

KOBE – SSR2 Review Team F2F Meet Day 1 [C]  
Friday, March 08, 2019 – 09:00 to 17:00 JST  
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

JENNIFER BRYCE: Good morning everyone, welcome to Day 1 of the SSR2 Face to Face Meeting at ICANN64 in Kobe. Today is the 8th of March. My name is Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Organization. This meeting is being recorded, please remember to your name for the record before speaking and I will pass it over to my right, if you could just say your name into the microphone, before we get started, thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN Org.

ŽARKO KECIC: Žarko Kecic, .RS

RAM KRISHNA: Good morning, this is Ram Krishna.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

---

*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: Laurin Weissinger.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks everybody. And please note that Steve Conte, ICANN Organization is on the Adobe Connect. And I'll pass it over to you, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, as we spoke last on our last plenary call, the first thing we're going to do today is the slides. So, Jennifer sent out a set of straw man slides, if she can put them up. My concern is that we have a couple engagement sessions that are only 15 minute, and I think there are too many slides for a 15-minute session. So, we need to figure out what our core message is and keep it short, and then we can have as many backup slides as we want for people to go through at their own leisure. But that's my objective for the first thing this morning. So everyone can pull

---

those up and we can figure out what we want, what core messages we want to share in these engagement sessions.

JENNIFER BRYCE: So I just dropped the link, I put these in Google Slides while we edit them, and I dropped the link into the Adobe Connect, so you should all have access and editing rights, as well. Since we love Google Docs so much. [AUDIO BREAK]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm seeing the meeting has not started yet. What are others seeing?

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, we're using, it's the ICANN64 link, Emerald. It should be...

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ah, okay. [AUDIO BREAK]

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, this is Jennifer, I just wanted to check if Kerry-Ann, you're on the line and if you can hear us, and if you're able to speak, please let us know. Thanks.

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi Jen, it's Kerry. I can hear, I can speak, I kept checking with Steve if you guys were still there, but I'm here for now.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Great, hi, we can hear you, thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hi Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hello. [AUDIO BREAK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So is the purpose of the sessions to just inform people and update them? Or is it to solicit any type of feedback?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's to update them and reinforce that we always encourage feedback, and by updated them, hopefully they'll have more context in what we're doing, so it will further encourage any feedback should they want to contribute to anything.

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:           Okay, no, I meant like it's not to have a dialogue at these sessions, it's just to say here's the status, if you want to talk to us, come talk to us?

RUSS HOUSLEY:               Yes, because at only 15 minutes, we're not going to have a dialogue, right? Some of them are that short. [AUDIO BREAK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         Jennifer did we have any, did anyone on the list provide any edits or anything? Thanks, still catching up on my email. [AUDIO BREAK]

RUSS HOUSLEY:               So, this is Russ. Looking through these slides, my thought is that we want to share that there are four Workstreams that were basically done with the SSR1 and that the other ones are in progress, and what topics they are. I think if we cover anymore than that, we'll be out of 15 minutes. What do others think?

DENISE MICHEL:               I agree.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: That was Denise. [AUDIO BREAK]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin. Is there one more slide we might be able to reasonably remove just so we have a bit more leeway?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know what you mean, what kind of leeway are you trying to get in?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So essentially if it's for example look at Slide 6 the Workstream 2 Scope Items. There is so much text on there, if we have a 15-minute session, you know, we might want to cut some this down even more. No, sorry, it's Slide 6, my apologies.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you want it to look more like Slide 7, but with seven bullets.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Exactly, yes. Just make it even more streamlined.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you think Bullets 1, 2, and 3 on Slide 6 are fine, and then make 4 through 7?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Absolutely.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: And then just make the rest shorter, so it's more, also make it a bit bigger so people can actually read it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Jennifer, do you understand what he wants?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I can just do it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, take a whack at it, then, I guess that's why we put it in a Google Doc.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: If you just worry about the content, and then at the end of the day I can format and all that.

ŽARKO KECIC: This is Žarko. I have question, do we have to have our slides with those details? It is much easier to explain what you're going to do in Workstreams not to have details right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I was thinking that we just want to give them -- in Barcelona we got a lot of questions about what's included in DNS-SSR, what's included in ICANN-SSR, when we did the engagements there. So I was thinking, let's answer that question. The problem is where do you stop, right? How much detail do you give, because even, oh, well, what's in business continuity management? All of these, you know, you could drill deeper on. But that was my idea, was to answer that question, because we were asked it in Barcelona.

ŽARKO KECIC: Okay, I don't have anything against the fact that we have that on slide, but during a presentation, during engagement sessions, I wouldn't go in details, I would just say okay, Workstream 2 is



---

focused on ICANN organization security issues, and leave anybody to read this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, so don't read every bullet, just say these are the topics, you can see for yourself whether they focus on ICANN's key SSR activities.

ŽARKO KECIC: Another reason why I'm saying why we are going that deep is that we should state somewhere that maybe we'll have some other issues within the Workstreams.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We're using these slides for a few different meetings right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, we're also going to use them to kick off the discussion with the Board on Wednesday, the "Board Caucus." [AUDIO BREAK]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin, just a quick question. The coloring, does that mean anything or is that just for style? So, this one has coloring,

---

the other one doesn't. No, I just wanted to know if there was like some idea behind it that I don't get. [AUDIO BREAK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do you want to add something just saying what was done for the SSR1 review, like something that is similar.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's on Slide 4, first bullet.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, I kind of meant in the same vein as the other slides that say that's going to be done, to do the work that has been done, say like 28 recommendations have been reviewed, check mark. The flow of this leaves me with the impression that all the work has yet to be done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see, so if we moved Slide 4 after Slide 5, where, here is our work, then we say, we're done with SSR1, and then we say, we're still working on the other three.

