BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call on the 19th of November 2020 at 15:00 UTC. Members attending the call today include Alain, Boban, Danko, Kaveh, Laurin, Ram Krishna, Russ, Scott, and Denise. From ICANN Org we have Jennifer, Steve, Brenda, and technical writer Heather.

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

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, the first thing on the agenda is to talk about the abuse team rewrite. The goal is to get to a point where we can turn this over to Heather so that she has two weeks to produce a document for us to go through and make sure we have consensus; and then after that, to deal with any of the things that have not been closed regarding SSR1.

It's a rearrangement that is moving the recommendations out into the main body which kind of created findings that didn't go anywhere. And Heather's been fixing those.

So, Laurin or Denise, I don't know which one of you is going to lead us through the doc.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:	I half-prepped a little bit on this. Denise, if you want to do it, go ahead; otherwise, I can do it and you can jump in wherever. Okay. I assume that means yes.

So essentially, we had comments coming in from KC, myself, and Kerry-Ann in particular. And obviously, Denise, made various additions to the text holding the pen after the last week's call where we discussed the way forward.

I have a list of things that I think we should talk about where it seems there is no agreement yet. So, after all the comments came in, you will that, if you scroll down in the Findings sections, there is a lot of stuff happening. However, as far as I could see, all of this is really, "Oh, the sentence doesn't sound right …"

It looks like a lot, but it's not really changing the—how can I say?—the kind of message of the text. But there are a few where I think we need to discuss stuff.

The first one I want to mention is, KC and I had a comment discussion where we essentially currently have the SMART criteria in front of the recommendation. KC essentially said, "Oh, why don't we do this after? And it makes more sense." I agreed on that.

So, this is the easy stuff first. Is this something the team thinks is fine; to move the SMART criteria stuff—essentially who has to act, how long should it take, and so on—after the actual recommendation text?

So, if no one raises their hand or voice, I will just assume this means we can do that.

And then we can go to an example as well. Page 19 should work, to whoever controls the scroll.

Yeah, Boban. Go ahead.

BOBAN KRSIC: Hi. No. The only question is, can we maybe see an example, and now you are going to the page. It makes easy to understand it. What do you mean with, "Let's make it later on and let's move it to where it is"?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. So, you can see the last two paragraphs here before the Recommendation heading. "The outcome of this recommendation is to empower ICANN Compliance … and recommendations require action by ICANN Org" and so on. This is just to cover our SMART criteria. And these two would kind of go behind the recommendation. Right? So, we just copy it down.

This is, by the way, one of the recommendations we need to discuss. That's why it looks so yellow. This is the next thing on the agenda.

So, yeah. This would be the only change where we would essentially take that and put it down so that first you have the recommendation, and then it says, "Okay. This is who should deal with it."

Boban says, "That's fine." No one else is saying anything, so I guess this is fine. I mean, it is an editing change, but it would be a lot of editing changes.

So, the next big problem, I think, where we don't really seem to have much clarity yet is on the recommendation here that's ICANN SLAs. And there are a variety of outstanding discussions and comments.

Whoever controls the scroll can go down a little bit more. And now we can't ... Yeah. Okay, it doesn't fit on one page.

So, essentially here, we have the SLAs where we say, "Okay, ICANN Org should introduce (I think Danko put the question in, 'you might want to say propose') anti-abuse SLAs to all contracts." And then we specify how that should work and what number percentages are relevant.

So, important point on this. This requires changes to how DAAR works for this to work. That recommendation comes later in the text. So, we should pull up that recommendation just in structure so people see that first before they read this because otherwise this one doesn't make much sense.

Other than that, though, we seem to be unclear or not in proper consensus on if what is currently on the page is something we're happy with; something we actually kind of want to go with. So, one perspective—I can't remember who said what, so, sorry I'm not crediting properly. Someone essentially said, "Okay. Is this too specific already?"

Someone else asked how far DAAR can actually support this recommendation. And I assume that was considering the changes to DAAR we asked for elsewhere. So, I would be very happy to hear someone speak up on this one; where do we think we stand with this.

EN

One key thing I will also note: point 6. Are there still question marks in there which we should fill in with something to make this make sense?

