

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Hi, everyone. As you probably now, my name is Danko Jevtovic. I was one of the liaisons to the review team together with Kaveh, and now we are together chairing the Board Caucus Group on the SSR Review Team and this is our first meeting with implementation shepherds.

First, I would like to say thank you to the whole review team and experience to the implementation shepherds who are continuing their engagement with us. So, Russ, Kerry-Ann, Laurin, and KC, thank you very much and thank you for being here.

The purpose of this first call is, well, to start the process. Formally, the Board hasn't made the decision, the resolution on the recommendations. The bylaws say that we have to do that before July [25<sup>th</sup>], and of course we intend to do so. But the Board has established this SSR2 Caucus, and we believe that early and interactive communication with the implementation shepherds is the key to our mutual understanding and to fruitful implementation of these recommendations and doing the best for ICANN as the whole ecosystem and our SSR2 [writ].

So as I said, the work is in progress. The number of recommendations is quite high. It's 63, not counting separately ones that are to review the SSR1 recommendations. The [work] team that is preparing the work and communicating with the Caucus is having quite a lot of different things on their plate, so the timing is rather tight to do everything on time. Of course, we will have to do by this mandated date.

---

*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.*

---

But in introduction, I just wanted to point out some of the key challenges we see in our side of the work. We see that some of the recommendations are creating numerous complexities because of the interplay from the recommendations with the current work throughout the whole ICANN ecosystem. Some of the recommendations are directing Board and Org in a way to create specific policies, and that's another set of recommendations.

And we thought what was the best approach to the full set of issues that are created by that. In order to do what is needed by the bylaws by our mandated date we are thinking about classifying the recommendations in a few categories: the recommendations we can easily approve and accept on this date, the recommendations that are likely to be accepted but some additional work and analysis is pending, the recommendations that we at the initial moment don't see as something that we can accept but we need additional analysis to see if they are going to be rejected, and some of the recommendations that we clearly see that are clashing with the bylaws as we have them and our processes then at the Board level they cannot be accepted.

We wanted to outline our thinking to the review team and listen to your thinking about the implementation and what are your initial messages just to start this interaction. In saying that, I wanted to point out that while doing our work and working with Org to analyze the recommendations we have kind of two levels of thinking.

One of them is to a specific reading of the recommendation how it is written and how it has to be interpreted and what we can do with the recommendation as such.

---

In addition to that, we are trying to look below that deeper to see what is the intent of the recommendation and what can the ICANN ecosystem gain from the recommendation and the problem as it is identified in the review.

So we also think that in addition to the formal part of the process we are currently undergoing we will also have a very good value coming out of the recommendations and using them to see below not only the formal part but also into the intent of the recommendations and what the Board and Org can use out of them to improve the whole system, not only through this process but through the normal part of our work.

Having said that, I wanted to give the opportunity to some initial questions and comments, and then we can go maybe into a more detailed discussion. Any takers? Well, Russ, not to call you directly, but would you like to say something from the shepherds side before?

RUSS HOUSLEY:                      Okay, well...

DANKO JEVTOVIC:                      Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                      This approach to kicking the can further down the road was done in the past, so I guess I'm not surprised to see that. But I don't think it aligns with the spirit of the bylaws. And we had this discussion in a side session with the Board Caucus, a previous Board Caucus group when it was

---

done at that point. But I understand why you're doing it. While I don't like it, I accept that that was a likely outcome all along.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Well, thank you for a frank [formulation]. I don't see our intent in this classification as kicking the can down the road because this is something I very much don't like to do or to say more bluntly hate it. But going through the recommendations as they're written, some of them are not that easy and clear to implement.

Some of them are connected to the different processes we have. Some of them the Board needs for some of them more understanding of what needs to be done to implement them, in a way to understand the cost-benefits of these issues and how to deal with them. So while some are easily implementable and directly implementable, some as you expected in the way they were written are more complex so we need to find a way to deal with that.

As we all know, on top of all this process we have actually a very large backlog of work in the whole ICANN trinity or of our whole ecosystem, and then accepted recommendations will have to go through that. So there was no possibility to stop life in ICANN and focus for this period of time only on these recommendations and only on these preparations. So some of that is coming from the process, and this is as you noted the realistic way to do it.

Merike, I see your hand is up.

---

MERIKE KAO:

Yes, it is. Sorry, early morning. Just figuring out my buttons here. Thank you very much, and thank you to the implementation shepherds also for having this meeting with the Board Caucus. Russ, I very well remember the conversations that we had relating to the CCT review which is really, I think, where your comment stems from.