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Also, should we get someone's favorite topic to show up there and they ask a question, like, can you tell us a bit more about business continuity management, which is a rat hole, what are we going to say? Please take that off line?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we'll say please send us email or come talk to us, right? We'll have plenty of time in breakout rooms, and hopefully we'll know that soon, and we also will have Thursday morning. My experience from Barcelona was we're going to get blank looks. We need to give them the opportunity, but I'm not expecting a mad rush to come talk to us. We had one visitor in the whole meeting in Barcelona.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I suspect that there would be a question raised on security incident management and response, to the fact, is that ICANN only, or does that include the broader, the main registries and registrars.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, but we're dealing with it in the ICANN-SSR, so it's not in the DNS-SSR. Like, I know there was a problem found with the

---

registrar website for registering for the meeting, that's the kind of thing we're talking about.

DENISE MICHEL:

This is Denise. I find some of the Workstream 4 bullets to be too specific, and so I'm suggesting some edits that just provide a little more latitude in describing what the team is looking at, given that we have especially a fair amount of work in that future Workstream ahead of us. So, for example, instead of saying a concentration of back end operators for new gTLDs, which is a very specific thing, give them something about SSR challenges involved in back end gTLD operations. So, if the group suggests that we look at something that's related but not specifically about concentration of back end operators, it will be in line with what we're publically discussing. Is that okay?  
[AUDIO BREAK]

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, I sense we're getting to the diminishing returns. Is there anything else anyone wants to raise? I think we can come up with a way to present as little or as much detail as the time allows with this flow. Looking around the room...

---

DENISE MICHEL: This may be a question, it's better addressed when Eric is here, it seems to me that back end gTLD operations are wholly within ICANN and should be addressed as part of the ICANN-SSR issues rather than Workstream 4. But I suspect there is some rationale here that I'm not quite understanding. [AUDIO BREAK]

DENISE MICHEL: So, ICANN's got contracts, both global policies and specific contracts with every single gTLD registry operator and accredited registrar that is solidly within its remit, and there are many things that ICANN has either sole or joint control over when it comes to back end operations. So, I guess the way I'm thinking about it is that if we're seeing evolving or future threats, that's something that should be addressed as part of ICANN-SSR.

MALE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I agree with you but I think maybe we've lost some wording around that. I remember the discussion we had in LA on that, it was the consolidation of back end registry operations was the topic. And that point is not on here. So, I'm thinking that somehow we would replace it with these words.

---

DENISE MICHEL: And so why wouldn't consolidation be addressed as part of ICANN-SSR?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think from LA, my memory of this discussion was this is a trend that we're observing happening and this is the place where if we think ICANN should do anything to address that trend we're noticing, it is a future thing, it's not something they're doing today.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, and I guess that's where perhaps the gray area is in our Workstreams, because I guess the way I'm thinking about it is that ICANN-SSR should address current and evolving threats and challenges in the areas we're addressing in that Workstream. But simply because it's like a future concern, it shouldn't be addressed there, but I think I'm missing something.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, great point. So, some of the future concerns are also current and maybe it's the word "future" that's throwing us off. So it's current and emerging threats, no? Am I getting way off topic here?

---

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    Actually, we did say that when we wrote the report, we were going to call it "emerging challenges," instead of "future challenges." I remember we said that, but of course we're not going to read in the Workstream that's like a billion Wiki edits. But I remember that's what we said we wanted to do to properly characterize it in the report.

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands in the Adobe Connect, and I'm not seeing anyone in the room, so, Jennifer would you please finalize these and we can move on.

JENNIFER BRYCE:                Sure, I can do that. So, just to confirm, I don't need to make any content changes, just formatting, okay, thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:                So, I think just in terms of our narrative, I think one of the ways I'm looking at these slides is particularly in Workstream 3 and Workstream 4, is that we're very much in the work stage, and as we process all of the information and data we have and have further discussions, there may be an occasion where we'll drop a topic that's listed here, or add to this topic, or refine something, my suggestion for people to consider and comment on is to, as

---

we talk about these Workstreams, tell people that there is a work in progress elements particularly to some of these Workstreams, where as our work progresses we may drop an emphasis or add a subtopic. What do you people think?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, my presentation style would be to say these are the topics we're investigating, there may be findings to share, there may not be recommendations on every one, we don't know yet.  
[AUDIO BREAK]

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, this is Kerry. I agree with Russ in terms of the approach.

STEVE CONTE: So, I'm going to put myself in the position of the audience again. So, is the message then if you have some input for this group, get it in pronto? Because we're starting the drafting. So if that's the case, which I think it is, we should actually explicitly say that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can do that. And we'll have that, you know, your input is requested slide at the tail, where I could make that point. In fact, that's probably the only thing I'll say on that slide. Okay,



---

the next topic, we'll use these same slides to open the Board Caucus session on Wednesday. What other points do we want to make, and do we need additional slides for that?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, it's Jennifer. Just to say, KC has joined us in the Adobe Connect room, as well.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi KC.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hi KC.

STEVE CONTE: Has everyone seen the Board's resolution on the CCT Review?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, I just heard about that when we were getting coffee before meeting. I have not, so tell us about it.

STEVE CONTE: Well, I can't tell you a lot about it, because I also read it during my travels, and it's very difficult to read. First of all, it's very

---

long, so I think we need to figure out what exactly it is saying. But the fact that it was long and very hard to understand, it kind of tells me it's important we figure out what exactly it's saying. Resolutions are usually very clear and concise, and you know exactly what the resolution is. I couldn't even tell.

DENISE MICHEL: Not a good sign.