So, if someone could add something here; kind of see what direction we might want to go in, or if people are generally happy with this or if we should change what is there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Is that a new hand for Boban or an old hand?

BOBAN KRSIC: It's an old one, but I can start if you [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Go ahead.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yes, thank you. Can we go to page 19 and start with the first three? Yes.

So, there are 7% and around about 10%. These percentages … What's the reference and base for that criteria? So, why do we recommend 7, 10? Why do we choose that?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This works as follows: we looked at, essentially, the top kind of abuse-ridden contracted parties, and looked at their abuse percentages were. And those tend to be … I don't have it on screen right now, but we

essentially looked at those and we said, "Okay. If this is like the 20 worst, we are reducing this."

So essentially, it was based on looking at the worst offenders and then kind of reducing the number down. I think it is totally possible to change these numbers. So, if you feel 7% is too high or too low, that's definitely something we can … I think that can be discussed. This is open.

BOBAN KRSIC: Well, I think to have metrics here in place, it's a good way. But I'm not comfortable with this finding something and saying, "Okay. This is a threshold and everything above this threshold is …"

Why we don't recommend something like an appropriate number of …? Yeah? And you can define it for you when you set it up. So, I think that should maybe work better when you recommended something only a methodology or to say, "Okay. Define for yourself the threshold and then everything above or below that, that's where you have to act" than any specific ciphers or any number.

BOBAN KRSIC: Right. Yeah. Personally, I don't see a problem with this. It might make more sense.

Kerry-Ann, I think you also had comments going into that direction.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I have a similar comment. Yeah, because one of the challenges that we face is that you may set a minimum threshold. What we see in our region when we monitor a lot of the DNS abuse and phishing and spam, etc., when you set that minimum level, it still doesn't emphasize the need that we just want them to address it because even if they're behold a threshold of 7% and it's something critical that has happened, like one of the domain names that they've attacked can have more catastrophic effect.

It's more the principle that we want to get at, not necessarily just the percentage. Setting minimum specifications, like minimum thresholds for them may be important, but I don't think report should be prescriptive because next year it may be that we need a 20% threshold or a 2% threshold. Or things have gotten worse and pretty much you want to say the threshold should be 0.5%.

So for me, being so prescriptive in this report is going to date it when the principle that we want to come out of it is the need to set these minimum thresholds for the security threats that they are identifying from DAAR, and ensuring that there's some amount of remedying.

And I think the other point we're emphasizing here is that when we take it at a more general description; one, we believe that contract renewal should take into account anti-abuse reports, whether that be DAAR or anything that evolves out of DAAR.

Secondly, contracted parties should get this list of [inaudible] that says, "Here. These are your most [damning] domain names and they're under

your watch and you're not doing anything about it and it's creating damage."

Too, this should be considered in their contract negotiation when they get to that part, which we speak to, I think, later in the document—or above in the document.

And in the warning aspect of it, I think that's a really critical part in terms of them getting a period to remedy or fix. But they already have that in the SLA. What I think I had found when I looked at the SLAs, not so much that they don't get a remedying period; but what they don't do is that they don't follow up to make it a contingent like them remedying being a part of the requirement for them to get a renewed contract.

They just roll over the new contract and just say, "Hey. We spoke to them once. They didn't do anything. We've continued to talk to them. They haven't done anything."

So, when you look at the website in terms of contract breaches and compliance, you notice that compliance will have probably several notices. And I think this year, only one registrar was shut down, when I tried finding it.

So, I think I support [what] Boban is saying, and I still support that we need this. This is one of the first things that I had noticed when I had joined the group. And I still think we need to state it, but not by giving our prescriptive percentages. That's the part I would disagree with.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Okay. Denise, I see you have your hand up. But just so I can take this comment because I'm trying to manage this thing.
	Boban and Kerry-Ann, you're proposing that we have these … We just said, "set thresholds." I assume the actor you're intending would be ICANN Org to do so? Please say yes or no in chat or wherever.
	And the other idea is to make this discussion a bit more high-level and a bit more general. Is that …? Feel free to just say yes in chat.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	For me, yes. It was just not being to prescriptive with the percentage levels because it could be that we need 5% next year and not necessarily 7% because things have gotten so worse.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Okay. I just put that in. Denise, go ahead.
DENISE MICHEL:	Thanks. These are all good points. I think the concern I have, or the challenge I think we have is how to help ensure that if the recommendation is implemented, it's implemented in a useful way without, as you say, being prescriptive.
	So, I guess I would ask for those who are uncomfortable with 7%—and I can appreciate that you feel it's prescriptive and too precise—how can this be worded so it's not as prescriptive and specific; but at the same time it is bounded so a reasonable percentage of security threats is