I guess I don't have the view either, just like Danko, that we're kicking the can down the road, and we've been working really hard to actually make that not be the case. It is not something that the Board Caucus is intending to do at all. But part of the issues that come into play are that some of the recommendations don't necessarily match the bylaws and what the ICANN Board or ICANN Org is able to do, for example, if it relates to some policy. So we're thinking through and looking very carefully in terms of what the recommendations are, the wording of the recommendations, and what the intention behind that is.

There's also overlap with some other work. Some of the recommendations have aspects that relate to the NCAP work that's ongoing. And so, part of the classification here is also dealing with trying to really understand where it overlaps with either other recommendations or ongoing work that's going on.

So I hope that adds a little bit of added clarity as to why some of the classifications exist.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you, Merike, for clarifying that. And also, I would add that—ah, Kerry-Ann, I see your hand. Just let me finish. I see, but it's not only that. Some of the recommendations are actually duplicating the work that is

---

already started by the recommendations by different review teams or the work we already have in our community.

So to accept the recommendation by the Board in a way how it is written will actually directly impact with these processes. And in deciding, the Board has to be mindful of all the other processes and decisions that have been accepted but also mindful of the public comments that we received during the public comment period and all parts of our community.

So, Kerry-Ann, please?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Thanks, Danko. And thanks for the explanation provided regarding the approach. I think what would be useful, and I think I could speak for all the implementation shepherds, is that mapping that you just mentioned in terms of the assessment of which ones are actually tied to existing processes. Because I think I don't know what ICANN's intention is for the implementation shepherds, but I think having that linkage of where we would see the implementation taking place under another process would be important. Because then we would be able to see the transparency between our recommendation and other processes and the end results.

And I think whichever review team comes in after—if one ever does, an audit or whatever comes up—they will be able to do that mapping and to see if the desired impact was actually achieved, which is what our review team strove really hard to do is that what does success look like. We tried to include that in all of the recommendations. So I think if that

---

mapping exists, if the desired outcome be tied to an existing process and we can see that transparently, I think we'll be able to give you a better opinion or a comment or support to the Board as they implement.

The second point I wanted to raise is for those measures, and I can't speak for Russ, but when we feel as if things are kicked down the bucket it's because we don't see, okay, when will it come back? When will it be addressed again? Having been deferred, is it being deferred indefinitely, or is it being deferred with a process being tied to it that will allow us to see how it will then be implemented in a later date?

For example, you have five dependent activities, and you know that you can't execute the one that we have spoken to because there are five dependent activities that precede it. As you said, you have a lot of backlog. So it will be important, I think, as the implementation shepherds for us to be accountable to the community and to be your support is to be able to see that linkage as well. The ones that have been deferred that are dependent or not interdependent but require being delayed because of other activities. It would be important to see that linkage as well.

And I think that's why it's hard for us to give a comment at this point because we can't see. That's not transparent to us right now. I hope that helps. And, Russ, I didn't mean to speak for you, but I think that's what popped up to my mind.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you, Kerry-Ann. I remember our discussions during the review team, and I believe you are speaking for all the team and you are making

---

very important points. So I'll try to answer to some of them, and then you can remind me if I miss something.

First of all, the actual implementation support hasn't yet started because the Board resolution hasn't been made yet. So in a way we are in this meeting setting up our communication and our better understanding. And we wanted from the Caucus to show you that we are working on that and that things will happen according to the bylaws.

One of the reasons for doing that is that actually we want to point out that we don't have any intention of delaying things or trying to force them to happen as fast as possible. So as I said, it's difficult to discuss in more general terms, and now we don't have anything very concrete. But we kind of can go through these categories that I briefly explained and maybe show an example from possibly each of the categories so it will hopefully create some more questions from your side.

For example, one of the things that we learned from the CCT review, we have there some of the recommendations that were directed to the community in a way to set up policy development processes. And those recommendations, the process was actually disconnected because the Board cannot control what the GNSO will do. So in a way, there was no clear [thing] how these particular recommendations will happen and what is following the recommendation.

In this case, we also do have some recommendations that are actually connected to the policy. So we will try to make it clear what's the distinction between [Board's draw] and what's part of the wider community and be mindful of who the recommendation is addressed to.



---

This is, as you also said, very important because we are thinking of how the next review, whatever the future structure might be and that's also changing with the holistic reviews, but how any next review could look at the current recommendations that your team have made, what's written there, and how to read them to understand and have them be implemented.