STEVE CONTE: So, there's two parts to that. One, is there something in there that should raise concerns to the community or to us? The other part is was there somewhat about how the recommendations were written and presented that resulted in this? Then we should learn from that and avoid it.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. I'm sure that the CCT Review members in particular are carefully examining the Board resolution and several of them are here in Kobe, so later in the week it might be useful to have a quick rendezvous with a few of those and make sure that we fully understand their perspective on the Board resolution and its implications for our work.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great, so that actually makes a great deal of sense. They're the experts and they're here. Can we arrange to have them talk to us?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm happy to take lead and see if we can make that happen, if you're okay with it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, tomorrow any time they're free, we can squeeze them in, or we can use one of the breakout rooms if Jennifer gets any on Monday. Probably not during the opening ceremony, but otherwise. Norm, can you send that to the list? Or put a link in the Adobe Chat.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise, while there is a lull, we had some side conversations about this so I'll sort of put it out there for the rest of the team. There has been a lot of discussion in the press and ICANN's done a blog on the latest series of what they're calling DNS or DNS infrastructure hijacking. Since we've got security staff in town and since there are several connections to some of the issues that we're dealing with on the team, I thought it would be good to arrange, it might need to be closed door

---

update from a couple of the experts here on the ground as to what has happened and what's happening with that attack. Unless there are objections, I'm happy to work with staff to try and make arrangements for that. We could either do it as part of the DNS Workstream, or just open it up to the whole team, if they're interested.

ŽARKO KECIC:

I have a question about that because I read a couple articles, but I don't understand why that issue is not now, and not five years ago, ten years ago, because that is very known and when I am talking about security of registry I'm saying that registrars are the weakest point when we talk about security. And I had presentation in Panama about security of our registry system and how we are solving that, but I don't understand why it's hot now.

DENISE MICHEL:

Hi Žarko, this is Denise. I agree with you, it's not as if registry locks in 2-factor authentication and DNS-SEC is anything new, in fact it has been something we have been talking about for well over a decade. I suspect it's hot right now, because multiple US federal agencies were hacked as part of this, and it's ongoing. But Norm is one of the experts in this area and I will defer to him

---

as to the import of this particular attack, but it just served as a reminder for me as to ICANN's role currently, potential role, are there things that the review team will want to address as part of the registrar/registry or abuse-related investigations and findings that we're developing. So it's more that instead of hey this is something new and different and we should learn about it.

STEVE CONTE:

Well, I think it's a great lesson. There is a perception from a lot of people that DNSX saves the world for DNS. Maybe the technical people don't have that, but there's a lot of nontechnical people that have that perception, and I think that the incident really illustrated the fact that is not the case. So, if your account is hacked, you own the account, period.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

This is Laurin. I think this might also be an interesting basis for recommendation regarding the promotion of certain security baselines for relevant products, for example.

ŽARKO KECIC:

Yeah, but SSAC I'll find out which SSAC document explains that far away 10 years ago, SSAC issues that document. So that's

---

something which is well known and it will go on. DNSSEC can save us on DNS level, but when we go to registrar hack and change of data in registry database, that's different issue and DNSSEC doesn't have to do anything with that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, absolutely, Žarko. My idea is of us more going into direction of thinking about if we can recommend something in the direction where this might help. So, saying ICANN should promote things, like, let's just say, two factor authentication, stuff like that, where these measures might actually help. So using this as a basis for recommendation. It doesn't have to happen, but you know, that's more my thing, not DNSSEC, I mean we all know it, it's not that relevant here.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, but my point on this issue is how far ICANN can go. ICANN can issue security of registry because they have direct agreement. ICANN can issue some security measures by ICANN registrars, whatever is the term, I cannot recall that right now. But registries do have a lot of non-ICANN approved registrars which are not following security rules. And that's the problem. We have a law, but I have registrars which was weak in security

---

and they don't implement anything except if something happened to them.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I don't agree they can just promote. If you look at the DNSSEC, DNSSEC was an absolute requirement for new gTLD, you had no choice in the matter. If you were a registry you must implement DNSSEC, use that same logic for a registrar. When you do a new registrar agreement you must implement these following features. So I think they can do more than promote. And DNSSEC is mathematical speak, it's necessary, but it's not a sufficient condition, there's other conditions that have to be there before DNS is secure.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yes, Laurin, but to me, high jacking doesn't have to do anything with DNSSEC. If you change record in database and then you take that record and sign it with DNSSEC, that's correct record.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm agreeing with you, I'm not disagreeing, I'm agreeing.

---

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise, I think, yeah, we're definitely in agreement, it's not going to stop in the middle of attack and there's many other things, but I think one of the things that may be worthwhile for this time I think to look at is there has been almost a decade of really intensive resource and outreach and ICANN's security focus here has been adoption of DNSSEC, which still, after almost 10 years, hovers at 16-18%.

There are other things that ICANN can be doing, can be promoting, or not, I don't want to jump to findings, but I think it's a useful discussion for this team to have to take a step back, look at the landscape, and look at whether we want to recommend any additional of different priorities, activities, that type of thing, both at the registrar/registry or ICANN level, I think is how I'm looking at this.

ŽARKO KECIC: Okay, we are again speaking about two different things. DNSSEC is one thing. When we come to DNSSEC, I'm running registry which is not DNSSEC signed yet. If you check, actually I can give you an address so you can check that. We are signing our TLD zones for years and because our Board wants to decide on everything, we still do not have, and I hope in the next month we'll have agreement to put these records into root zone. Why they are hesitating is the fact that we have less than 15% of DNS



---

resolvers verifying DNSSEC. So when we are talking about DNSSEC, that's the fact. And on the other hand, we have DNS server, TLS proposal, and RFC and DNS server, HTTPS, and all other critical issues with DNS and I really don't know where we are going now and where we end up in next couple years. I would love to have DNSSEC and Eric is not here, and Dane, to prevail in that issue, but I'm not sure.

