
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary #113 on the 10th of June 2020 at 14:00 UTC.

Attending the call today we have Kaveh, Danko, Russ, Ramkrishna, Laurin, Norm, Kerry Ann, Matogoro, and observer Dennis Tan.

We do have apologies from Eric and Boban.

Attending from ICANN Org, Jennifer, Steve and Brenda, technical writer Heather.

Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. And Russ, I'll turn the meeting over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. We also saw apologies from Denise. Okay, I notice that Alain is not here. Sorry, we need to do the second agenda item before we do the third. So, Jennifer, could you tell us when we expect to see answers to the outstanding questions?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. Thank you, Russ. So I sent some questions and answers to the list my time yesterday, so hopefully you've all received those. There's a second batch of questions with outstanding answers that we expect to get to the team in the coming weeks, being cognizant of the deadlines that the team has. Just to note that a lot of the questions require

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.

multiple functions to input, so we hope you understand it takes time to coordinate the responses.

I did have a specific comment on a question that KC asked last time about DAAR. I see that she's not yet on the call, but KC had asked for some more information about the work that is underway with regards to DAAR and how ICANN is measuring its effectiveness. So and his team, jump in if you like. But we suggest that that discussion is best to take place on a call. And I know that KC had asked for some written information just to point back to, but we can always record the call and post the transcript and everything to the Wiki so that that serves as an archive. But I can put that in an e-mail as well since I see KC again is not on the call. But that's where we are with the questions, and happy to answer any other questions that you guys have. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE:

Just to follow that up a little bit, my team's looking for relevant documentation or postings that we've already published to help set that stage and then hoping for that dialog that Jennifer said that we can record and transcribe to offset or enhance that information.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you, Steve and Jennifer. Any follow-up questions from the team? Okay, let's turn to topic three. So Alain had the action coming out of the call last week to put the public response things into the spreadsheet. He was going to talk about them today. I see he's not here, so we'll move on to the privacy grouping of subteams. Kerry Ann, I think you sent an e-mail to everybody with some responses. Can you walk us through that?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

[inaudible] Brenda or Jennifer if you put it on the screen, what I did is I went through all the privacy questions that they had. A lot of it was about, should ICANN be—the reference I had used in the justification of findings was related to a blog that ICANN had, but there's not much online about how ICANN treats data protection except for a page that speaks to data privacy and policy, and then a general page on privacy which is a part of their website only.

So in general, I think the concerns persons had was ensuring that the text did not try to make ICANN's obligations related to handling data privacy on the internet at large but only the data that they have in their possession. So I think in terms of what is actually stored and [cared for] at ICANN. I tried to change the language to make it more specific about data within their control. [Whether I think those] registrar/registry data is one thing. Whether that's the responsibility of ICANN or the registrars themselves or the registrants' data, but ICANN still has sight of that data.

So I tried to make it just broad enough that what we're asking for as a team is that ICANN had a specific—not just within Legal but a specific thing that monitors data protection and privacy changes, that ICANN just establish something that's very specific to be able to monitor the change, because I think GDPR is one thing, but I think in the privacy realm, it's evolving because as persons start to understand what their role is as a data controller, what's happening with the EU and China and the US relationship, I think data is going to change again soon, and I think ICANN as an organization should still have a specific unit dealing

with it. So I did not remove that recommendation for a specific group dedicated to monitoring privacy issues generally. Whether or not registrars are in charge of the registrants' info or not, ICANN still has [sight of] all of this data at some point or the other.

