BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call Number 123 on the 1st of October, 2020 at 14:00 UTC. The review team members attending today include Boban, Danko, Kaveh, Ramkrishna, Laurin, Russ, Eric, and Zarko. We have observer Dennis Tan on the call. And apologies from Jennifer. ICANN Org, we have Steve, Brenda, and Charla is filling in for Jennifer. And our technical writer, Heather, is on the call. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Russ, I'll turn the meeting over to you. Thank you.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Could you put up the bar chart?
BRENDA BREWER:	Yep.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	While Brenda's finding the bar chart … There we go. The idea is to see if we can finish off the bottom part of this chart today and then move to the status update on the middle piece that's missing, which is the abuse collection of subteams. And if that is the case, we will have something, roughly next week, for Heather to begin working on. So, that's the objective. We'll see if we can get to consensus. We're going to start with number 23. And is Zarko on the call?
ZARKO KECIC:	[Inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: I would say yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can you take us through where the subteam is on 23.

ZARKO KECIC: Yes. We submitted a response to … Let me find it in the document. Yeah—a response to the comments we had about recommendation 23. And we are considering in changing terminology because the title of recommendation is not appropriate. And we should explain what we meant by accelerating security issues in the root zone management system—existing one and that should be used in new, which is under development and we don't know what is status of that new system.

EN

And also, we decided to remove, because it has to do something with stability of the system but our comment was, based on several places where new root management system was presented and there were some issues—for example, change of delegation of top-level domains to be automated … And we believed that it should go through the public comments and the PDP process before it is implemented. But it just doesn't have to do anything with the security and stability directly. And we decided to propose to remove that part of the recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anyone want to push back on the direction that subteam has proposed? Okay. The proposed text, you put in a Google Doc?

ZARKO KECIC: No. I put only responses in the Excel sheet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, Brenda, can you bring up the public response sheet and scroll down to recommendation 23? It's a long way down. Heather says line 220. There we go. Okay. Scroll down one more line please. There we go.

So, there, the first part is where Zarko was talking about the change in terminology. And okay. Next row, please. And then, the part about where he was talking about dropping 23.2.

BRENDA BREWER: I'm sorry. This doesn't scroll real easy.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. And I think you're now down to 24.

BRENDA BREWER: Is this the one you want? Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Okay. So, Heather, what …? Do you need more than this to do the update?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Let me think about that for a moment. No. I think I can work with this. Yeah. That should be fine.

ZARKO KECIC: We can work together, Heather. I can send something and you will help me out to—

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Or I can … Let me go ahead and make the change, and I'll send it to you, and you tell me if I got it right.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. Great. Thank you.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. I'm not hearing anyone speak against this direction. Okay. Let's move to 25. Is KC on the call? KC is not on the call. All right. Let's skip that one for now and come back to it. Hopefully she joins late. Zarko, can you take us through the EBERO one? Is it in the same spreadsheet?
ZARKO KECIC:	Yes.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay.
ZARKO KECIC:	Let me find where it is. Okay. There are a couple of comments on the EBERO process. And in the response, I believe we tried to explain what we meant by "testing." And there are a couple questions to explain what is smoke testing, and request to provide measurements, and a way how to proceed with this. We should look at the EBERO as a disaster recovery system for failing TLDs. And we believe that ICANN should define and propose measurable action items and timelines—how they are going to do all this testing.

And only what we are proposing is to use—not to check all domain names, gTLDs, which are under EBERO process but to use anonymized and dummy datasets because of GDPR and other privacy issues. So, the idea is to check EBERO process from declaring EBERO, sending data from escrow service to ICANN, and from ICANN to EBERO operator, and to see how it's going and what is timeline of that. Can they meet SLA? |

EN

And what can be improved? So, it would be treated at testing of DR policies.

And second part is that there are … Yeah. We requested a publication or a document. There are not much documents or information on ICANN's die. So, review team should request from ICANN to document and describe entire process, procedure, with diagrams and photos and also to clearly define the decision points and how an EBERO event is declared.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That makes sense to me. I saw, in chat, a couple agreements.

ZARKO KECIC: And also, here are two questions about smoke testing. I just put explanation there. And we should change "smoke testing" to just "testing" because they believe that, at first part, to explain what we expect from ICANN. It is clear that we do not need deep testing but just to be sure that the process works and EBERO operators are ready to take over if needed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Boban and Steve, do you want to bring your discussion to the recording, please?