DENISE MICHEL:

It's Denise. I understand that. I'm thinking of the range of activities that and perhaps should be undertaken to provide security in different ways and at different levels, including the use of two factor authentication, registry locks, DNSSEC, the whole range, and was thinking of multiple issues here.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

This is Laurin again. So, essentially this was kind of my idea as well, to use this as a basis to then go into measures that are not DNSSEC but that would help against this kind of stuff, because we don't really over those anywhere as of yet. So that's why I think it would make sense, because of the whole discussion that DNSSEC was kind of mentioned as a measure that would help and we know it doesn't, and so on. But more to kind of go for the stuff that would help, and put that into our report.

---

ŽARKO KECIC:                    Either I do not understand you, or you do not understand me.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:        This is Laurin, I think we have, we'll take this off line, I don't think we actually have a disagreement, it's just we don't understand. E

ŽARKO KECIC:                    Those two things don't have to do with each other. DNSSEC is one issue, and having secure registration systems is another issue. And as Denise mentioned, two factor authentication, registry or registrar lock, and all other issues is the fact that we can strengthen security at registry level and know how far ICANN can go with that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:        Yep, I agree with you. I'm just saying we should focus on these things in our report, as well. I mean, Norm mentioned there might be ways ICANN could kind of push this, so Norm, if you could kind of explain how you think this would be possible or doable, that contractual kind of enforcement.

---

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, so if you look at the registry agreement for a new gTLD, it requires that you implement DNSSEC, it's a requirement. But to my knowledge, I'm not 100% up to speed on the registrar agreement, but I don't think there's any special conditions they have to implement as far as security goes. And the thing is, they hold the crown jewels for security. So I'm not coming across as being very hard on this, but it could say you must at least offer the ability for two factor authentication, it doesn't mean you have to necessarily inflict that on people, but you must at least offer it. That's an example.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, this is Kerry. I was wondering if I could just input at this point, because I wasn't sure if there was anyone with hands up in the room, so I didn't want to just jump in.

NORM RITCHIE: Please jump in.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I kind of agree with Norm's stance, just from the public safety working group perspective and the topic of actually having anyone with the contract with ICANN, just at minimum, meet the minimum specifications that it could have in the registrar

---

agreement. I know there was unwillingness to negotiate some of the terms and a lot of registrars really, even with some of the minimum requirements in the contracts, have not been compliant. That's an issue that came up in 2016 when they actually spoke to the compliance department about it, in terms of them saying they didn't have the capacity to pretty much follow up on every contract that they had in order to make sure that persons are being compliant.

So I tend to agree with the point that even if we can't, as far as how far can ICANN go, even if we can't specify, hey, you guys should do this because all other repercussions that could come from us being very strict in terms of our recommendation. I think it's something that we should highlight that's a topic of interest that should be and should have high priority so ICANN Board at least start to reconsider how they negotiate a contract and how they actually staff the compliance, and we can take it from that perspective, in terms of making sure that minimal specs, which I think we will cover on the DNSSEC and other areas that we're looking at, just to ensure that those minimal specs for security is included in any renegotiation agreement across the board, and our compliance is actually staffed with qualified persons to actually follow up on it, or even to have a mechanism for compliance that actually follows those aspects.

---

We could have insight once we get to the stage of writing, we could probably reach out to the public safety working group. I know Fabian is very active still with sending our reports to GAC on the different issues related to this, so maybe he's someone of interest we could have to actually speak to, once we've gotten to the point of writing that.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, so we actually talked about two things here. The first is the CCT-related resolution and trying to figure out during our Board Caucus session what that means to us, and talking to people before that so that we can be productive when we do have that short 45-minute meeting with the Board Caucus. And the second thing is how to address this recent infrastructure attack, I don't know what else to call it, and who we should talk to this week regarding that. Denise took the action to try and work with Staff to line something up on that front. Did I miss anything else in that meandering conversation?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

This is Jennifer, I just wanted to bring everybody to the Adobe Chat, KC has posted a couple of lengthy comments in there, just FYI. I can read them out if you want, but I think if you're in the room. [AUDIO BREAK]

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, are you hearing us and is there anything you want to say about SAC74?

So, I was hoping Boban was going to get here before the next agenda topic. We have a break scheduled in 15 minutes. Why don't we take it now and start in 15 minutes? Maybe he'll show up. If not, we'll figure another way.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So have we finished the Board Caucus meeting prep?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No one had anything to say. Do you?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't know anything about it, so I was questioning, other than the email who's attending, that we saw, is there any other, do we know anything about this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We don't. The only communication we've had is they would like to have an opportunity to dialogue. So I am speculating that some of the Board members knew what they were about to do

---

with the CCT and thought that they ought to talk to the other review teams before, that's my guess. Maybe I'm giving them too much credit, we'll find out. Alright, let's take a short break and be back at 10:15.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I noticed that KC successfully dialed in so maybe just before we break, just double check in case there is anything KC wants to add.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, I'm sorry.

KC CLAFFY: Can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, we can.

KC CLAFFY: Hi, sorry about that, my fault. You know there is supposed to be some board advice register where we could maybe have somebody and I'll go and try at break and figure out what, was there any followup to the SSAC74 that's sort of an ongoing issue,

---

and even how closely the recommendations in that document relate to what we've been talking about the last 15 minutes. So, I'll take the action to go look into that, that's all.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I haven't read 74, but it's about credential management lifecycle.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I think that one does and some of the previous ones I talked to, best practices to secure credentials. I think the issue is the one that is in the CCTRD resolution is that these things are governed by PDPs so we can't just direct ICANN to go get the problem fixed. So we can bring this out again, because it's not a new issue, but I didn't have anything particularly to say, except that somebody needs to go do the research to find out when this has been recommended in the past and what has been the followup. And I'll start the ball rolling.

DENISE MICHEL: KC, this is Denise. I can help with research if you want to just shoot me an email outlining what's needed, I'm happy to help.