In trying to do that, sometimes we had a challenge of having the recommendation and not understanding clearly what the definition of the problem was. Sometimes it's easier to implement when you have the definition of the problem and more flexibility in implementing. Now we in a few cases have the precise definition how to implement it but not seeing what the actual problem that needs to be solved.

So this is a process that at some points needs more understanding. I hope that I've been helpful.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Noted, Danko. Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Okay. Maybe it will be...I don't see any hands at the moment. Maybe it will be useful to ask Larisa maybe to say something about this categorization we were thinking about and preparing [inaudible] for the full Board. Larisa?

---

LARISA GURNICK:

Hello, everybody. Yeah, thank you very much, Danko. Thank you. So we have a slide up just to give you a visual of the five categories that are being considered by the Board and, as Danko spoke to, the different elements and considerations that would lead for a recommendation to be placed in a particular category or bucket.

And these are high-level explanations, but as you already heard the Approved category is for cases where recommendations are clear. There's no dependencies on other work. There is clear community support, clear path toward implementation. And in some cases there are some recommendations that are being looked at and considered as already fully implemented based on the work that has been done over the course of the last couple of years.

The second category is Pending, likely to be approved once some additional information is gathered to enable the approval.

The third category is also Pending, pending for some specific clarity or further information. And to the point that Kerry-Ann was making, in cases where the pending condition is dependency on some other work or on something else that needs to happen, that would be clearly mapped out what those dependencies are and what timeframe those other areas of work are following to the observation on the mapping.

Oh, I see, Laurin, your hand is up. Let me pause here.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Yeah, thank you for pausing. Laurin, please?

---

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yeah, so I just wanted to make a point here, and I think Kerry-Ann went into the same direction. The categories, that makes sense. I think the issue for us to talk to is we need a bit of an idea of what goes where or where there is a lack of clarity, specifically to the recommendations. So what you're saying makes sense to me and I think makes sense to the other in terms of what you're saying. It's more how shall we comment without knowing, okay, this is bucket one. Nothing needs to be said, essentially. And this is another bucket where you actually have questions or where better input is required or something along those lines. It would be useful if we could get a little bit of that as well. I know this is a work in progress, but it would help to have an example or two where we can actually speak to if that is possible in your process and at this point in time.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Of course, Laurin, you're absolutely right, and that's very clear. Unfortunately, for this meeting we don't have this document that is created putting the recommendations into the buckets. So we do have some examples of our thinking, and we are still very much working every day between Caucus and the Org to prepare that in time for the discussion going for the OEC and then OEC recommending the full Board. And we have to do that by July 25<sup>th</sup>, so it's a lot of work. So I understand you cannot go into commenting into too many details. And actually, that was not the full idea of this call. The full idea of this call was just to start a process. So definitely, we the Board will have to produce the full Board paper with the resolution and explain our thinking about every particular recommendation, and that will be the start of our detailed discussion of what to do best. And that will also give

---

us an opportunity inside the implementation process for these ones that will be pending to discuss them then in more details together. Your hand is still up so please? Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: That should have come down. Apologies.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: No problem. No problem. Not seeing any more hands, I hope we have some more examples from Larisa, categories.

LARISA GURNICK: Actually, let me invite Jennifer. She'll walk us through a couple of examples, some specific illustrations of recommendations that are being considered for most of these categories. And that hopefully will shed a little bit more light. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Larisa. Hi, everyone. Nice to speak to you. It has been a while. I'm going to go through a couple of examples of the Board's thinking in terms of where some of the recommendations may sit and [I'm with the catchphrase] that you can see here on the screen. Again, hopefully this is helpful for illustrative purposes but, again, not to be considered yet as any kind of formal stance.

But in terms of the first bucket, clear, no dependencies, recommendations might include such as 24.2 which asks for the

---

common transition process manual to be made easier to find by providing links on the website.

And then also recommendations that it may seem that the measures of success outlined by the review team, like Kerry-Ann mentioned, we took good care to lay those out for each of the recommendations. In cases where it seems like those measures of success are already fully met or, indeed, exceeded by existing work they might fall into this category.

So one example is 4.1 where ICANN Org should continue centralizing its risk management and clearly articulate its security risk management framework and ensure that it aligns strategically with the organization's requirements and objectives. Right now the Board is considering elements of the ICANN Org's centralized risk management framework and function that already exists and how that aligns with the strategic plan for which the Board risk committee provides oversight. So that may well fall into the Approved category, and that is already considered to be implemented.