So the changes I've made was just to take out the reference that was problematic and to keep the recommendation that was in, and then I provided response in red in the table as to the action we took. So if anyone has any questions, let me know.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Kerry Ann, what is the document that we should be pointing the review team members to where you made the changes?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

I made the changes in the link that Russ had the last link that was sent as the master document. Russ had sent an e-mail with a Google doc. So I made the changes in that document and I included the link in the e-mail I sent, and because I didn't want to mess with the table, I copy pasted the sections related to privacy and put that in the body of the e-mail instead of in the Google docs that is monitoring the comments, because I didn't know how that was being managed.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Thank you. I can get that one.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So in the e-mail I sent, it has the comments. That's all related to privacy and [inaudible] put the changes in the e-mail, but I didn't try to include it in the Google doc because it was getting a little bit weird, so I decided to just put it in the text and whoever is the kind of master controller for that document, I made sure that you could—

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's Heather.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, I put it in the e-mail in red so you could include it. But I had done the changes directly in the Google doc link that Russ had sent the last time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So Jennifer, the e-mail you're looking for has a subject of "subteam space privacy."

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, I think I see Kerry Ann's changes. I posted the link into the chat there, and I believe it's page 59.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It sounds like there are changes in two places, in the doc and in the e-mail. What some other teams have done—

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, the changes are always going to be in two places, but one's in this doc, and she put it into the subteam one doc. And then there's the table to deal with the public comment response and that's what she included in her e-mail instead of editing the table.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Thanks Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I hope that helped everybody find it. Okay, we're looking at the changes to recommendation 29. And I think you explained what you did there, that made sense. The privacy and SSR measures.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: The one thing I didn't explain, there was one that was really problematic for all the groups that commented on it which was related to DNS. So I deleted that recommendation altogether because it doesn't add value to the privacy component of it, and I didn't want when the document goes out and it's finally published that persons kind of hone in to just that first section and ignore the other recommendations. Again, that's more specifically related to privacy. So everybody is okay with just deleting it, because it didn't add value, didn't take away value by it not being there, so the first one that was there, I deleted it altogether and

then just continued, because once we have a unit that's focused on it, it'll cover all the relevant data that should be under ICANN's purview.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So it was really a—trying to find the text where you deleted it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It was 29.2, it had text that had like a conclusion rather than just a specific recommendation, so I just went directly to incorporating safe management of protection and collection of data generally instead of specifying DNS and fragmentation.

I think persons had a lot of issue with why is this under our purview when you have other groups that deal with DNS specifically. So I just deleted that context because the fragmentation was proving very problematic.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Now I understand. I was looking for another recommendation and what you meant was a subpart of this.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, it was in 29.2, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. You also deleted 29.4, right?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think I did. Yeah, because it had a similar issue most persons had, and it didn't add value to the point we were trying to get to so I removed it as well. There's ones that I think we could have considered too. It doesn't take away from the essence of what we're trying to recommend.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Can we turn to the table that was in the e-mail where she recommends the responses to the public comments?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I think I'll have to share my screen to do that because it's in the e-mail rather than the table.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Go ahead, Kerry Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, what I did is this text that was recommended, we could just use [directly] as a response. So I explained in the second one that pretty much the person was trying to say that was something that we should not include because they think it's something that I guess is done or addressed already, but I tried to explain and give justification that for us, it's more that data isn't something that's going away anytime soon. And while we can't see what ICANN's configuration is now, it's going to be something that's going to be an issue in future. So actually, putting in measured now to handle it becomes an automatic security concern

because if the data is breached, that's when security comes in so you can't exclude data from security [inaudible] trying to set up privacy is not an SSR2 consideration, really, but you can't exclude the two. They're interrelated while not completely dependent. So I tried to put in an explanation based on that, the relationship between a chief data officer and a CISO which we've recommended, how critical it is. Any questions on that one? This is text, I think, that we could actually put in and [that's why I correlated it to recommendation 6.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, we may want to include some of this in the findings related to recommendation 6.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I don't know, who has pen for recommendation 6? I think it's our group, right? The compliance group.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think it is.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay, so we could probably do that then. [inaudible] tell us exactly where, but I think it would be good to help explain our thinking as well for the public response.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, just to confirm, recommendation 6 is risk following the CISO position. Sorry, it is the CISO position.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's the creation of the CISO position.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Apologies. So Kerry Ann, that's actually yours so you can literally do whatever.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Russ, probably tell me exactly when you kind of [get time to] look at it, tell us what aspect of it we should incorporate. We'd made amendments to that section as well which Laurin will talk about. So I think probably when we get there, we could probably what from this we would want to incorporate.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just the interdependency between privacy and security, that part was what I was talking about.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. Jennifer, you could probably put that as an action for me, that once we have kind of have a wider group acceptance of the proposed changes that [Laurin's going to] present, I could then [refer them to it.]