---

KC CLAFFY: Sure, sure, okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And this came out in 2015, so like you said, this is not a new topic. And that ties back to Žarko's why now. Why is this a hot topic now?

KC CLAFFY: Well yeah, again, I think Denise kind of hit that nail in the head, that it's got a lot of attention, and the US government has now issued some advisories about this. There was recently this whole FTC conversation about consumer protection in this space, how many clauses there are in the registry and registrar agreements that relate to consumer protection that seem to not be followed, or if so, compliance seems to not be transparent about it, what is in the agreements, and maybe there are not a lot of teeth, but what teeth are in those agreements, it's not clear how effectively they're being.

And I think the other thing at least what I felt was blow back was that ICANN issued a press release that said, you know, the first thing in the press release was DNSSEC, as if DNSSEC would be the silver bullet here, and that doesn't make a lot of sense, since DNSSEC wouldn't have really helped in these attacks except in a weird, convoluted way, because the attackers seemed to be

---

clueless in some cases about whether to re-enable DNSSEC after they turned it off.

Anyway, DNSSEC helped in one of the cases because only the domains that weren't under DNSSEC were compromised. But it's kind of convoluted. So it's really the issue of claiming DNSSEC would be the first thing you should do to stop these attacks, to prevent these attacks in the future is not quite accurate, to say the least.

Now, ICANN did have, underneath that claim, they said there are a lot of other things that matter. Best practices for handling credentials really matters and there's all these other things that should be done, but the headline of the press release was about DNSSEC. And I think that had people scratching their head, given the nature of these attacks. I can't say more than that to Žarko's question about why this got so much attention.

**RUSS HOUSLEY:** Right, had the attackers been clueful, they could have gotten their inappropriately altered data signed.

**KC CLAFFY:** Absolutely, and I think they'll learn from these mistakes. This whole thing is an arms race, so the fact that even sort of basic

---

hygiene isn't being followed I think should have been the headline. But I don't think that ICANN can make that the headline, for reasons that are quite clear in the CTT recommendations. Anyway, that's a longer story. But that was my thought on that point.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks KC, I think that's really useful. I think ICANN can make it a headline, and I think that's part of the discussion that I would like to have here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, let's take that break now, then. Thank you. [AUDIO BREAK]

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, so the recording has been restarted and this is after the morning break session of the SSR2 Face to Face Meeting, Day 1.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is Russ. During the break, we had a long discussion about who is accountable and responsible for which parts, and so I wanted to make sure that everyone is aware of that. So I asked Jennifer to put up the document. The ICANN SSR was divided

---

into several topics and we have a small team responsible for each one of those. And if you scroll to the next one, we'll see the DNS-SSR, it's split across pages, but there is a group of volunteers for each of the sections or topic areas and there's quite a bit of overlap there. In fact, I see Žarko on the second one on that, the business continuity plan, right?

Okay. Keep going. This was edited last meeting I believe, last plenary call, we moved an item out of this section into the next one. And then the future challenges has I think a smaller number and the people on that, right? So, given that at least one of my take-aways from that last discussion is that we need to go through this and find out what is blocking progress on each of those. Is that right? Okay. In some cases, I know we're waiting for questions to be answered. In other cases, we've gotten the answers and I am then unaware of anything blocking that group from progressing on that topic. So let's go back to the beginning of the document, please.

KC CLAFFY:

This is KC. It would certainly help if someone told us which of these do have all the questions answered, because it's hard to tell...

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're right, KC, it's hard to tell from this, and that's why Jennifer, when she sends out each of the responses to the question, she has a little tag line under each one which says how many other questions are outstanding from that topic area or whether they have now all been answered. So, I'm hoping that the people who are in those topics at least are aware of whether they have everything, or not.

KC CLAFFY: I would encourage somebody, and maybe ICANN could do it, or the leadership guys, to put it in this document, because I think whatever we're using to track progress. If I look at this document and I see a row that is green, I say, okay, that's all systems go, I have everything I need to forward with that line. If we're supposed to be tracking it through email and figure out based on which email, which group I'm in, that seems like it's inefficient. Just my thought.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Anything we can do to organize the work, I'm willing to do. The easiest thing to do now, probably, is to add a column that says number of outstanding questions.

---

KC CLAFFY: That would be great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Obviously Jennifer needs to do some work to figure that out, to put it all in this one place. So let's do that. Let's go through each of these. Looking at the first one, Jennifer, are you able to quickly find out whether the questions on #1 have been answered?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, so on the first topic, there is one question outstanding. Number 2, there are a number of questions, it looks like 18 of them that have not been answered. Number 3, there's 6 or 7. Topic #4, there are 4 outstanding questions. Security incident management, it seems like all the questions have been answered.

RUSS HOUSLEY: On #5 there is one, unless it was answered while I was flying here.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Well, see, some of them are in subtopics, as well, I'm looking at the questions and answers document that I pasted into the chat.

---

Anyway, topic #4 there are questions outstanding. Topic #5 there is one at the top there, and so I think there are 2 on #5. Topic #6 there is no questions.

Thanks Laurin, Kerry-Ann has posted a comment in the chat saying, "For me it's just been unclear how to coordinate all the volunteers for each section. For example, should we contact each other directly or go through staff? Any suggestions?"

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Kerry, I'm in the room, people are saying directly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is Russ. I know that some of the sub teams have been exchanging draft texts. So the idea is to get to a point where the team has their thoughts gathered, and then bring it to the team, so that they can share a complete thought, as opposed to each little neuron firing. But the idea is that each of these would gather their findings and then if there are any recommendations, what they will be, and bring it forward to the team. So, Norm, you were going to say something?