arrived at that we don't end up with it being implemented with a number that is essentially meaningless and has no impact?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Denise, I could answer, probably, immediately. Currently, we looked at the DAAR reports for this year, for example, and based on that assessment we could give a recommendation as 7%.

What I would probably say is that if the team is still minded to keep a percentage as a minimum threshold, we could actually say that, "As of the time of this report, we believe that 7% would have been appropriate because X amount of threats were detected …" and as a result, give whoever has to set the threshold the guiding principles by which we have derived the 7% if it's a mathematical equation.

If it's a matter of logical equation, explain the logical equation and then say, "As a result, we therefore recommend 7%." And this principle or logic or equation can be used in the future as results from the DAAR comes out in the future—whether it be next year or the year after.

Just to probably re-emphasize, my difficulties that I see in 7% is that there is no context in which we have derived this, and it does not empower whoever has to implement it in the future if things get worse, which I am suspecting this next 2021 might be that much worse because we're now getting used to the fact that everyone is online, there are more domain names being purchased.

Everything is going to get a little bit wider and bigger, and we need to give more guiding principles in addition to the prescriptive one if we want to. But it still needs guidance to help.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I agree, and I think your suggestion is a good one and I would support that change.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, just to move this along, I have a few more on the list. So, we make this thing a bit more general. We then give an explanatory, maybe, footnote. I'm not sure what will work yet because it depends on how we arrive at a range and what we think, at this point in time, is fine.

If that were to be done, would we, as a team, be generally happy with the ICANN SLA recommendation?

As usual, silence means …

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Okay. I have done that.

Okay. Let's go to the DNS Abuse Portal, page 22. So, we talked about this DNS Abuse Portal multiple times, and this is essentially me looking for confirmation on two things.

EN

Number one, do we still want it. So, essentially, Abuse Portal would be a way for reporters to report in centrally and then it gets automatically distributed, making it essentially easier to submit abuse complaints. And they would automatically be tracked.

The key issue, if we're happy with this idea of simplifying the process, seems to be that it is not sufficiently clear how that would work. So, I was just kind of asking should we create a flow chart or something like that to explain how we intend this thing to work? Maybe that is B; and A is, do we still want to recommend that as well?

Denise, I see your hand. I'm not sure if it's old or not.

DENISE MICHEL: Old, sorry.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, actions would be: we keep recommendations and we add further explanation to the process. Would that be acceptable to everyone?

Going once, going twice. Okay. I assume this means we have rough consensus on keeping DNS Portal and adding explanation.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I agree with keeping the recommendation. I had just one observation. Last night I was able to, with a clear head, read the entire thing—the first in a long while—and one of the things I noticed with this section

being here is I think it's going to be more than just putting in an explanation.

Each time I go on the Complaints portal, it's something that they do update. They have four different places that they keep the complaints and how they manage the complaints. And they have one section that has a table that says, "Okay. This person complained; it was resolved because the person misunderstood what was happening," or something like that. So, some of the comments are very vague in terms of what action ICANN Org took.

So, I think it's a bit more than … We should publish a number of complaints made in a form that allows an independent third-party to analyze because the complaints are there. The letters are there. The responses are there. So, I don't know if the complaints we're talking about here are more the technical side of it because this is still too vague.

The information is on four different pages on what complaints were made, how they analyzed it, and the response they've sent to the complainant. So, we do have resources; it's just that it's very vague and very generic sometimes in how they respond.

