
BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR2 Plenary Number 92 on the 27th of November, 2019 at 15:00 UTC. Members attending the call today include Elaine, Denise, Russ, Norm, Eric, Lauren, and Scott. Apologies from Negar. Guests joining us today include Natalie Vergnolle and Steve Shang. Observers Allie, Hussain and [Christina Hacobian]. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer and Brenda, and I forgot to mention we do have apologies from Steve as well. Technical writer Heather Flanagan is on the call. And, today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Russ, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hi. I think the first thing we are going to do today is hear from Steve. Basically, he is going to share with us how SSAC does the prioritization and to see if there is anything that we want to lift from the way that they do it, for prioritizing our Recommendations.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, should I go?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, thank you, Russ and members of the review team. I was asked to share a little bit about how SSAC does prioritization, which it recently

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.

conducted at its workshop, September this year. You can go, please, to the next slide.

So, the SSAC, just a little bit of background on the SSAC exercise. So, the SSAC wishes to do a ranking of the various threats to the DNS ecosystem. The purpose of the exercise is really for the SSAC to determine what areas they should be studying. So, they did a systematic analysis. Before the workshop, the SSAC members and the ICANN support staff did an environmental scan. So, they did a broad scan of the various threats to the DNS ecosystem and they listed into a couple sections. Those are, for example, the DNS infrastructure, the DNS namespace, protocol, DNS abuse, IP address and routing, as well as registration services.

So, at the SSAC workshop, there's a two-step ... By the way, my colleague, Nathalie, has been very instrumental in helping SSAC going through this exercise. And the methodology we used was largely borrowed from the ICANN Organization.

So, it's a two-step process. Essentially, the first day, the SSAC members during lunch are grouped by a subject matter areas, which were previously assigned. So, each of the six areas that I mentioned. And then they consider holistically all those threats articulated in that area and they do a ranking approach. So, they rank the severity as well as the probability. So, then the table, each of the tables has one staff supporting the effort and then the discussions were noted down on those two dimensions.

So, after that, the next day, when all the six groups did the exercise, and then the top ones Each group contributed a top five, so in total we have about 20 or 25. And then, a subsequent effort, which was the whole SSAC got together, and then we went through a similar exercise. In this case, we start by asking the [inaudible] by asking the SSAC of all the things—these are high priority items on the list—were there anything missing from the list? And there were some members contribute a few more of those, and those were added.

And once that section completes, each SSAC member were given, for example, five votes essentially, and then they would put all of these on a flip chart by sections. And then we did this exercise where each member goes to the flip chart and if they think this is a [inaudible] threat that is really important, that it's really severe, they put a mark, or they put a pin next to it. And then the final result was tallied. That's how the SSAC arrived at its final ranking.

I want to preface this by saying this is the first of such exercise, initial exercise, so the methodology is being refined as we speak. And the SSAC is likely to do another iteration. So that's kind of a broad overview of the methodology. Are there any questions?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

One question is, when the pins were being put in, if somebody thought one was way, way, way important, could they put all five of their pins on the same topic, or were they required to spread them?

STEVE SHENG: I think they are request to spread them, but let me refer that to Nathalie. My understanding, my recollection, they could only put one pin next to one item other than put all five next to one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you.

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE: Hi, everyone. This is Nathalie Vergnolle. I am Director of Strategic Planning, and I did assist Steve in putting together the methodology for SSAC. Maybe we could go to the next slide to give you a little bit more of a visual of what the first step looked like on the risk rating. So, that first step was really looking at ... So, they had a set of about 50 or 60 threats and they were looking to rank those threats in terms of risk for ICANN in general.

So, they used this matrix. And really the important thing is to consider which are the two angles against which you're going to do your banking. And so, here it was risk. So, for risk, you evaluate risk in terms of impact and in terms of likelihood of occurrence. And then you have to define. It's important to define your scale and to agree on what the different elements of the scale mean.

The important part is that everybody shares the understanding and agrees on what a four means, what a five means, so that when you apply the ranking to a given element, you apply a similar ranking for a similar level, so you have something that looks similar in the end. That's the important part is really to focus on is what are your criterias and

what are the definitions associated with the different levels you use on your scale.

So, that's how they got to their first level of narrowing down that list from 60, to a list of 20-25. Basically, they broke into sub-groups and each sub-group looked at a few of those risks, so each of them had a manageable number of risks to look at and agreed on assigning the ranking of those different risks to the different elements.