EN

STEVE CONTE:	Sorry. I have unruly puppies so I was double muted. So, I don't have any issues with the language at all. I'm just looking—trying to look forward because at the time that this report is submitted to the Board, it essentially closes the review team, other than shepherds. And this recommendation is now saying that ICANN should propose these measurements and things like that. And I just would … I think it would be good for ICANN and good for SSR3 to have clarity on to whom ICANN should propose these measurements.

And I see Boban responded. And I'm okay. I just think that that should be explicit, in my opinion, if it's going to go in as such. Otherwise, there could be ambiguity when SSR3 launches. And the review could be difficult on this item. Thanks. |
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Boban, do you want to put a few words into the spreadsheet to make that clear?
BOBAN KRSIC:	Yes. I can do that afterwards. So, an idea would be to say, "Okay. Come on. Let's propose it to the Contracted Parties." So, we have the EBERO operator. We have escrow agent. And Zarko and I will draft some text and put it into the spreadsheet.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you.

BOBAN KRSIC: You're welcome.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Heather, assuming that the slightly-revised text is clear, do you need anything else from Boban and Zarko on recommendation 26?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I have a very ignorant question. Is there any reason … Since this is talking a bit about, basically, disaster recovery, should we move it up into the business continuity section?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it's about disaster recovery of non-ICANN-run systems. So, no.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I get how you got there. But they're providing the disaster recovery for other root zone owners.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Got you. Thank you.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Anyone have concerns with where this subteam landed? Not hearing any. Okay. Did KC join while we were talking about that?
BRENDA BREWER:	KC did not join.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. So, let's move to 28. Naveed sent some—a plea for some help to the list a couple days ago. I didn't see anyone respond. So, if Naveed is on the call, I'd like him to bring his questions here and maybe we can help him. Is Naveed not here?
BRENDA BREWER:	Naveed is not here.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Oh, boy. Is either Noorul or Ram …? Can you …? You're also on the subteam. Can either of you explain what the open issue is?
BRENDA BREWER:	Ramkrishna, your line is muted. He has a mic issue.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	He has a mic issue? Okay. If people will go to their email, we'll look at the note from Naveed. He says, "With reference to public comments regarding recommendation 28, I need the team's input to proceed further." There are many aspects of this recommendation that he is not

personally familiar with. Attached is a spreadsheet, where you find his responses. "Please look at the attached file and see if it makes sense."

"I also need advice related to row five, eight, and nine of the attached file. Regarding row five, the comment from RySG is inquiring whether our recommendation is also related to TLD or it only applies to the second level." So, can anyone help with that question? And then, we'll take the other two rows he needs help with. So, this is a developer report about frequency of measuring name collisions and a proposed solution.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Russ, which line are we on? Sorry. I know you just said it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Five.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Five of the spreadsheet he sent in his mail. Basically, the public comment is concerned about, "Unclear how this recommendation overlaps with the NCAP studies. Is it possible that the RT is referring to malicious name collisions at the second level and not inadvertent collisions at the top level?"

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I haven't been tracking exactly where the text is. I do recall that we had something, at least before, that said that it should—that our recommendation should be commensurate with the NCAP study. So, my guess is, from this comment, that that text is unclear—maybe got dropped or something like that.

But I do think, probably, we could address this comment by saying, even at just the beginning, instead of developer report, say, "Consistent with NCAP and its evolving direction. SSR2 is supportive of developing a report," and then just leave the rest there because I think, nominally, this fits into NCAP. And NCAP is going forward, though I personally haven't been able to track it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, "Consistent with NCAP and its evolution ..." Is that what you said?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Something like that—its evolution, its continued … Yeah. I think that would be perfect, personally. And I know Heather can fix my terrible wording.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I will put together a response on that one for Naveed. He said the next one he needs help with is row eight. This is from SSAC, who basically were calling for an independent study. And SSAC says its unclear what we want. And how is this …? And are we asking for something that is independent of NCAP?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, my take is that this statement was designed to throw—to support the NCAP undertaking and that whatever needs to be done to it to disambiguate that, that's my root of our statement. And I think it's responsive to the SSAC comment. So no, it's not saying, "Let's do something different than NCAP," or, "Let's rewrite NCAP." It's saying, "We think NCAP is a good idea."

So, I'll note that that looks like … Unfortunately, that's slightly in contrast to what I see Naveed has penned in the column E. So, we need to make sure that that's okay with Naveed and the team. But my read on it is that this is sort of saying, from first principals, that something like an NCAP is a good idea. And so, it's tacitly lending support. So, maybe that just needs to be more explicit.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I will tell him it's intended to be support of NCAP. And he asks for row nine. He says, "I need your input on how to make the reporting mechanism smart." So, community reporting of name collisions … This report should allow appropriate handling of sensitive data and security threats and should be rolled into community reporting metrics.