So, I think this is not going to help us moving closer. I think if we're keeping this, I would probably say we either move just one alone to be part of where we have DAAR. But I don't know if there's any justification we could give to this to make it a substantive recommendation.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, Kerry-Ann, you're talking about complaints to ICANN if I understand you correctly. This is about funneling complaints to contracted parties, and that's why we came to the conclusion to only do more limited data collection.

So, I'm not sure if you …

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But it's not very clear. But that's the thing. When I saw this, I went on the four different portals that actually manage DNS complaints generally [whether to parties] to action and to ICANN Org for remedying. And there is a website that has some of the complaints to contractors as well. I found that one last night.

So, if that's what we're speaking of, as I said, even if we do more specific background, I think the recommendation needs to be more clear that's what we intend. Because myself, I didn't pick that up when I read this. I found all three different variations in how ICANN actually accounts for this on their websites.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I could you send you the links. I could try and pull the links back up and you could see the different examples. But there are like a million different pages where these things are on. But it's not specific. Yeah.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: In trying to manage the consensus process, if we were to clarify—I mean, that I think we already have agreement on—and maybe added a sub-clause here where we kind of mention this problem you have just described … We could suggest to include that issue into something like that. So, there is like one portal where this stuff would also go in and be linked appropriately so you can actually find it.

Would that work to address you comment?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think so.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. And with that to be done, would we have consensus, roughly—I mean obviously you haven't seen the full text—that we can go ahead in that direction and everyone would be happy with keeping this plus adding more explanation of the process, plus adding text to summarize everything on that page, essentially on that portal?

I'm not hearing anything, so I will go to the next point.

Let's just go to page 25 for an example. If you click on the "We further note that the PDP …" that's the example. Oh, wait. You can't see the comment. Whoever controls the scroll also controls the mouse, so please click. Yes, thank you.

So essentially throughout the text—this is just an example for people—we have a discussion of Danko and Denise going back and forth about how this works in practice. Now, to me reading it, I felt that that context is essentially so relevant—even though it is alluded to or mentioned or discussed before—that without this being present, it is not clear to a normal reader what the differences are and what is intended, and so on.

So, my question is, do we essentially have to take these discussions between Danko and Denise and turn them into explanatory footnotes, if you want, to clarify each step here—kind of like what's going on and why do we believe certain things can be done and certain things cannot be done?

The same is true for one comment where I was involved as well where I quoted the registrar base agreement, stuff like that, to kind of indicate where things work and where they don't work.

So, I am proposing now, I'm not moderating right now. I am proposing that we have to rewrite these into footnotes or something like that and have it on these pages so that it's really clear, "Okay. This is what's possible for registrars. This is what's possible registries," because otherwise it might look like a very general claim and not make much sense.

I can see an "agree" from Kerry-Ann. I can see a hand from Denise. Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, Laurin. Just to clarify, are you suggesting that the inline text be removed and then …

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No.

DENISE MICHEL: … added as a footnote or augmented with additional footnotes in a few places?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, essentially what I'm trying to say is, right now you see on the screen Danko's comment, your comment, Danko's comment. What I'm saying is, those discussions need to be rewritten as a footnote so it is clear what we're talking and not talking about. I don't feel, from reading the text, it is sufficiently clear what is possible and what isn't possible as we interpret it, and I feel we need to clarify that because, otherwise, people don't understand.

So, not removing anything. But essentially turn the text bubbles on the side into explanatory footnotes.

Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Laurin, I support that because I think when I read the discussion on the side, it helped to understand the section, which is why I didn't have much comment. And I thought the explanation provided by Denise, and

then Danko's further clarification, I think it could either be in text added to the in-text and not just a footnote. So, I think we could use it to just improve on the language that's there to make whatever's not a statement or fact, just put it as an observation or something.

But I agree and support because the clarification helped.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, excellent. I just called it a footnote, and I think it might jump back and forth. But the key thing is, are we happy with this being entered? And so far, I've only seen positive responses that these discussions should be incorporated.

Okay. Abuse Portal, we have done. Last page, please, 28. This is privacy. I think we have two things here. We had discussions about should privacy be part of this section. I think that's one thing we should discuss.