Then they combined all of those results and got to this initial list of, "Well, okay, these are all my fives and fours. So, these are the ones that I'm going to focus on. They are my critical and unacceptable items. These are the ones I'm going to focus on." And from there, that's how they got to the 20-25.

And from there, they did the voting. And there was a discussion about, "So, we have five votes, can we put all of our votes on one item?" There was some back and forth about this. Again, it's really just everybody agreeing on a methodology. There's no good way or bad way of doing it. It's just agreeing on a way that works for everyone. They decided you have to vote on separate items. So, you can only apply one vote to one item. And that's how they got to their final list of organizing things in priorities.

If I can take a few more minutes, I did want to bring up a few other possibilities or methodologies to do prioritization. If we can go. Brenda, skip the next slide and go to the one after. One more. One more.

Okay. So, most of you are probably very familiar with all of this. This is very classic prioritization methodology, where you can do this sort of

value versus complexity matrix. So, you look at your recommendations in terms of effort to implement the recommendation in terms of value. What's the benefit of this recommendation?

Basically, you start with your top left items, the items that are the biggest value and lowest effort. And then you move on to the top right, so the ones that are still the higher value, bigger effort. But knowing what's interesting with this way of looking at things is also identifying those items in the lower left corner. Those are sort of your low-hanging fruits, so things that are maybe easy to implement and nice to have that you might want to just scatter around as you go through your implementation.

If we go to the next slide, one other way to look at things, which is a little more analytical or mathematical is to do a scorecard. That's maybe a little more complex. So, you define a set of different criteria, you assign a weight to your different criteria, and again, you agree on a scaling on how you're going to rank your Recommendations against those different criteria, and you assign those ratings, and that gives you a final scoring. And from that, you can rank your items. But the highest score becomes your number one item and so forth. Back to you. Russ, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, thank you for this overview. Does anyone have any other questions?

BRENDA BREWER: Russ, Denise has her hand raised.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, go ahead Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi. Thanks, Steve and Nathalie, for joining us and for this presentation. We appreciate it. I was in transit and I didn't see most of your slides, so apologies if it was displayed there and I missed it, but how do you use the process that was outlined? Is it to determine what SSAC will work on or are there other issues as well?

STEVE SHENG: Right. Thanks, Denise. The primary purpose is for SSAC to determine what area, what study areas they should be working on. Obviously, in addition to the severity and the likelihood, there's also membership interest, membership expertise, and membership time. So, those are also a factored into the decision. But that's separate from this ranking exercise

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Yeah, I can see how this certainly would have been useful at the beginning of the SSR2's work, when we had a really big list of issues people were interested in and trying to winnow it down. And so, once SSAC goes through this process and assigns a weight or ranking to the various issue areas, then what happens?

STEVE SHENG: Well, from the very top of the list, the goal is to study the areas that are most important, most significant. And then from the top of the list, the members will go through the list and see what can be done, if anything on those. I mean, some of the things are out of ICANN's control or influence areas, so then in those areas there's probably not much to be done. There are others that can be done, is within the advisory [mid-area] within the SSAC. So, then they have a full discussion. What do we do about this topic? There's a lot of things going on, but I think, too, it needs to be very precise to make an impact on those particular areas.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. And then once that activity is been done and an issue has been identified that ranks highly and is within the remit of both ICANN and the SSAC, then work is undertaken. Is that what happens?

STEVE SHENG: That's the expectation from the SSAC. This is an exercise that the SSAC initiated. So, it's not for what ICANN should be doing.

DENISE MICHEL: No, no, no, I understand, I'm just trying to understand how it fits into the workflow. So, once a high-ranking item that is deemed within the SSAC's purview and ICANN's purview, then SSAC works on it, writes a report? Is that where this is in the workflow? Yeah?

STEVE SHENG: That's the thought, but obviously there are some areas that there's only certain things, a limited remit for ICANN, right? So, the SSAC is advising the Board and the community, so it's a narrow scope on those areas.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. That's why I added those two caveats, but then SSAC writes a report?

STEVE SHENG: Right.

DENISE MICHEL: And then the report is approved by the SSAC team and then it goes to the Board? Is that still the process?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. You're talking about in general how the SSAC work is? Yes, so the SSAC writes a report—

DENISE MICHEL: How this fits into the SSAC workflow. I don't know if everyone's aware of SSAC's workflow, but I just wanted to clarify that. So, this is, if it's a funnel, a report funnel, more at the beginning of the report funnel, and then a report is written. Yeah?