NORM RITCHIE: Were you going to ask about #6, because there's no questions about it, so what's holding it up? So, as far as I'm concerned,

---

nothing, other than sitting down and writing it. So, there may be questions that arise as I'm doing that, and I think that applies to most of these. The fact that there is question outstanding doesn't prevent people from writing the rest of it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin, just as a note, this is essentially what we said we would do during this meeting. We have today and tomorrow and then the idea is that we have these smaller breakout rooms during the meeting to do the writing in smaller groups. That is the plan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is what we said on three plenary calls.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, I would like to ask Laurin how he will divide himself in small groups. I see your name on multiple issues.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin again. This is not just a problem that I have, but that we will all have, because we're all on multiple things. Luckily, some of them are related. For example, Boban and I are



---

on a variety of ones that refer to ICANN SSR issues, and so obviously it's not perfect, no one claims it is.

**RUSS HOUSLEY:** I'm struggling with how to move forward. You're smiling, which means you understand the struggle I'm having. I don't know what else to do but break it into topics and then get team members to work on those topics. What would you do differently?

**NORM RITCHIE:** I agree that that, at one point you just got to sit down and do it, right? So, yes, these two days I believe the start of the drafting sessions, but I'm assuming we come back and everybody reviewed what has been drafted. It gets reviewed by everybody, is that correct?

**RUSS HOUSLEY:** Yes, I hope so. How else do we achieve consensus? But we don't need to all delve into every topic. Basically we're trusting the small number of people on each of these tasks to do the research and then brief the rest of the team on what they found. Why don't we pause for a moment and let Jennifer fill this column in? I'm not sure we can understand where we are without pulling all the information into one place.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, I can do that, and I might suggest that while I'm adding the numbers to the column there, that people take a look at the questions and answers document that I posted into the Adobe Connect Chat, just to read through, and you can get a sense of how many questions have been answered.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, thank you. [AUDIO BREAK]

KC CLAFFY: This is KC. I'm noticing down toward the bottom under DNS-SSR there are topics that are not numbered and don't have any questions underneath them, and I'm vaguely remembering we ran out of time at the last meeting to fill these in. Or did we decide explicitly we don't have any questions for any of these topics? I can't recall. Like under the first one, my name is next to it, Date of Hearing, Date of Release. The next one is BCDR Plan. And these don't have any questions underneath, is that because we didn't get to them or did we decide we didn't have any questions?

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Can I offer an answer? So, any topics under the DNS-SSR Workstream that don't have any questions, they just don't have questions. We went through this document I think on one of the plenary calls just to double check that people didn't have any questions, and this is the document that we have. So, you can assume if there are no questions, then the team hasn't asked any questions.

KC CLAFFY: Fair enough.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There were some that review team members felt they had all the information they needed.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin, just as a general point, I think what we might want to do is to find a way of organizing the breakout sessions next week, so we should figure out as quickly as possible which rooms and how many rooms we have, and then go through, make sure the people on each list communicate with each other,

---

we figure out which one we can deal with and when, and we try to time it as soon as possible. I know this is a lot of work, but I don't see how else we can deal with this problem right now.

To continue on, this is still Laurin, I'm happy to essentially do that for the ones I'm on, just email relevant people.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

This Jennifer. At the moment there are some breakout rooms booked on the morning of Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. I can send the times to the list but it might helpful as well if anybody that would like to have a writing session and there's a time that's not already booked that would suit for, let me know, and obviously I can't guarantee that we can book a room, but we can try. And also there are spaces I'm sure we can find some space.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you, Jennifer. I'm sure that was a pain. Just so people are aware that last topic in the future challenges, we got a followup question, asked for clarification of the question we asked and I had asked Eric to answer that clarification question. He had a paper deadline last week, I'm sure he'll do it this week. Just so that everybody is aware, we don't have deadlock there, that's all I'm trying to say.

---

Okay. So, given the small number of people from the team who are here, I'm not sure we will gain much by going through each of these, but I'd like to focus on the ones first with no questions, and then we can come back to the other ones. So the first one is ICANN SSR 6. Norm, you said you and Ram had not yet gotten together on this, but you're not aware of any information you need at this point.

NORM RITCHIE: Fortunately, this is probably an easier one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so you're both here, let's sign up for some of the time in one of those breakout rooms and get some text going. The next one with no questions is Data Sharing and Data Release, that's KC. KC, is there anything else you need?

KC CLAFFY: No, I'm writing it right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Of course, awesome. Žarko, the Business Continuity, you have 0. Do you need anything else?

---

ŽARKO KECIC: Probably not, because I see this first time, but since Business Continuity and root zone management will have questions, definitely.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You will have questions?

ŽARKO KECIC: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So let's get those out as soon as possible, because we're already seeing some of our answers aren't going to come until the last day of March.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, but I will have to do my research before I ask questions.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Fair. Okay. Denise, Name Collision. We have no outstanding questions, do you need anything else? And you're alone on that one, so you could start writing.

---

ŽARKO KECIC: May I ask, because I don't know what's going on with name collision, that's the biggest that I know that new gTLD program is waiting for.

KC CLAFFY: It was the biggest issue before the CCT report came out.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi KC, this is Denise. What does that mean?

KC CLAFFY: It seems to me the CCT report put a whole bunch of other issues on the table that might be perceived as higher priority than name collision.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Say more, people are looking puzzled.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, have people read the recommendations in the CCT...

DENISE MICHEL: So, KC, are you suggesting that we rethink the priorities, the priority topics under this and revisit whether this is high enough

---

a priority in the context of other things that the CCT Review Team has raised, or that we should do more than just...

KC CLAFFY:

No, no, no, sorry, I was just surprised at Žarko's statement there, because he put it in the context of the new gTLDs. My read of this report is that it's not in. Name collision is not in the context of new gTLDs and getting the next round out, it's just in the context of DNS-SSR Workstream. So, I think it should absolutely go in, maybe I should try to give a more useful answer of what is the state of the name collision work? I don't actually know the answer to that. And give that SSAC is supposed to be overseeing it to some extent, maybe that's too strong a word, but it's sort of gone dark and there is an admin committee inside an admin committee or something on SSAC that's sort of taken over and I guess is talking to ICANN internal folks about it, but I honestly don't know the status myself. I could reach out and ask, or maybe Denise...