The other thing is, how far do we want to keep this in this current form and keep it here? And Kerry-Ann, you're the expert on this, so if you're able and willing, if you could speak to this that would be very useful.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think I had made a comment last night, if it's not there, that we had agreed several meetings ago that we would just include privacy under the General Observation section.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, yeah. There are a lot of comments.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. I had just put a little reminder because this came up in the last call again and during the sub-group call. And I remember that with KC, we had kind of spoken about it and agreed.

I still believe that we need to mention it because it's a growing present security concern from where we sit right now, and it comes up a lot with a lot of the governmental side recognizing that there's a huge movement in localizing the Internet; and a lot of bilaterals happening, and privacy and security still being tied together as one.

So, I still believe that we need to mention ICANN not just removing itself form the topic or just doing it for themselves which is what, I think, the discussion with KC, we were trying to just distinguish ICANN doing privacy regulations and complying with EU for themselves; but also recognizing that they need to say on top of the broader discussion that's happening as it affects and should keep registrars accountable to that as well.

So, I still believe it's relevant in the report, but I will probably just lean towards it being a more general observation as things that we believe ICANN should be monitoring and staying on top of.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you. Okay. Anyone against this, or are we happy with this? We just move it somewhere where it makes sense, but we keep as is. Okay, no concerns?

Okay. I jumped over a page. All of you thought we were done, but no. Page 26. Bottom, please.

So, here, essentially, we have the temp spec where I'm asking. We had this discussion, but we have not had thumbs up on this.

Number one, "The ICANN Board should create a Temporary Specification regarding abuse handling in case their efforts described above are insufficient to tackle abuse …" and then create an EPDP.

So, there are two comments of mine after reading this, so I'm jumping out of just moderating again. But the one problem I think is, we should kind of put something in where … how this would be determined. So this would, I feel, go to ICANN's general council. They have to figure that one out.

Also, I feel we could clarify this recommendation in terms of, when does it actually hit? And I feel our intention here was to kind of say, "Okay. If the other recommendation can not be completed or if you arrive at a point where the council says you cannot do this without policy, then establish the EPDP," to kind of have that linked together.

So, I essentially have made these two comments, and I ask if we should commit, essentially, to the proposed additions to the recommendation. And so far, I don't know.

So, please everyone, tell me if you think that makes sense. I'll take my personal hat off.

DENISE MICHEL: That makes sense to me.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Anyone else, or are we happy? Kerry-Ann, I'm not sure. Is this hand old? I assume silence means yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I did a plus one, Laurin, to Denise.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, okay. Awesome. Sorry. It's because your hand is still up, so I wasn't sure.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Oh, let me move it. Sorry.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, this puts all of this text where we had to resolve … I ask every time with the changes if we're happy with that. So, now comes the general question, right? Are we happy with the document to move forward, obviously including the things we have just discussed and obviously a major cleanup of all the comments, and so on?

                        But are we happy with the direction, with what the document or the section now says? Or are there any general concerns or issues I have failed to recognize as needing discussion?

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think I want to first start off by saying thanks a lot to you and KC because I think you did significant work reordering the logic. I think the only general comment I had which, sorry if I missed it at the beginning, was in terms of how much background is given at the beginning of the document right now for this section. I just wanted to make sure that how we've laid out the flowing recommendations that this logic falls in line with how the rest of the report would look because I wouldn't want that all this work is lost because it now needs to fit into the wider logic or the other sections to look deficient because it doesn't have this logic.

So, I just wanted to just flag that for leadership; that as we put the report back together, that that is taken into account because this section has …

I had highlighted where there was some repetition, and as I said, given the significant breadth of the outline, the problem [inaudible] at the beginning of this, I want to make sure that the rest of the report that may deserve some amount of equal backing, that we just take that into account when we merge the documents.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Yeah, I do agree that the style is slightly different. And having worked with you as well on the risk section, it is possible that some stuff there we need to kind of prop that up a little bit in some places to match what we did here. Specifically, I'm thinking of adding a sentence or two, for example, under SMART criteria that we ourselves voted to adhere to, and we have to make sure we add a sentence of two for all the other accommodations.

Okay. I can see a thumbs up from KC which I'm not sure if this indicates agreeing with Kerry-Ann or agreeing with the direction of the section.