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Thank you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: If there's no other questions, that's it for me. The other aspects are really shorter comments because I incorporated or deleted based on what the issues were. So if you're okay with it, then I guess Heather could copy the response here into the master document if that's all right.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Of course.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great. Okay, are there any questions or clarifications from the team for the output of the privacy subteam? Okay, hearing none, we'll move on to the next one which I think is Laurin and the risk subteam.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. I believe so. If we could put up the document that I said is the clean version/easy read because the other one is so full of markup it's hard to see what's going on. While that's coming up, just to give you a quick summary, essentially, we made quite a few changes to structure, changed the order of recommendations around in the hopes that we're creating a clear and narrow [inaudible] clear and logical flow for what

we're trying to say and how these things are relating to each other or are interdependent.

Essentially, what you can see now in the easy read is what we came up with. This is already in the new structure that we decided we want to adopt. Because of the changes we thought were necessary, it wouldn't have made sense to not edit this.

So essentially, the whole section now is the key stability issues within ICANN. It starts with a larger kind of analysis of the situation, we then speak about C-suite security position which has various edits, so if you go to the other document that was in the e-mail, you can see specifically what we have done. It was quite a lot. We do not think that the kind of direction of our recommendations have changed. We may indeed try to clarify.

So essentially, we're talking about creating the position of someone who is at executive level who will take care of security followed by risk and security management which was recommendation 7, so you can see we still have the old numbering in there so that it doesn't get completely confusing. We clarified that one. Following general risk management, we go into information security management systems and certifications, followed by what was SSR2 recommendation 3—titled as such—about best practices and outreach to then have another kind of big section of business continuity and disaster recovery where we have axed number nine and included eight and nine into one. This was one of the requests and one that we think made sense.

There were additional requests to merge, for example when it comes to risk management, the ISMS. One comment for example was if they do compliance with—I can't remember what the exact relationship was because all of this is interdependent. So you could just not have this recommendation, but we chose to essentially keep the narrative going and kind of go from okay, have someone in charge, they do the risks, they do the security management part, then because of ICANN's kind of special situation, there's something to be said about transparency and disclosure, to then go into business continuity and disaster recovery which we said, yes, this makes sense to have as one because they are so strongly coupled.

I know this is a lot of text. I think it's like nine pages. So definitely just put in your comments later on, and happy to answer all the questions. I think apart from Kerry Ann and myself, I'm not sure anyone from the team is on the call, at least during the roll call there wasn't, I believe. Oh, Norm has arrived. So we have three people who were involved in this and hopefully can answer all the questions.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, I read it before. You sent the link. And I thought it was really good, it's very clear that within the team, you've already made an editing pass at least once. I do think the interdependency between security and privacy should probably come in in the discussion before recommendation 6, somewhere around page 29. That's my suggestion. But other than that, I thought it looked really good.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Laurin, can you put just a comment? Probably where Russ is thinking, and at least that'll be a placeholder for me.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, so I'll put it in our working doc, one that doesn't have all the changes accepted. Just so you know where it is.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's the one I was looking at.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, I realized this one was, again, so messy that someone who wants to have a quick read would struggle. That's why I provided [too much.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand, but I was more interested in what's changed. Anyone else?

NORM RITCHIE: Just a quick thing. This is part of the discussion we had within the subteam. In 7.1, it has adopt and implement ISO 31000, and then it says validate and certify. You can't certify that one. The risk management ISO standard, there's no certification for that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, did we—

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, we just need to take it—we can validate it. Don't need to certify it. [inaudible] take it out now.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're saying you can validate but you can't certify.