BRENDA BREWER: Russ, Naveed just joined the call.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hi, Naveed. We're talking about row nine of your spreadsheet. So, does anybody have any ideas about how to make the community reporting of instances of name collision?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I like Naveed's comments in column E a lot more than, I guess, our initial comments. So, I don't know. I think if the team is supportive of Naveed's comments, they seem to make sense. In summary, the way I read this is column C is saying, "Name collisions need to be measured and reported on." And It looks to me like SSAC is saying, "Well, report what? Seems like mumble, mumble." And then, column A looks like it's saying, "Well, you could say we have Controlled Interruption. So, what's the problem?" But we've never measured whether Controlled Interruption actually works. So, we need to reassess. And think that's a very salient comment. But that's just my take.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Hello. Can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Sorry for being late.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. It's okay. Let me tell you where we are. Okay. We went through your spreadsheet because no one did it on the email. And so, on row five, we're suggesting that we add, to the front of the section, that we want something done that is consistent with NCAP and its evolution, so as to be clear that we are supporting NCAP, not trying to do something independent of NCAP.

I think what was confusing was what "independent" meant and whether the … And we're looking for things that are—the ability to be able to report throughout the tree, not just at the top level, which points to the evolution. And that kind of overlaps with the response to eight, where, no, we're intending to be supportive of NCAP here, not replace it.

And then, on nine, Eric has proposed that your words are great and that the point is we want to be able to measure whether controlled interruption works. Does that make sense? And if I send these notes to you on-list so everybody can see them, does this give you what you need to go forward.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Sure. So, there were some comments, from, I think, from Business, or some Business Constituency or something, that I could not understand. I mentioned that in the email as well. So, I'm not sure if we had the chance to discuss that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Your email, we went through line-by-line. I don't see anything about that. It says, "Attached are the public comments and my proposed

responses. Please look at the attached file. I especially need your help with rows five, eight, and nine." So, that's what we did—five, eight, and nine.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. Five, eight, and nine. I think row five, I'm talking about … Yeah. That's okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Good. All right. I will send you this. And then, if you could put together the proposed replacement text—

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: - based on that. That would be super. Okay. Thank you. And thank you for joining, even if you were late.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Thanks a lot. Sorry for being late.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I think we now, then, on your team, have drafted text. And we need you to, then, put it together into the Google Doc.

EN

Okay. Moving on to recommendation 29. There's been some discussion on email between KC and Kerry-Ann. Sorry. Her name popped out of my head for a moment. KC is recommending that we delete this recommendation altogether.

And Kerry-Ann is not supportive of that. But she says that while this was something to consider in the future workstream, when the team got started, it is now clearly not just future. There's a whole lot been done with GDPR, for example. And there's a webpage we can point to. But at the same time, based on the communique from the GAC, they think there's more to be done. And she wants this review to be supportive of that GAC statement.

So, please tell me where the rest of the team is on this one. Come on, guys. Help me.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi. Is this relating to …? Which …? I'm sorry. I—

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is recommendation 39 on privacy—I'm sorry, 29 on privacy.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, I'd like to understand, broadly, what change would be made to align it to the GAC recommendation. I was supportive of the initial thrust of the significant challenges ICANN continues to have to deal with privacy within its remit and responsibilities, let alone staying ahead of new initiatives. So, I also thought it was a worthwhile intention but

would be interested in hearing, if Kerry-Ann's on the call, what the more recent GAC recommendations are in this area.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, she sent a note yesterday that basically said—quoted one paragraph from the GAC minority statement on August 24th. "The GAC acknowledges that under applicable data protection rules, including GDPR, Contracted Parties will likely remain responsible for the decision whether to face domain name registration data and may face certain liability risks related to that decision. GAC understands that Contracted Parties have, therefore, sought to maintain control over the discussion whether to disclose domain name registration data.

"GAC notes, however, that those decentralized decisions, whether to disclose the data, are largely exempt from challenge and enforcement action, notably by ICANN Compliance. Registration data is important for the security and stability of the DNS and there is a real concern that Contracted Parties, may inadvertently or purposely, not probably weigh the public interest of the requestor to obtain such data.

"ICANN's CEO has recently conveyed this very concern to the European Data Protection Board, pointing out that due to a lack of legal certainty, registrars, as controllers, are likely to evaluate privacy and data protection in absolute terms, without considering other rights and legitimate interests, to avoid possible regulatory sanctions or a judgment against them. Denials of a legitimate request to access domain name registration data have real consequences."