KC CLAFFY: That indicates that I don't have my glasses on, and I thought I was doing a raised hand.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, okay. Go ahead.

KC CLAFFY: I just wanted to echo a comment Kerry-Ann made earlier about the stuff on the side here. The comments on the side, I think, would be really helpful to have in the text about the temp spec part because otherwise, people are going to say, "Why is the temp spec here the right thing rather than a PDP?"

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. So, that's an action we definitely have to take.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, sorry. That's all I want to say.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, that was agreed as, "We do this, but we have consensus on doing this and with what the text does."

Okay. So, with these comments then, I will ask again for everyone to speak up; considering what we discussed, considering the actions that we will take—or that Heather will obviously do, cleaning up as well.

It appears to me, playing moderator, that we have general rough consensus on this text, obviously considering that we have to see it in context of the full report which we have mentioned before. But so far, I have not heard anyone say we cannot move this text forward, and we're generally happy, pending, again, agreed edits and actions.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Laurin, I have one concern that is mechanical, which is, at what point are you done and Heather starts?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I believe, essentially, I will have to talk to Heather, and the sub-team has to talk to Heather about how we're going to manage that in the best way possible. So for Risk, when the final edits were happening, it was essentially concurrent work. For Heather, it would start, and we would have her going back and forth with the sub-team.

So, my assumption, and I have not talked to the sub-team and Heather, is that we would do roughly the same thing where Heather can essentially start, and then we resolve issues along the way. The thing is, when Heather starts working, which is very useful because she uncovers issues and requires resolution in a way that is, I think, helpful for us.

EN

But again, that is my personal point of view and I would have to talk to the sub-team and Heather, see if everyone's happy with my doing that. I can see Heather's hand has gone up, so she can [answer it].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, a bit of what I heard today involves some of what I felt are substantive text to the text, and I really hesitate to start waving my editorial pen through the document when, for me, it still feels like a moving target.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Agreed. I think the issues that I was raising today were, however, concentrated in the Recommendation section of the text. The findings, while there is a lot, it essentially changes to … Like the long findings part in the beginning. That's all changes to language or adding some stuff in, deleting some stuff that superfluous, stuff like that.

So, one option could be—and I think we should review this before we actually go ahead—is, you can take the findings if you feel, after looking through them, that there is nothing left that needs substantial action. That might be a solution. I'm not sure. Like I said, we should have everyone look at it and discuss it. But that might work, and that might help us deal with the limited timeframe we have.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I can certainly do that. I would cautiously highlight that working on the findings as if they were separate things from the recommendation is part of what has made this document so challenging.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: That is correct.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, what I'm hearing is that the handoff can sort of begin. But like what's on the screen now with the comment conversation between Danko and Denise; that needs to turn into either text or footnotes or something. And that seems like a big ask for Heather.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, absolutely. This is when I'm trying to say, obviously, that is stuff where the sub-team needs to at least reach agreement that that text is fine and that we're covering everything. I can see KC's hand is also up.

KC CLAFFY: I just think it's probably Laurin and me since Denise is on vacation. We need to agree to get that piece of the writing done by Monday or something so that Heather can take it all.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That would be awesome.

KC CLAFFY: I can work on that over the weekend with Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, so if …

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin, you just lost your weekend. Did you see that? That was slick.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh. I'm thinking when I last didn't lose my weekend, so that's not uncommon. But okay. KC, then let's do that, and then we can resolve everything, and Heather can have it by the beginning of next week. And I hope that is, in terms of progress, fine because Heather is still working on the SSR1 stuff as well, so she's probably able to fill her tomorrow without this being ready. Right, Heather?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, what I'm hearing …

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, it's funny you should mention the SSR1 stuff because …

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, well, we'll get to that in a minute. What I'm hearing is the two weeks that Heather says she needs starts Monday.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: And so that we will not see the whole compiled report until December 7th. Heather, does that seem right?

KC CLAFFY: That assumes Thanksgiving counts as a week for her.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Which is fine. It does.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was why I was asking.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. I anticipated working through that. Beef stew doesn't take a lot of time and attention, and it's just me and [Bennett]. It's really good that I don't have my video on right now.