NORM RITCHIE: You can validate, you can't certify. There's no certification for risk management.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you. That's correct. We discussed this on the call.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible]. A lot of the confusion was what can be certified and what is best practice, basically.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thanks for catching that. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks Russ. Just looking at this with fresher eyes than I looked at it in the past or looked at it recently, something that's catching me right now is that the recommendation is not only creating or asking to create a new position but in essence is creating an office, and you reference OCTO as doing some things, and that is more than just David Conrad, it's an office of 21 people now.

In that, I would like to—I don't even know if it's recommend, but at least note that if it is indeed an office being created, it should reflect that. And although not asking to give it a specific number, I would recommend also putting that that office should have a budget that's relevant to complete its mission. Whatever that budget is, but just acknowledge that this isn't just a cost of hiring somebody, this is a cost of hiring somebody at an exec level, creating an office and that's inheriting some of the pieces that are already there, but also probably expanding on that, plus having enough budget to do the mission itself.

So I don't know if anyone—I apologize if it's not called out as explicitly as that, or if it is called out as explicitly as that but just something that I'm noticing right now. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yes. Thank you so much for that. There is a recommendation on budget which should be in that section, and that was not this group of people. So that one is not in there yet. And I will make a note to make this. I think in our discussions, Kerry Ann and Norm, correct me if I'm wrong, our idea is mainly about where this function and this position sits rather than kind of who is involved. So for us, the importance is, okay, should

not be somewhere under, it should be—the person responsible should have a seat at the table. And then obviously have some structure below and we should also probably clarify that a lot of this already exists, it would just have to kind of be retooled slightly.

I will definitely put this in, we'll discuss this on the call. Thank you. That's a really good point.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So Laurin, I think the budget recommendation is about transparency and being able to tell which items in the budget are SSR-related. So I don't think that is the kind of budget Steve was just talking about, which is make sure the CISO has an adequate budget to do their job.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yes. I just want to say there is something on budget which we didn't work on, that's why we didn't touch on it. And my feeling is it would mainly be a kind of redistribution of funds, but as I said, this is probably something we should discuss in more detail in the subteam and probably rope in the people from recommendation four, which is the talk about budget which is [true, it's mainly] transparency.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

That's my point, is I think there are two different aspects of budget. Okay, so Laurin, you've gotten a little bit of feedback. What is the plan, and have you yet the responses to the public comments?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I did not understand the last one of the public comment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's a column in the table of the public comments where we were going to put a response. Has the team gotten to that yet?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: We copied it out so we can kind of play around with it. It's in a Google doc. I believe it's also in an e-mail I sent. It is mostly done. Might need some language edits, but we made sure that for each comment, there is an action, sometimes a general action and a response, sometimes it just says "see the action" because the action contains our response. But yes, this is done, and as you can see, we have a table which definitely needs some work in the document as well which links to the kind of big question of why and the smart criteria. We also have a general one, but again, it seemed more appropriate to not kind of write into that right away. So if someone has anything on that, please, let us know as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: For some reason, I only opened the first two links and not the third one. I see it's there. Is there anything you want to highlight in that table, like why is one of them orange?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think that was a board comment and we made that one orange to make sure we look at that in detail. There's also one from ICANN Org. It's just for us, there's no other reason than to highlight them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You weren't trying to draw the team's attention to [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, do you think this table gives you what you need to pull it into your table?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: There's so many tables.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But one of them, you own.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It sounds like I hold the pen on most of them, so I'm not actually sure which table you're talking about.

RUSS HOUSLEY: In Laurin's e-mail ...