And then moving on to the second category, recommendations that may be pending but seem likely to be approved, one example might be recommendations 19.1 and 19.2 which pertain to complete the development of the DNS regression test suite. So this is an example of recommendations whereby the review team in the report talks about several different things all of which appear that they may be feasible but, indeed, have different implications in terms of the resource requirements that need to be better understood before the Board will have all the information that it needs to take action.

---

So for example, it talks about DNS test [bed] and regression test suite and also a suite for DNS resolver behavior testing. So again, those three things are quite different and while possibly all implementable may have different requirements. And so perhaps further engagement with yourselves to get some clarity as to the review team's intent would be useful.

Example of a recommendation that would perhaps go into Pending, hold to seek clarity or further information, this might be recommendations that are purely dependent on the outcome or resolution of other work that's going on either in the community.

One example is Recommendation 17.1 which pertains to name collision. ICANN Org should create a framework to characterize the nature and frequency of name collisions and resulting concerns. And then there's a bit more detail in the recommendation as to what should be included in that particular framework. There are dependencies with this recommendation on other ongoing community work in this case and the SSAC NCAP studies, and there may be other considerations as well that perhaps would be necessary to be resolved before the Board could take this positive action on this recommendation.

Some examples of recommendations that may fall into Category 4 which is Pending, likely to be rejected, this might be recommendations that currently as written the Org does not have the authority to do or, indeed, the Board. And so it might be that clarifications from the implementation shepherds as to the review team's intent could be sought before a decision can be made on the recommendation in terms of dispositive action.

---

And then finally the Reject category, this is recommendations that are clearly unworkable for specific reasons. One example that the Board is considering at this point is the 14.1 which asks for ICANN Org to create a temp spec that requires all contracted parties to keep the percentage of domains identified by the revised DNS abuse reporting activity as abusive below a certain threshold.

Temp policies can only be established by the Board and, indeed, must meet specific requirements that are laid out in the registry agreement and the registry accreditation agreement. And so it may be that the Board considers this recommendation doesn't meet the requirements that are laid out there in terms of for a temp spec. As well, this recommendation is directed to the Org. The Board would need to initiate the temp spec.

So with that, I will pause there and I'll hand it back to Danko and hopefully have some discussion. Thanks.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you, Jennifer. I see Kerry-Ann's hand. I just wanted to say that this last example is generally important relating to the...I mentioned the policy development process and the other bodies that have to do it in our multistakeholder bottom-up model. So this is an, I believe, important thing to discuss and understand in this meeting. Kerry-Ann, please?

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Thanks, Danko. Using the last example because I think that's what you're [getting our hands] to go up, the intent of the recommendations versus the actual process which the review team may not...I mean, we try our best to read everything in terms of the bylaws. We may not hit in terms of who it should have been directed to correctly, but the intent is there and the spirit of the recommendation is there.

For similar recommendations, is it that the Board will just dismiss it because procedurally it's not directed at the right entity? When the explanation and logic for why the recommendation is included is there and the Board can clearly [probably] interpret what the intent of the recommendation is. Is it that the Board will assess it and say, okay, while not this way we understand the spirit? We can then do it this way or table it for another time, another purpose. I think it will be important for us to understand that as well.

And, Laurin, I know this one in particular—I know KC is on the call as well—I don't know if they will probably want...I know this one in particular is something that we spoke about quite a lot.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Yeah, we did speak about it in the review team, and I believe KC has joined us but has challenges with Internet connectivity. So by formulating...I don't see any hands from the Caucus members, so I'll try to give initial answers and probably be updated a bit by more knowledgeable members about the bylaws. But by some of these recommendations you gave us quite an interesting task to try to find the best way how to work on them.



---

The Board doesn't try to reject a recommendation because of some small point in it. So in a way by analyzing them I believe the key is not to whom the recommendation is directed but what kind of process is it? So there are a number of examples that are coming to my mind.

One of them is, for example, recommendations that are related to the contracts and updating of contracts with contracted parties. This is, as we discussed also during the review, this is voluntary negotiations between ICANN Org and the contracted parties. So the Board cannot make unilateral changes to the contracts without agreeing with the contracted parties.

Similarly, in our environment the policy development process is a bottom-up policy development process that is done by the community bodies that are in charge of that process. In the case of the [G domains] is the GNSO. So the Board cannot, to whomever the recommendations are written, the Board cannot order the GNSO to do this or that. The Board cannot actually act on that recommendation.

