say, there is a concern that the Board's commitment to implementing recommendations coming from review, where there's a perception that that commitment has changed post-IANA. That before IANA, you used to get the recommendation. You passed them over. There was no concern about budgetary thing. You just tell them "do it" and then move on. But you have seen now a change in your mind that the Board is taking a different attitude.

There's also a concern about cherry picking on the recommendations and that rather than looking at the whole recommendation as a package, there are -- you are cherry picking and you are evaluating certain things and we don't understand the criteria you use to even evaluate those, right?

There's also concern about even those that you said they're pending, you haven't declared your intent that you're actually going to take this seriously. And when they come back, your intent is actually to accept them once the issues have been resolved, all right?

There's another concern which says, your communication has been terrible, Board. At least you should have in the case of CCT RT, you have sat with the team and talked with them about what

you're about to do as your resolution and see if they agree, don't agree, and how do we go forward and how do we communicate this together. And you kind of caught them by surprise with your decision, rather than have improved the communication with them.

And then there's the last one. You talked to us about budgetary controls, but we don't understand those budgetary controls. And how do we make -- take that into account if we don't even know what you're talking about. So there's a lot of -- there's a lot of stuff there.

So it's not going to be resolved in one meeting and me just saying the right thing. But I can tell you the following. Number one, the Board commitment to accepting recommendation has not changed post the IANA transition. Absolutely has not changed, right?

So it would only be seen in the Board actions and months to come when other reviews come forward, that's for sure.

In terms of the CCT RT and our intent, our intent, hopefully, that ICANN org come back with all the answers and then we move forward with these recommendations, right? And if there's another issue with them, we're going to talk back with the CCT.

And I spoke to Jonathan Zuck about that. And it was -- we did not handle this one in the right way from a communication point of view. But certainly the intent is not to say, "This is a way of getting rid of them." No, it is not. It's just the opposite, right?

In terms of communication, you're absolutely right. I think -- for example, with WS2, we spent an awful amount of time with the team leaders, with the rapporteurs, in ironing out the recommendations. And I was part of the discussions, and I know how much time we spent backwards and forwards, backwards and forwards, in trying to resolve the issues before anything comes to the Board.

In the CCT review, some of that took place because I had a meeting with Jonathan yesterday. He has acknowledged. But at least at the last minute, the triage between the recommendation that passes through, those that are accepted, we should have done a better job of actually getting that agreement, that two-way conversation before the Board's passed a resolution. So that is fully accepted.

And I think we should not repeat this with the recommendation coming. We should engage. There has to be this engagement and this communication. 100% agree with that.

It takes me to the budgetary control. That is -- that is what Chris has mentioned quite rightly, is we are -- from a financial point of

view, we are in a different era. That is absolutely true. For the last ten years, our funding has been going like this, up, on a straight line. And our costs have been going up on a straight line following that, not because we just have to spend because we spend but because the demand from the community and from work and everything that's needed to service the community, as the funding grows and as the scope of ICANN and ICANN grew and our problems became more complex and our environment becomes higher risk, the support for that from an operational point of view increased roughly at the same rate.

But now the funding has plateaued, and we don't see the rise again. So we have to begin to live according to our means. And I have to say that in the past, we did not live according to our means. Or we did but we spent what we got to be absolutely frank. So now the budget is limited.

And I ask you for a second to put yourself in the place of the Board. And if you're there and you see 37 recommendations from CCT review, 112 recommendations from WS2, policies from here, other reviews, and you look at all of this and we have a fiduciary responsibility for the money that is sitting there. What do you do?

Could you blindly say we accept all of this, ICANN org, it's your problem? Spend whatever you have to spend and make it

happen. Or you could say, "Let's find a different way of being more responsible in the way we implement this."

So one way is to phase the implementation by working with the community, so working with you guys and trying to help you, say, Okay, can you give us some prioritization.

And if we were to, for example, do some costing analysis for you and tell you what the budget limitation in a particular year, what would you say your top three or four recommendations that we need to? And how do we -- if you say your three or four recommendations and then CCT say these are the top three or four, five, or ten and WS2, if we add all of those up and say still more than what we can spend in that year, how do we engage the community in making the trade-offs? We don't have the answer now. We don't have the answer now.

We definitely committed -- there's no point to you spending years on recommendations, putting all your effort as volunteers, and then come back and we say no. It is not the intent, and I promise you that is not the intent. If that's the intent, please -- that's not the case. It's just now become an issue of how do prioritize and how to phase the implementation of the recommendations.

And in our letter to the CCT, we had a whole section on phasing implementation. That is a community-wide topic that we need

to engage in and we need to together find a way forward so that we are fair to our volunteers and our reviews and our commitment to implementing the recommendation.

If I'm a community member and I'm spending two or three years on a review and then to be told at the end, you know, it's not affordable, that is not a good way of doing it. That is not a good way of doing it, right?

So we need to address that issue.

Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I want to try and wrap this up, if I can. But on a just sort of lessons-learned basis and to kind of circle back to something I said earlier on, I want to reinforce this, is that we will ask ICANN org -- it's up to you, if you want to accept this. But we will ask ICANN org to provide you with more cost information, more information on cost implications as you do your work, if that's going to be helpful to you.