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Which I haven't had a chance to look at yet, came in yesterday.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It did, but the third link which takes forever to open, I have no idea why.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The one that says all our comments and actions?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So we'll wait two minutes for it to open.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Popped open right quick for me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. If you would—because the response and the action are kind of different, I think, than you intended. That's why I'm asking.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I can work with this. And if I have questions, I'll ask.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And just so you know, the actions, just one quick thing though. Heather, when you look at the actions, actions is really to get consensus for a subteam. So each of us had kind of just explained our thinking to the subteam and actions part, but the response is actually what we're proposing to go in the public comment document, not the action table, the action column. The action column is really just our logic, thinking for internal discussion within the team, and the responses what is for the public-facing aspect of it that we recommend that that text could be used for putting into the public comment document that's publicly available.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But the action shouldn't be in anything, that's really just our blah-blah thinking.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Fair enough.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Having seen this, what's next for this team? Are you thinking you're done and it's now over to—other than adding that one paragraph about the security and privacy part near page 29?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think that's one, yes, and the other one would be to address kind of Steve's comment on the budgeting. [We definitely have to kind of pull in] the recommendation 4 under budget transparency, because that might need to have a bit of a rework and be included here as well, because this part is truly missing in the narrative that we tried to create and Steve was very right to pick up on that. So I think that's the other one we need to discuss and rope in the team that has been doing number four.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Do you think you'd be able to report that out next week?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: We can try.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Very good. Okay. The next agenda item is the abuse subteam, which since Denise is not here, I think Laurin, you're pinch hitting.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Okay. So essentially, abuse is moving, but it is moving more slowly, as I always say. Still looking for Denise's e-mail that contained the table we're looking at. Okay, so essentially, we were looking at recommendations 10 and 11. We haven't done the redlines of those even though in the table, there is some text examples. Could we open that one? Because I think that would help.

JENNIFER BRYCE: We're not sure what table we're looking at now, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, I'm also having trouble locating this one. I have it. Kerry Ann, do you know where Denise sent it to or when?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: She sent it last night. Who should I forward it to?

JENNIFER BRYCE: You can send it to me or Brenda or both. Or the whole team.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's forwarded now.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so I'll just talk through it. Essentially, we have kind of a summary now for what's going on. Again, these are so many comments that while we will do the same as the risk team, as in go through one by one and create a response to kind of show, A, that we tried to really address what's going on and show our diligence here, we can say that for 10, which is the framework to define and measure registrant, registry compliance, we got support broadly from GAC, BC, [inaudible] and IPC, again, broadly, with NCSG, the registries and registrars, I think it should

go through PDP and SSAC agrees with the intent. And there are various more specific questions here as well.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Just a quick one. I just sent it, but Denise's e-mail just had one link which is just our assignment, how we broke up the team. So it would just give you guys a general update from how she had summarized it in terms of how we're approaching it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yeah. So essentially, what we're thinking about here, we're considering to merge this with recommendation 17 and 18. We kind of do not want to end up with the position where kind of nothing is strong enough and no one is empowered to do anything so it's a kind of eternal stalemate. We want to think about who should establish the performance metrics for this recommendation and to kind of think about how abuse can be appropriately incorporated in relevant negotiations.

So we're planning to do the redline, I think we said on call, within the next week and we have on schedule for next week. With recommendation 11, we have concerns expressed that there's an overlap with existing work, which I think is something that happens a lot with this review in general. There's a variety of clarification questions for that one. And yeah, some of the board comments on this one relate to some of the relevant stuff being out of scope, potentially.

So this is, by the way, the commitment and abuse definitions. So here we're thinking about condensing the recommendation and kind of

trying to make it more applicable and to allow for this to kind of go ahead and work it slightly differently.

Recommendation 12, again, it's a question of how this will be scoped. Support comes from various parties, others are not supportive, so we always, with abuse, kind of have some constituencies being very happy and some not being so happy.

And yeah, for this one, we're still trying to go ahead and rephrase this because this essentially touches on WHOIS data. I'll just stick with WHOIS. I know the name is changing.