I can certainly start on the body of the text, assuming that folks sign it off to me. Appendix D still has a lot of open issues. There's nothing for me to do, so it's not like I'm actively working on that at this point because I'm waiting for input.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, I get that, and that's the next topic on the agenda. But if we're saying that December 7th is when the team is going to get something so that—the call scheduled for the 10th—we can start plowing through it

and making sure we have consensus, I'm wondering if we should make that a two-hour call instead of a one-hour call.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I would vote for that. I think that's a good idea. I do want to get some quick clarification.

In terms of editing the abuse text in particular, given how challenging it's been to put it together, I'm assuming that I'm not going to reorganize this; I'm going to work with what's there, how it's been laid out. I'll help with the language, but otherwise I'll leave the structure alone.

Is that what you expect?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, that DAAR section needs to move forward, which I guess you will do this weekend.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yep. So, I think …

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I was going to say, I don't know the answer to that question right now, so let's postpone that question because we have to do a final read and I haven't even read …

I trust whoever said—I forgot who just said (Kerry-Ann maybe)—it doesn't match the rest of the structure of the report because Laurin and I went off on our own. And I accept that, and I think I can maybe take a look at that. It will need to change to match the structure of the rest of the report. I would love it if Heather could do that, but it might be too much to expect.

So, why don't we postpone that until a Monday conversation that we can just have with Heather after Laurin and I have dug in again. If you could point us at the current draft at the rest of report so I can approximately see how far off we are with the structure, that would help, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Sure, of course.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: What I would like to add, I think it's one of those which we also did with Risk to some extent, Heather, where you did the edits. And as someone who is semi-involved on the kind of …

You're in a very particular position, essentially, and I think it was really useful when you just came back to us with questions sometimes. I think most of the time it was, "Oh, yeah. This is just dull or dumb. Just change it around," as you said. This was a normal response, I think, we had with Risk. So, I think that it would maybe be a middle way that would work.

As KC says, let's just have this discussion on Monday or Tuesday, whatever works.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We've essentially consumed the hour, but I'm really, really, really happy with where we ended up. So, my concern is that we have these threads on the mail list regarding Appendix D SSR1 findings that are just not getting answered.

So, we're certainly not going to go through them in five minutes, but if we could bring up on the screen the list so that people can see how many threads have not been closed.

No, not that; the table.

So, there are a whole bunch of rows in here that are not green. The green ones are the ones that are sorted. The good news is some of them are, but here are 8, 10, and so on.

So, each one of these has an e-mail that Heather sent to the responsible party. We really, really, really need an answer, and for the two weeks to begin that we just agreed on for Monday, we really need these e-mails answered by Monday. So please, everyone, take a few minutes and do the ones that are assigned to you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I have a question on this one. What if we are struggling to do so? So the one that Alain and I have got, we were just the last people assigned. Right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, of course.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It goes back to information that I'm trying to dig up. I just haven't succeeded in doing so. So, what are we doing with those? What are we doing with the ones where it's hard? What's our strategy?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm disappointed to hear there are such things, but I think, given that we are down to three minutes on this call, I think the leadership call on Monday will have to dedicate a big chunk of time to sorting that out.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Awesome. Let's do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I mean, I don't [inaudible] …

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I see KC has a hand, by the way.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Sorry, I was looking at the Google Doc.

KC CLAFFY: No, no, no. I think I talked. I'll take it down.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, please, please, please find time in the next three days to answer the messages from Heather. Otherwise, we're going to have to have a … spending time when we should be going over the whole document to deal with this.

So, we had already cancelled the call for the 26th of November, given that that was U.S. Thanksgiving. At this point, I do not want to cancel the call on December 3rd just in case these e-mail threads do not get resolved. Then, we will hold the call on December 3rd to resolve them. My hope is we can cancel that because they are resolved on e-mail.

Okay? Does that look like a way to get there?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sounds good.

DENISE MICHEL: Sounds good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Thank you, all. This was really, really important.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, do you want to extend the 10th of December call now?

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: I do. For two hours.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Normal start time, just go an extra hour.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Got it. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right, everyone. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you all. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]