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah, I'll do it. I will craft a followup question for Staff on this matter and have it submitted. I'll leave that out on the list today. By way of background, it's something that I occasionally follow, over the years have followed, and you know, a big



---

problem with auto discover domains and what I went through in seeking attention and resolution on it over the last several months just prompted me to think it would be a good topic for the review team to take another look at.

KC CLAFFY: I think there is a bunch of stuff in there to take a look at, for sure. I didn't mean that it shouldn't be looked at, at all.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, I will have a question on the list for that.

KC CLAFFY: I would just definitely object to us presenting it as we need to resolve the name collision issue so that we can move forward with another round.

DENISE MICHEL: No, I was coming at this issue of thinking that it would be good for us to take stock of what has been done and what the state of name collision is, and what the ongoing work is. And if we see an important nexus with security and SSR, we may want to have a finding and additional suggestions in this area, or not, if we feel that everything is on track and everything is working as

---

appropriately. I think that was the spirit in which I was addressing this.

KC CLAFFY:

And now that you're mentioning it, it's occurring to me that it may intersect with the data sharing part that I'm doing, and I didn't really even think about name collision because I was focused on root zone management. But name collision is a part of that and I think part of the confusion about name collision and the state of the research is the state of the data released about it.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Laurin and Žarko?

ŽARKO KECIC:

I just have questions, I don't see data sharing in data release, actually data release is okay, and name collision to be in the section of root zone management.

KC CLAFFY:

You do not?

---

ŽARKO KECIC: Data sharing and data release in my opinion covers much more than root zone. And name collision does not have to do anything with root zone management.

KC CLAFFY: I'm sorry, in this section, the data sharing release was specific to data sharing about the root zone. I completely agree with you, there's lots of other things you could talk about in data sharing, but I think, I could be wrong, but I thought that in this part of the document I was supposed to write about root zone-related data sharing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's correct. Because we're trying to stay within the ICANN remit part. Because you can come up with lots of name collisions that are lower in the tree. Anyway, root zone management, data sharing, and data release in the context of root zone management and name collision in the context of root zone management was what we came up in LA.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, but name collision which is related to content of root zone, but happens somewhere else, and root zone management

---

means something else. Root zone management and name collision, I don't see that together.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My memory of how this came about in LA was managing the additions to the root zone to avoid name collision. That's how I remember it. Does anyone else have a different memory?

KC CLAFFY: I mean we can always revisit it now anyway, but that sounds right to me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Laurin, your flag is up?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yep, sorry, I temporarily forgot what I wanted to say. So, essentially, we have two data sharing ones, so there is the data sharing data release for root zone, and then we have it again for the future challenges. And my question is simply, KC, would you want to be roped in for that one, so you know what's happening there?

---

KC CLAFFY: Sure, no problem.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: KC, this is Denise. I was going to do an initial write-up on that and it's more dark focused, and I'll loop you into the first draft. And you see it as complementing what you're doing in the root zone section?

KC CLAFFY: Yep that sounds great, let me know.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is there anything else we need to talk about regarding name collision at this point? Okay. Laurin, NS and DS record management. No outstanding questions?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, everything that is Boban and me, as my comment on the side says, which you cannot read, Boban and I are meeting Wednesday to go through everything. So, that's for that and all the ones that will be coming up below that have our initials. And

---

there might be questions coming out of that meeting, but we obviously cannot say that yet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, the next one is the Best Practice in System Hardening for L-Root. Alain has that one and there are no outstanding questions. The next one after that is the comment on the RSSAC document around proposed government model for the root servers. KC and Alain are working on that. KC, do you have anything to share at this point?

KC CLAFFY: No, I don't. Is Alain there?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, he's not.

KC CLAFFY: Is he in Kobe?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't believe he's going to be in Kobe.

---

KC CLAFFY: Okay, I'll reach out to him. We have not gathered to talk, but I will take the token today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Okay, Eric is not here to talk about Accountability and Transparency Regarding the Risks and Benefits, annual report on alternate route. Kerry, there is no outstanding questions on the SLA Compliance. Is there anything you can share at this point?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Kerry has just typed in the chat, she said she will collate and begin to coordinate a draft.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Propagation Delay and Consistency of Changes of Root Zone Contents Across Servers. Eric and KC are on that one. KC, anything to share?

KC CLAFFY: No, I'll bang Eric and I'll figure out what the status is there.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Scott was going to deal with Registry Availability and Measurements Regarding the Security of the IANA Registries. I know he's in transit after the RSA conference. We're still looking for a name of the KPIs for SSR Measurements. Measurements, I kind of thought Eric and KC would be fighting for this one, but neither one of them has put their names up.

KC CLAFFY: I will, hold on, I'm losing track. I'm not finding this in the same document.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you explain what is meant by that one? Is that for us to come up with KPI's? I'm confused.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm not sure what that topic means.

KC CLAFFY: Me neither.



---

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's probably why no one has got a name there. I do not recall who put that, but it clearly gets dropped if no one wants to work on it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Or put question marks there for now until we figure out what it was with the larger group.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin, I believe to remember that we were discussing that often measurement and performance indicators are missing. This was part of the discussion on doing these smart type recommendations that are trackable, and I think this is where this came from. Because we kind of said we have to think about how you would measure these things and track these things so that we can make recommendations that allow for tracking. I might be mistaken, however.