STEVE SHENG: Thanks, Denise. So, this is more of an exercise to identify study areas, and then for the study areas that the SSAC determined, they will go a deeper dive. That's where they study into detail and then you should report to the Board—sorry, not to the Board. Its advice to can be to the Board and to the community. So, that's the workflow.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. And then of all the various reports that SSAC has pending or sent to the Board, has the Board ever asked you to come back and prioritize the different reports against each other and rank them?

STEVE SHENG: To my knowledge there was no such request. I mean, there were some questions in the past on, "What does this advice mean? Can you clarify the advice?" So, I think those are through the ARR Process, the Board Advice Tracking Process. Understanding of requests. So, I think those are handled separately.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Okay, thanks Steve. I appreciate it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any other questions?

BRENDA BEWER: There are no other hands raised, Russ.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry, I'm on the phone. I just wanted to go back to the timeline. So, from what I've understood, this process was a multi-day event with group sessions going back-and-forth. What do you think of the kind of minimum of time we would need to, let's say, prioritize 25 items like that, from your experience having done something like this?

STEVE SHENG: Laurin, thank you for that question. I can start and then perhaps my colleague, Nathalie, can weigh in. I think the one thing I certainly learned that it's important coming into the discussion to articulate as much detail as possible of those 25 or 20 items.

One of the things in the SSAC discussion, it turns out some of those issues were not clear enough, and then people were going back and forth. So, I think to do enough preparative work, as much as possible, it's critical.

And second, the other thing I learned is to allow enough time up front in the beginning, for those break outs to work out the ranking first, because that's where a lot of the discussion happens, and properly note those down.

And then I think once those two steps are done well, then the rest will be easier. Probably needs a good moderator. In our case, I think Nathalie and also James from the ICANN Risk department also help us a little bit. So, I think those help are invaluable.

So, in total I think this probably can be [collapsed] within a day, so can be done in one day, morning and afternoon. We did it in two days, just because the SSAC workshop starts at the noon of the first day, and then goes to the second day. Nathalie, anything you want to add?

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE:

Yeah, sure. I think it can be very fast. It very much depends on also what you decide to go with in terms of methodology. It's very important to have that very well defined in the beginning what are the criteria and what are the definitions of the different scales that you're going to apply. Because, it was one item that kept coming back in the discussion about people asking, "Well, what do we mean by a number five? What do we mean by this? What do we mean by that?"

So, having [audio cuts out] that you're going to do your ranking again are really [audio cuts out]. So, you're not going to have the issue of not knowing what you're talking about. But, then it's probably, as Steve said, allow enough time for those discussions in subgroups, maybe one hour or two hours I would say for that, and then coming back together probably another two or three hours. If you decide to do a voting ... I mean, you have to look at the whole thing and agree on, "Well, this is the ranking," Okay, we agree on that. Then, if you do the voting, it takes a little bit of time. And then, going through more discussion. So, yeah, it's between a half day and a full day exercise I would say.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Thank you. That was very helpful.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. If there are no more questions, we thank you guys for coming by, and we're going to move on to the next agenda topic.

STEVE SHENG: Thanks. I will drop off now.

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE: I'll drop off, too. Bye.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thanks so much. Okay. The next thing we're going to talk about is filling the gaps. There's been several emails about this. The agenda included a pointer to a spreadsheet with 12 items in it, where we needed some [inaudible] text. I'd like to just go through those and find out where we are, and make sure we all understand where we are, and what needs done, and whether we agree with the text that is added. The first one was the Work Stream 2 needs intro text, that was Denise. Did that happen yet?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, intro text for?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Work Stream 2.

DENISE MICHEL:

Ah, no. It will.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. Thank you. All right. I know it's a holiday coming up, but will we be able to get that by the call next week?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Great, thank you. Alright, the next one was the C-suite security position. Kerry-Ann is not on the call, but she had agreed to do that. Jumping over to the Google Doc to see if something was added.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