So essentially, the question here is about, okay, we're talking about something that already has an EPDP attached to it. On the other hand, there is a clear relevance of this to security and abuse, so again, we're thinking about how can we address the comments and make sure that this shows what we're thinking but it's not causing some trouble in terms of implementation.

Number 13, this is about DAAR. We're considering to merge 13 and 14. 14 is about quantitative analysis of what's going on regarding abuse. So quite a few community groups talk about improving DAAR, and essentially, I think this one, we're mainly talking about language changes more than anything else.

So 14 is on the enabling rigorous quantitative analysis, and this one I think will just fold 13 and 14 into one where it's about, okay, going forward, certain data should be shared and should be kind of required to be shared, but not like any immediate changes right now.

15 and 16 are both about contracts, the kind of mitigation to DNS abuse contract changes. Here we're also thinking about doing a merger of 15 and 16, and we would like to kind of, again, as before, ask the ccTLDs if they have an interest to also [inaudible].

So again, like 16, we believe will be folding in with 15. And here we have to clarify the text and unilateral contract changes are obviously not something we're recommending, so we have to clarify this.

17, this is the central abuse report portal, and we're considering to merge this with [18] because we will kind of develop this probably in the direction of this being more operational.

There was one note on abuse e-mails being required, which is true, so we'll think about if there's a way to kind of implement this part of the recommendation in a way that kind of works with what is currently in place. Where was I? Okay, 18 was about kind of how to organize compliance function differently. This is mainly about providing a better—kind of siloing off the compliance function that we discussed many times, and we were thinking about merging this with like 17 and 10 under a new heading that's called Compliance.

And then 19 which is on kind of misleading naming, abusive naming, whatever. So here, we are also considering the merge into another recommendation which is 11 in this case to essentially deal with this. So again, we have an insane amount of comments. I say this every time. This is 164 comments in this table right now, so these are very general actions and it is just taking a while to go through this one by one. And KC on the call yesterday for example mentioned, "Okay, I looked at

them, I wrote down comments but a lot of it needs discussion, a lot of that, we need to clarify on call.” So it’s steady but slow, essentially. Risk had far fewer comments, so I think we could push that along better. Okay, hope that was at least somewhat helpful. No text yet, unfortunately.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I'm not surprised at the part where abuse is the part of the report that got the high volume of comments. I don't think anyone is. So, are there any concerns with the approach that this subteam is taking?

That’s good to hear, but I think we’re going to have to have the text before we do a thorough review. Are there any subteams that are ready to report out who did not send me e-mail in advance to get on the agenda?

Okay, so I think the actions for the team are to take a look at the risk that was only sent last night, so some of you I'm sure did not have a chance to read it in advance so that we can raise any issues on that next time. So we will return to recommendation 27 on the next call. Privacy, I think we’re done with unless there's any comments because people didn't have a chance to read it.

Risk, we’ll revisit next week since the text was actually delivered so late. And hopefully, abuse will be further along next time, and hopefully we’ll have other teams to report out next week. I want to remind you about a note that was sent, I think out on Monday, that we’re looking for all of the subteams to finish by 1 July.

Last time, KC had made the recommendation that a deadline be set and any team that doesn't finish by that deadline, that we drop their recommendations. What we're going to do is a little less harsh. Any team that has not delivered by 1 July, we will have a whole team discussion about what the best thing to do is. But note that what that means is people who even volunteered to work on that topic are not finding the time to do so. So the call around 1 July is where we will deal with any teams that have been unresponsive. Any questions about that?

Okay, is there Any Other Business we need to talk about? Okay, Jennifer, is there anything to raise in the confirmed actions other than what I just summarized?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

No Russ, I think you summarized it pretty well. And just to note, I took the specific action as well for Kerry Ann to make the updates to the recommendation 6 to include the privacy text. But other than that, you covered it. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. I think if you got that specific, Laurin adding adequate budget should also be there.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Okay, I'll note that too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right then, we give you five minutes back. Thank you, and look forward to talking again next week.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you all.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks everyone. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]