So if you are heading down a particular path, we think it would be help -- it would be helpful to us if you are prepared to engage in that conversation. So that we can use this review, as I said, in respect to -- to trying to figure out -- or help us to figure out a

pathway through this for all of the reviews. So we'd like that to happen.

I would like to move on at some point and talk about how it's going, is there anything we can do to help.

But, Russ, if you want to respond to anything or have anyone else to respond. Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: So the difficulty -- and this is why we don't have an answer -- is that it's very hard for a review team to engage in a costing until you've got your reviews -- until you know what your recommendation's done. So there comes a point where there is the merit of the recommendation which the Board would then accept, if you see what I mean. And then how do you -- it's prioritization. But you can't prioritize also without giving you some costing information, some -- so give you some something. You need to help us, what else you need to help you prioritize so that you say, "Well, this and this recommendation are critical, and they have got to go first" and then the others can go the following year or something like that.

Tell us what it is you need to help you prioritize, and we will do everything we can to help you on that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: I appreciate this is a difficult construct. At the end of the day, this is an independent community review and the review team will need to submit the recommendations that the team feels are appropriate to the Board; and the Board will ultimately agree or disagree.

It would be useful to have as much insight on implementation and perhaps cost as the Board or staff has the ability to provide. But I'm not sure what the team is to do with the Board saying, it looks like recommendation 5 is going to cost $2 million, so factor that in.

You know, we don't have the Board's overall comprehensive insight into and balancing of the myriad of responsibilities and budget items as well. So -- but really appreciate the ongoing dialogue and how we do this better.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You're absolutely right, Denise. To be clear, there's no silver bullet here, but we can get little bits. So a little bit from here and a little bit from here would be helpful.

On that -- just on that score, one more thing that occurs to me which might -- which you might -- which might help you and goes to your six-months thing, we're told -- we understand that

you've already admit the drafts -- but you have already drafted a number of resolutions -- a number of recommendations in respect to SSR1. I don't know what they are, but you've done that.

So my question is: Would you find it helpful if we asked org to do -- to do an initial look at those recommendations and come back with any sort of suggestions, et cetera, on those recommendations now rather than to help -- you know, to help you inform those? Or would you think that that's just interfering, and we shouldn't do that? Or they shouldn't do that, rather?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Premature would be my response.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We recognize from other aspects like watching the high, medium, low in the CCT recommendations that we need to cull the list. Let's not cost before we make that first task, right? We're just wasting staff time, if we do.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Kerry-Ann again. I think another thing I would probably caution the Board, just from a strictly advisory perspective, is that for other review teams, I think it may be flawed to begin to think in only cost factor because some of the recommendations may not be costable or estimatable, for a better word. I think it would be -- I would just caution the Board in terms of other dialogues with other review teams as they develop that part of the cost conversation could come in during that six-months period when you have to look at the implementation plan and then come back to say, "This will cost X, Y, Z" because some of it may not be feasible to estimate.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely agree.

CHERINE CHALABY: Response? 100% agree. I think the most important thing here is prioritization. And cost is really our responsibility, our fiduciary responsibility. We only mention if this is something that will help you in your prioritization, that's fine. If it's not, it's not.

Because like Denise said, so you tell me this recommendation is 2 million, what do I do with that, right? Does it change my recommendation? No. Will it change my prioritization? Maybe. It depends on the circumstances.

So I think together we're going to figure it out. There's no doubt. We haven't got a silver solution or silver bullet at the moment. But we -- we do recognize the challenge. And we're not going to change our commitment towards the importance and implementing the recommendation. We're just asking the community to work with us, help us with prioritization so that there's no mismanagement of expectation and no letting down of the community and the hard work that the volunteers are putting. That's all we're saying here at this stage.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. One more comment.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is Naveed again.

I just want to understand, like, what the difference between -- I don't mind if the Board at the end of the day says accepted subject to costing or analysis or implementation analysis. That's okay.

But what I would not like to see as a team member who is putting effort, like, a lot of voluntary effort in this, at the end of the day the Board says "pending subject to costing analysis" again. That's the difference between the two, you know? Sort of data collection, okay, that requires costing and analysis and

subject to which domain we are interfering. For example, the SOs, ACs, are we interfering with their work or something like that.

But this, like, accepted -- because at the end of the day, we are independent. We have to be an independent review team. We need to do what we have to do, right? So we are analyzing things subject to what is required rather than what can be implemented.

So we just need to keep that in mind at the end of the day. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Acknowledged.

I do want to give you an opportunity to just give us an overview of how it's going, if there's anything we can do to help. But I also just want to very quickly just pass to Kaveh to address one point.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Chris.

So I just wanted to say, first of all, thank you. I was following the work as I joined most of the calls, and I keep the Board caucus up to date. But especially the past two workshops and upcoming workshop, they collided with RSSAC workshop, Board

workshop, and RIPE meeting. So, unfortunately, I wasn't able to be in the face-to-face. Although, I followed up. Listened to the recordings, read the minutes, and kept the Board up to date. I still think it could have been more effective if I was present physically.