Kerry-Ann said she had not actually done that, and she was going to work on it on her flight home.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, thank you. I missed that part of her note. All right. The next one is the security risk management. Matogoro had agreed to put that in, with a note that Laurin can help. Matogoro is at a funeral. So, let's see.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Russ, I believe he hadn't added any text yet. He said he was going to share it shortly to the list.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, I don't see it either. Okay, business continuity management. Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Business continuity management and this whole aspect, if you look at Boban's email ... So, he is kind of the one taking charge. And I will figure out a time with him to do that, hopefully by next week, but definitely within two weeks' time. I'll be traveling next week. That's why it might be difficult to add that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, Laurin, does your statement cover the disaster recovery as well?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, Russ, let me just pull up the email that everyone might not be in everyone's inbox. So, he said here, "Security risk management, business continuity management, and disaster recovery."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. And the next one is abusive naming, which is also Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, there is some text in the Doc right now. I have noticed there is interaction, if you want, [these findings and with the compliance text.] Nevertheless, something is there for everyone to look at.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. It looks like there's a couple comments in here as well.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, that is good. I have not seen those.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is Heather. The comments were added by Danko to the Recommendation. The findings were ... I don't think Danko saw those, because these were added after he had gone through the document.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see. Okay. So, Laurin, can you quickly give an overview of what we're going, just to see whether the team is in step with that?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Russ, absolutely. Let me just get Google Docs to do what I want it to do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think its page 38, if that helps you.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Page 38 of the Recs and Findings document

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, it's abusive naming findings doc. So, essentially, starting with this kind of abusive exists [inaudible] to misleading naming. This is a question, I think, where we a team have to think about how we want to define misleading naming and abusive naming and how we want those to relate to each other.

So, I have written this under the idea that, okay, misleading naming is the thing to say. It might not be on purpose, and it becomes abusive if the quality of being misleading is being used to commit crime, etc.

I give one example here, where a Danish word looks pretty similar to Google, Googling, whatever. I'm sure there are better examples. I just couldn't come up with something. So, I think that would be the distinction I propose.

So, essentially then we're speaking to virtually [inaudible] problem and the TLD [chaining] problem. You make it look like it's Google.com, but actually it's a sub-domain. Names, [inaudible], trademarks, is again an area where things might become difficult or [inaudible] country or another, so we might have to ask them. [Texter] and then the use of hot spot typos, etc. So, we agreed last time we were writing to kind of say we put all of this under that umbrella. So, that we stated.

Impact of the recommendation. So, we kind of speak to consumers and the corporations being affected, and that abusive naming might impact on ICANN's perceived legitimacy. For example, I have seen comments

on I think the Yelp reviews or something, where people are really unhappy about this kind of stuff. Sorry, I lost my line.

Then I could just think of this example from Danish and we're kind of saying at the same time some types of abusive names can be spotted rather easily by registrars. For example, FacebookLogin, Facebook-login, whatever else kind of is registered in bulk that is pretty clear. And we think that you cannot remove a misleading naming and the abuse of it, but you can definitely curtail it.

So, implementation. This would obviously start with registrars because they're the people that see this first. At least that is my understanding and position. We can discuss this.

And then I think one really important aspect is misleading naming. It's very difficult for us to say now how this will look like in five years from now. Which then means how do we track this, etc.?

I put down the system should be developed within the next 24 months. That's also open for discussion, but considering there would have to be some form of study, I know that the Google Chrome team did something. We talked to I think [Amalie], right, Russ? I can't remember exactly. But there is not much else. That would probably have to be studied, then algorithms or tool kits would have to be developed, so it might take some time.

Then the measure of success, there are three things I think. One would be tracking. This could be included in DAAR as mentioned above. And then identify it obviously. And then the last thing is discourage the use of this type of stuff. And obviously one and two can be tracked, but how

much it's being discouraged is obviously [inaudible], so there's no measurement possibility to really say what would have happened if something else had been in place, etc. Yeah, that's about it. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does anyone think that think that there's something that needs to be added or done differently here? Okay.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Russ, quick comment. As I said, we have to look at this one I think again in terms of timing, and particularly when we kind of have a more final stage, because we have similar text and similar issues being mentioned in the compliance and anti-abuse space, so I will make a comment after that in the Google Doc so we don't forget.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. All right. The next one is the DNS test bed. Eric, you had the pen here. I don't know if you got to it yet.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I noted in the spreadsheet that the first draft is done as recommendations. It's posted in the Google Doc as a suggestion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, I see. Okay. So, that's on page 39 for other people. Okay. So, basically, I think you're just saying OCTO started this. We want them to keep going.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that was my recollection that that was the consensus we reached, so that's just how I penned it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Anyone have any suggestions or guidance here? Okay, hearing none, IANA Portal, Alain had the action here.

ALAIN AINA: Hello. Can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hear you fine.

ALAIN AINA: Okay, good. I [inaudible] the text, which I sent I think this morning or yesterday, so I'm expecting and reviewing comments and I've seen also questions or comments from the technical writer asking about recommendations. I think the answer should come from really [inaudible] of the team, because from my finding, I thought the recommendations would be written differently, and so I would like to hear from the team and so I think [inaudible] would be free to read the document or ask questions.