So, I think Kerry-Ann has highlighted a point that needs to be sorted out by the community. But it's not clear how to turn that into a smart recommendation text, which I think is what KC's point is.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. It becomes much too detailed and complicated. And this snippet, of course, doesn't address the responsibility that all entities have to respond to cybersecurity and criminal matters, in addition to complying with GDPR, which most of the companies of the world do now. The approach being sought by Contracted Parties of absolutely no liability in this area and absolute certainty is not in-line with the approach taken by the rest of the world.

And I think, given where we are, it would be really challenging to do a deep dive into these issues. And I think it would be more appropriate to say what's the general thrust that we have of asking ICANN to ensure that there's appropriate resources focused on existing and proposed privacy and how that can be addressed, consistent with its responsibilities, to advance its security and stability goals.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. So, to that end, Kerry-Ann, at the bottom of her note, recommends that we … She says, "I'd like to propose that we had agreed on the call that we would develop new text that should still capture—" I think this was a call between her and KC because I don't remember this— "that would capture the issues and the need for Compliance to have a stronger role in the process, which is the basis of the original recommendation 29."

So, I think if there's support for that, then we can ask Kerry-Ann to go back and look at the text some more, hopefully with KC, so we can avoid another impasse here. Striving for consensus, is what I'm saying. What do other people think? Is this …? My gut says we have to say something about this because it is a security and stability issue. What do others think?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I was supportive of 29.1—of ICANN monitoring and regularly reporting on privacy-related developments, both technological and I think we covered legislative [regulators] in that. I'm open to looking at revisions.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. I think that our thinking—now we're going back quite a ways— was we have no data available to make any recommendations deeper than, "Get us data so SSR3 can figure out an even better way to go." Does that memory resonate with anyone else or am I totally misremembering it?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Russ, just as a note, Heather, KC, and also I all have hands up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I'm on a different screen, obviously.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'll let the two of them go first. I'm not sure who was first.

KC CLAFFY: I was not first. KC was not first. I saw two other hands up.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I guess that leaves me. If this ties … If the resulting changes tie so tightly to compliance and making sure that this is being covered and measured that way, should it move into the work that that abuse team is doing?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I will respond because this is exactly what I wanted to propose, as well. This seems to work and align well with the abuse section, in my opinion, as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. KC?

KC CLAFFY: Oh, goody. I don't have to say too much, either. When you said, "Should this go into compliance?" I just assume and hope you mean the other kind of compliance—not compliance with privacy law but compliance with what's in the contracts. And what I had said to Kerry-Ann, but then everyone ignored the text, was that I do want to put it back on that— put something on this issue in that section.

EN

But I will assert that I don't think the issue here is that ICANN should stay abreast of privacy regulations. I think I would have been willing to say that in 2018, when I think there was a lot of head-in-the-sand behavior going on, with respect to GDPR. I don't think that is the case anymore. I think ICANN is quite well-aware of privacy regulations around the world. They're in a different … They're just … My impression is that they feel their hands are tied, somewhat, with respect to what the rest of the community—in particular the Contracted parties—are feeling. And I think the GAC text that Russ read earlier sums it up quite well. And I'd be happy to quote that entire segment in the draft and just change this to another problem.

Frankly, I don't think … One, I don't think that ICANN respecting or staying aware of privacy regulation is the SSR issue. I think the SSR issue is access to RDAP data. And that should be covered in the section—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. I agree with that.

KC CLAFFY: Right. So, I think that should be covered in the section of the report about access to RDAP data. And we should not even imply that we believe ICANN isn't staying abreast of the law because, one, we're not experts in that. I don't think we know. And frankly, to the extent that we have data on the website, I think ICANN is staying aware of the privacy issues—of the privacy legislations around the world.

EN

I just don't think they have the ability to overcome the dynamics in the industry, as the GAC has said. This is just not an issue that ICANN can solve anymore. And I'm more than willing to say that in the report. Like, "Look. We have reached a point where an SSR recommendation on this topic will not be effective so we are not going to make one."

However, on the compliance issue and the access to RDAP data, we can say, "This is still an SSR problem. If ICANN can't solve it, as GAC has said, other avenues will be taken to solve it." And we should just say that, flat out. We should not say … I don't want to pretend that ICANN can solve an issue the ICANN cannot solve, in my best assessment of the situation, even if it's in the Bylaws.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. Okay. So, KC, I think that, based on her picking this paragraph as the one to quote back, I think she would probably agree with you. Can you put some text on the mail list and reply to Kerry-Ann?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Although, again, this will be easier once the report gets to a point where I can see what is where. Like, where is the compliance stuff talked about? So, that's another reason I hadn't put text before. It's like I don't know where what remains of 29 should go in the report.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, Laurin and Heather have both suggested maybe it goes into the abuse piece because that is talking about the ICANN Compliance organization.