So because of that, I'm going to propose and ask the SSR2 team if it's okay with you, we have Danko, which I will introduce himself just in a minute, as one of the newer Board members. If the team accepts, if we can fulfill the role, both of us. Because in the Board there are multiple commitments. I have my own constituency as well which I -- it's very hard to skip.

So if the review team is happy with that and can accept that, that would be a great help for everybody. Otherwise, we can continue; but I think that will help.

And I don't think you need to decide at the moment if you're not ready. That can come to us. So.

With that, I think it's good, first, if Danko has an opportunity to introduce himself.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you, Kaveh. My name is Danko Jevtovic. I'm a new Board member. Well, this is my first full ICANN meeting in this role. I'm also a member of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

In that role I am involved with the RSSAC in process of the reviews. And also member of the Board Finance Committee. So I think it could be relevant to the things we are discussing now.

And on that point, I'd also like to add that it's not only about money and funding. It's also about budgeting process. I just came from another room where we responded to the community comments about the plans for next budget. And we're also discussing possibility of about two years' budgeting cycles. So some of the things that are -- should be funded and will be funded have to go into all of these cycles.

So as a new Board member, I was not involved and I'm not there -- I was not there during the proposing part and the starting of this group. But I think having managed a CC registry and been originally techie before manager, I could help Kaveh in this role. And I will be more than happy to help. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: To answer your question, I think two things occur to me. One, that we're rushing to get the remaining outstanding information that we've requested from ICANN org. So in prioritizing the responses to that I think would be great.

Then the team has also identified a need for technical writing assistance. So, also, you know, escalating that and getting that

in place would also, I think, as a practical matter be really useful for the team.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Denise.

Russ, do you want to –

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I personally have no objection to an additional Board member as a liaison. I would warn that coming up to speed is not going to be easy, stepping in at this point when we're actually at the point where we're beginning to draft this report. So that's just the state we are in.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Of course. Of course.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you're up for that learning curve, welcome aboard.

[Laughter]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Foolishly he seems to be prepared to do it. So that's kind of good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I would like to echo what Denise just said. The technical report writer, frankly, if we don't get that person on board before our face-to-face is scheduled in May, don't bother.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. I think I understand that.

[Laughter]

I don't think -- I think I get that clear message. Do you have any -- do you guys have any -- anyone that you've got in mind? Is it a particular person –

RUSS HOUSLEY: We have given staff two resumes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excellent. Cool. And your goal is to have them on board by -- obviously before May, before the face-to-face.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ready to dig in.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Ready to do stuff.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So onboard in April.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: All right. Anything else that you want to cover with us or ask us?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, you asked an earlier question which is where we are. I don't know if you watched the engagement, but basically our work is divided into four chunks.

The first chunk is required by the bylaws, is to review SSR1 and whether the implementation of SSR1 had the intended effect. So we are essentially done with that part.

The next chunk is to look at the SSR-related activities of ICANN itself. We've identified seven topics that we're digging into there. And we are beginning to write on that. We have some outstanding questions. We've been told they'll be answered by the end of the month. If that actually happens, then there are no roadblocks to that activity.

The third chunk is what we call the DNS SSR, and we're focusing that on the parts of DNS that fall within the ICANN remit. There's six topics that we're addressing there.

And, again, there's some questions we have that have not yet been answered. Again, the end of -- I think they didn't dare say April 1st, so they said March 31st --

[Laughter]

-- as a response. Again, as long as that actually happens, I think there will be no roadblocks to completing that.

The fourth part is something the bylaws says we may do, and it's not something we're required to do but we want to do. And that is to identify future challenges in the SSR aspects. And that is a little more nebulous, but we have come down to a small group of things that we're continuing to investigate. They have to do with, you know, how was things like the Internet of Things affecting DNS, what does privacy mean in this, and so on.

And so there there's less questions, but there's a couple. We're relying on other sources for the most part for that fourth stream. So that's -- that's the "Reader's Digest" version of where we are.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much. Okay.

Last call around the table for anybody who wants to make a final comment. Okay. Well, all I would say is -- only final remark I would make is if you feel there is any benefit at all in direct

communication with us through the Board liaisons, please take advantage of that. They will come and talk to us and tell us what the messages are and so on and so forth.

We really do -- I want to just underline the fact that we have got some issues here that -- not here, we have some issues with the review stuff that we need to deal with. And if we can use this review to help us do that, we would be most grateful. That is not in any way underestimating the fact that you are incredibly busy, and you have a huge amount of work to do. But we would very much like to see if we can -- we can work closely with you to ensure that when we get your recommendations, everyone is very clear how they're going to be -- to be dealt with.

So, yes?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just one sentence. Naveed here. I think it would be better if we can plan something similar like what we're doing now in Marrakech for example. And meetings like this would help having a better communication and understanding of each other.

So if we can plan that and put that in schedule in advance, that would be great.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Very happy to do that. We'll get it done. Thanks very much, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019