So, I'm ready to provide more information, but I think going through the document should give everybody enough information and then it would be easy to see if the recommendation [inaudible] or the way I drafted

the recommendation [inaudible] probably maybe need some adjustment or change on the write up, so I'm open to get feedback from the team.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I believe this was on email and not in the Google Doc. Is that right?

ALAIN AINA: Yes, I didn't put it in the Google Doc yet. I just sent the document, but if you want me—

RUSS HOUSLEY: I was just trying to help people find it, Alain.

ALAIN AINA: No, but if it would be easier for them to find it, the document, I can also put it there. I thought [inaudible] of some of the team members before it goes there, maybe help with that. By the way, I didn't put it there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Has anyone had a chance to look at the text proposed here? And if so, do we have any advice for Alain? I saw Heather responded to his note.

ALAIN AINA:

And Russ, if you allow me, I think the text I put there is not only IANA Portal per se, it talks about the root zone management system, the whole, not only the portal. I don't know if you want to just narrow it down to the IANA Portal, but if that's the case, yes, but the document is about the root zone management system. So, the whole root zone and management system, including the portal and the other processes they use to manage the root zone. So, it's more than just the portal.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. Do you have any specific questions that the team can answer while we're on the call together or what's the next step?

ALAIN AINA:

Okay. I think that I would like ... I don't remember her name, the technical writer. I think I would almost re-write the recommendation and I would like the team to look at it and see if it's fitting. But, if you want to look at the recommendations, then you have to look at again the [inaudible], the finding. But I think I want the team to look at the recommendations compared to what we had in the document [inaudible] not big changes, but changes in the message is changed, or the issue we address also is more high level than what it is in the current recommendations. I think if the team can look at that one, compare it to the recommendations, the old one, that would be useful. That would be a good discussion point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, do you think it's appropriate to put that in the Google Doc, so that everything's in one place?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I can absolutely do that. What I'm hearing, is that since we're trying to compare the two recommendations, the one as it originally stands and this revised one, I'll keep them both there, so it's easier for people to compare and contrast.

ALAIN AINA: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, thank you. Okay. So, to the whole team, would you please look at that this week, so that we can sort that out by the call next week? Okay, the next one is name collisions. Scott, I think you're on the call.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yep, I am. So, reading through this, I know Russ, you had sent me a note on this. It seems pretty straightforward. Are we looking for anything specific on this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We have the Recommendation text and that's pretty straightforward. What we're looking for is the findings that lead to that recommendation.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Okay, I will work on that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. And even though it's a holiday week, would you be able to get to it by this call next week?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah, that's not a problem. I'll work on it today and tomorrow.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great, thank you. And Kerry-Ann has not done the privacy yet. Is KC on the call?

BRENDA BREWER: KC is not on the call.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Last time she was the only one not wanting to delete the research briefing, so we're waiting to hear her argument. And the last one is Eric on DoH.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. As I noted in the spreadsheet, I've done a pass and I've added things that I think address at least what I think were the outstanding [delta] where we needed to go, and I guess among other people, Zarko

should probably take a look at it since he brought it up to our attention.
But it's in the Doc. It's there for everyone to review.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great. That starts on page 51.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Eric, one of the things I was looking for, for DoH, was the ICANN Strategic Objective tie-in.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, that was for me to do? I thought we already had that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Not for DoH.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, we added that one after we did that exercise.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think Zarko should do that since he brought this up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree with you. Good luck. Okay, can you take a look at that over the next week, Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I will. And unfortunately, I'm about to have to jump off because my 11:00 is coming now, so I may disappear in a minute. But I'll take a look and see what I can do. We should hopefully get Zarko involved in this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Drop him an email. Okay. So, hopefully we will be done with filling all these gaps on the call next week. Please keep working at it, so we have a full thing to deal with when we get together in January. If you'll notice the spreadsheet that Heather has, there's a material needs tab and there's a full list tab. The full list tab is our next set of work, so if you want to look ahead, you can see there some of that has already gotten accomplished, other is not. But we will building our next set of action items from that once we have finished filling in the material needed.

Okay. I think that brings us to the end unless there's any other business someone wants to raise. Not hearing any. So, Jennifer, I think we had two action items, one was for people who had not yet done the items in the spreadsheet to do them. And the second, is for everyone on the team to review the new findings text that has been added.

JENNIFER BRYCE: And that is [inaudible], Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right. Great. Then for those in the US, enjoy the holiday and we'll talk again next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]