ŽARKO KECIC: I'm sorry, I didn't get, measure what?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin again. We had this discussion about recommendations where we said recommendations that we

---

give as SSR2 have to follow criteria. One of the key things is that you contract these recommendations, and that means that there has to be something to track and this I think was essentially the point, that we have to think about like what are the key performance indicators/measurements for doing the measurement for Section 4.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, just keeping things within our own scope, it sounds like we're looking at a recommendation that these be developed, not that we develop them.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin, I think this is absolutely an appropriate way to do this. I'm not sure why we have it, I just wanted to say I think this is the context under which this point emerged.

KC CLAFFY: Can you just write that down in the Google Doc line, because already I'm going to forget it by tomorrow. And we'll revisit this when I get there. I feel that measurement may be covered in a lot of places in the document, and let's just make sure after we cover it in all the other places that we think it's adequately covered, this particular subtopic, or we cover it here.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin. The section Section #4 Sagittal SSR measurements. So it kind of make sense here if we want to discuss it.

KC CLAFFY: Fair enough. I was just saying, whatever notes you just said you were trying to recall from when we met last time, just put it in the document, if it's not in there already.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yep, it's already happening.

KC CLAFFY: That's all, we can move on.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so the next one is Name Space Abuse, and under that, Transparency With Respect to Abuse, which includes Dar, Denise, KC, Norm, are all online here.

DENISE MICHEL: When are you arriving, KC?

KC CLAFFY: I'm not arriving in Kobe, but I'm available.

DENISE MICHEL: From that list, then, Norm and I will confer and follow up with you.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, the next one, Reactive Versus Proactive Compliance.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, I'm following up on email with Kerry-Ann on that one. I don't have any further questions at this time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Laurin, Norm, Denise, KC, on the Big Stick one?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin. A coordination email for meeting has been sent.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anti-Abuse, Laurin, Norm, and Eric, I assume, when he gets here.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin. Same thing, coordination email for meeting here in Kobe has been sent.

NORM RITCHIE: Just on that, I'm looking at the similarity between the reactive versus proactive compliance and then this one, which is proactive anti-abuse measures. It sounds very similar, I'm thinking maybe they should be grouped.

DENISE MICHEL: I agree.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin. Either we group them right now or we can just do like a short meeting, do like a kind of blurb, and then meet together, might be another option. Or just combine?

DENISE MICHEL: What do you think, Norm, just combine them right now? Yeah.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, we're talking about whether to combine those two rows, or not. Don't put a note to combine them, merge them. Alright, as soon as you're finished with that edit, Norm, tell us where we are on the Software Interop, Testbed of Software Variants.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I know I'm boring, this is Laurin. Coordination with Eric for meeting here in Kobe is on the way.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And Laurin, Eric, and Kerry-Ann are on New Uses of DNS such as IOT.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin again, same thing, I have sent a coordination email for that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so we clearly will need to go back again when we get answers to some of the questions on these other ones, but my hope is that the people that are here can get together and start doing the text preparation to bring to the rest of the team. Thank you who is expanding all the initials. Because several times we've stumbled. Alright, given the people who are in the

---

room, which ones can we make progress on now? Break into working sessions. Yeah, okay, so Laurin and I are going to work on the IDN, okay.

Žarko you're alone on one of these, right? Oh, you're on with Boban. Can you start work on that, or at least create the questions. You said you would have questions, okay, thank you. Alright, I think that means everyone has something to work on, good. Alright, let's break into sessions. I think lunch is at 12:30, right? It's already here, alright. So, let's get something to eat and then right after lunch we'll work on the sessions and hopefully the remote people can find one to start working on, as well. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: So, Laurin, this is KC, can you tell me, are you guys going to meet now? Or should I go tuck my kid in and come back in an hour? Where can I be useful?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hi KC, this is Laurin. Just a quick question, why me, specifically? Am I missing something?

KC CLAFFY: You were the one who sent me email saying can we meet.

---

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, KC, these are like to coordinate times, we don't have to meet right away.

KC CLAFFY: I'm aware of that, but I thought this was also our time to do those meetings, and I thought Russ just suggested we do some of those meetings now, maybe I misunderstood.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: KC, the thing is, your initials are not on the IDN, but do you want to be on that?

KC CLAFFY: No, no, no, I'm just talking, okay, never mind, I'll take it to email. I'll let you guys go have lunch, that's fine. I'm signing off then, for now. I'll work on text tonight. And then we dial in tomorrow?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, I think that we're going to do breakout sessions until then, so anything you can work on, that's great.

KC CLAFFY: I will, I'm already doing it. Okay, bye. [AUDIO BREAK]



---

JENNIFER BRYCE:                    Alright, welcome back everybody, so this is just basically a quick wrap up. The team has been working for the afternoon and breakout sessions. We are going to close the meeting and they will continue to work in the breakout sessions this afternoon. Before we close, just a quick wrap up of the action items. I have an action item, this is Jennifer, to finalize the slides, which is actually complete, and I sent the slides to the list for information purposes. I have an action item, Denise, for you to work with Staff to set up a meeting with the CCT Review Team members here in Kobe. KC offered to take the lead...

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    Wait a second, on that, it's important to me that that session happen before our caucus. Because the point is to go to that meeting informed.

JENNIFER BRYCE:                    Wednesday at I think it's 11:30.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    It's at 11:00.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, Denise, will you just keep us posted in terms of anything you need? Okay, thanks. KC, took action to take the lead in research and any followup from SSAC74 and again Denise had offered to help with that one. And then the other one was to list the number of questions complete in the document, which we have done, as well. Are there any other action items that I missed from this morning or this afternoon session that you would like to put on the record?

DENISE MICHEL: What's the second item I'm on the hook for?

JENNIFER BRYCE: SSAC74, KC is going to take the lead for followup research and you had said, if, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is Russ, just to encourage everyone to keep up the energy despite the jetlag, and get the writing done. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, and with that we will stop the recording and meeting. Thanks very much everyone, see you tonight at dinner.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**