DENISE MICHEL: Can I get in the queue?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Please.

DENISE MICHEL: So, yeah. As I recall, through these conversations in the past, it wasn't … The impetus for this issue being discussed was that not only was ICANN not keeping abreast of key privacy legislation and regulations, that their engagement in the few that they were aware of and involved in was not informed by the serious security and stability impacts of what was being proposed, how ICANN and Contracted Parties were proposing to interpret it and implement it. It was the security and stability impacts of existing and proposed privacy laws that, as I recall, was the genesis for this.

And even today, I think there are many that are quite concerned that there is not enough understanding, awareness, or engagement by ICANN on the security and stability implications of where they are now, with their interpretation and implementation, or lack thereof, of GDPR. And I'd be happy to work with you, KC and Kerry, to see if we can update this draft to accommodate—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin?

DENISE MICHEL: - our various comments.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I thought you were done.

DENISE MICHEL: I am. Yes. Go ahead.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin, your hand's up.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. So, I just wanted to say I agree very much with what KC said and also Denise. I think it just makes sense for us to put this on the list for things to include into the abuse section because it makes sense there logically. Both Kerry-Ann and KC are part of the subteam. So, I think we just … If we can take an action to discuss this in the context of the restructured abuse section that not everyone has seen yet and see if can get it there, I think that would work. And then, we can report back where we ended up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We have just a few minutes left. What I'm thinking is now that 29 is part of the abuse section. Hopefully, we'll be hearing about that next week. Zarko, my understanding is where recommendation 31 landed is

that you want to withdraw it. Has anything been put in the public comment spreadsheet about this one?

ZARKO KECIC: Yes. I tried to explain why we put that separately from 29. And you can look at that explanation in response to the comments. And our proposal is to drop this because of us trying, from the beginning, to find out how ICANN can help, within its remit, with this one. And we couldn't find a way that ICANN can deal with these issues. The most important part is abusive implementation of the agent. And I already cannot say what ICANN can do there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anyone have concerns?

ZARKO KECIC: And Russ, I would like to add one thing that I forgot about EBERO. There was a proposal that escrow service directly send data to EBERO operator. But Boban and I looked at that. And there will be much more problems than what we are trying to solve there, to get the faster process. So, we'll drop that line that's, I believe, 26.3.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, basically, you're saying keep the current workflow but make it go back—

ZARKO KECIC:	Yes, from escrow to ICANN and from ICANN to EBERO. So, that way ICANN can control the process and they cannot blame each other if something goes wrong. So, that is one of the points. And another thing is we requested measurements so ICANN can keep track of SLA and how EBERO and escrow services were responding to declaration of EBERO process.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. That makes sense to me, now that you explained that. I thought we were just trying to eliminate an unnecessary leg in the triangle. But that makes sense. Okay. Heather, does that addition make it harder for you to do the text or are we good?
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	I think we're fine.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Don't want to put you out on a limb that I—by accident.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	No! Do it on purpose.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Exactly. Okay. So, I'm hearing … Let's go back to 31. Anybody have any concerns with the recommendation of the subgroup that we drop this? Okay. Given that we're down to four minutes, I don't see much point in getting a report on the abuse team at this point. There's a big block of

EN

work going on there. We're going to hear about next week. And we just added 29 to it. So, that will mean they're going to cover 10 through 19 plus 29 next week. And Naveed, you have the action to finish 28, given the input. And I'll email that to you. And KC, is there—

KC CLAFFY: I know, I know. It'll be done, 25. I'm a deadbeat. I'll do it by next week.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: I know I keep saying that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's exactly where I was going.

KC CLAFFY: I keep saying that so you have no reason to believe me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. You're a deadbeat.

KC CLAFFY: I am, I am.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: But you're going to deliver next week.

KC CLAFFY: End of fiscal year deadbeat. I had like six big reports to write this month.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, thank you all. Is there any other business we need to do before we bring this to a close? Okay. Last thing is a reminder that slides for the webinar on the 7th of October were sent out on the email. If anyone has comments on them, please respond to the email. I think they're very straightforward about where we are and doesn't … We purposely did not include anything that would box us in to prevent any changes to the first part in dealing with the public comments. But please take a look at them. It's a short slide deck. Let me know if there's any concerns. Because that happens—that webinar happens before our next call.

Okay. So, if I don't see anything from the email, say, by Monday then I'll assume they're okay. All right. Thank you all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, everyone.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Please do your action items. We have a lot to finish next week.

BOBAN KRSIC: Thank you. Bye.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thanks, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]