Having said that, as I said in the beginning, for all the recommendations we are trying and counting on your help to understand the intent of the recommendations that will improve the security and stability and resiliency of the Internet and ICANN as the corporation. So we always strive to find what can we do the best to understand the problems identified and to find the best way. But for some of the recommendations, for all of them, we have to follow the bylaws and for some of them we have to understand how they can fit in our process and how exactly are they written.

---

Any additions from Caucus members? Becky?

BECKY BURR:

Danko, I put this in the chat but I think it's not just that the Board can't make unilateral changes to the contracted parties agreements. Org can't do that either. They are by definition agreements between the contracted parties and Org.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Yes. Thank you for pointing that out. Precisely. And it's voluntary negotiations if I remember correctly the term. But also if I remember those recommendations that called for a kind of third party to participate in such a contract negotiations and that also probably needs more understanding of the intent and if that is implementable. Thanks.

Okay, so I believe we've gone through some of the examples we prepared for these categories. Do we have any more questions or comments? Okay, understand this is just an initial meeting, so probably as Laurin pointed out without more details and the detailed explanation of the Board's reasoning behind every recommendation, it is difficult to go into any deeper comments.

Russ, from your side, any last comments then? We still have 20 more minutes.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I don't have any. I don't know if the others do.

---

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay, sorry for calling you out. I just....

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, it's okay. KC, do you have audio?

KC CLAFFY: I do. I'm just finding it hard to comment at this level because it seems somewhat abstract. So I think it would be better to go to the next step.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Absolutely, you are right, and we recognize that. But I believe it was beneficial to start. Laurin, thank you. I see your hand is up.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, so thank you for that. I just want to underline what KC just said. It's really the next step would be more useful where there is something for us to engage in. Maybe a document we can read before we talk so we have a more specific idea.

So for example, when it comes to the contractual questions, we did have these discussions and there is some description in the review report, if I'm not mistaken, regarding how the team proposes something like this might be doable over time. So it would be interesting to see for example there why that approach is not considered feasible.

---

I think in general, and I hope I'm not misrepresenting the team here, I think what the team saw was issues in a variety of areas where the team felt that there was a lack of due care and/or due diligence when it comes to security matters.

And I think one of the things—and I think this was also kind of said by multiple people over this call where probably the exact implementation matters less in some cases in that something is being done that has kind of an effective outcome. I hope I'm not misrepresenting the other shepherds or the SSR2 team, but that is kind of my interpretation [inaudible]. But as Kerry Ann, said, where this exactly goes, that's not the problem that needs to be solved from the end of like the security review but more that there is an issue that is identified and where something needs to be done about it. But yeah, looking forward to kind of having a bit more detail as well and hoping that then we can have a bit more of a functional discussion about specific problems. Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you for the comment and let me point out once again that we are in full agreement, I believe. We are working together towards the same goal. We are trying to do the best with those recommendations and we are counting on your support, also as you said, to understand the intent or better say to problems identified in all the cases so we can find the best way to handle them, how to implement the recommendations.

So yeah, any last hands or comments? I see that we are—without having more detail material at this point, we are running out of discussion topics for this meeting.

---

Our idea from the caucus, we are, as I said, still working with the org in preparing all the papers for the Board resolution and we will have that by July 25th. So from the caucus side, I see the next step after having [inaudible] paper will be to give you some time to process it and then to have the next meeting that we can discuss how best to work together going to maybe more details about our decision and the reasoning behind the recommendations, and then to split them in some groups that will help us to get a better understanding of the ones that are pending and to focus first one that.

So now I see Kerry Ann first, then Russ. Kerry Ann, please.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

Thanks again, Danko, for the next steps. I always believe in managing expectations. In terms of once you get back to us and we review it, how much influence do the implementers have in this process? Or is it that we would just be relied upon once you have a plan to provide clarification to whichever unit will be implementing?

So just to manage expectations, it's a matter that with additional explanation, you may reconsider the approach, or is it more that a decision will be taken and we will just consult it to guide? Because I know this is a new rule that ICANN has and I think we're all working it through as to what it looks like, because you had used the words "work together" so I just wanted to make sure we manage expectations so we know when we do review, what lenses we'll be looking at the document through. Thank you.

---

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Well, it's difficult for me to answer your question very precisely. I know for the caucus that we will listen very carefully to whatever you have to say and to indicate to us. Your influence is extremely important, especially in the way how to implement the recommendations.

On the other hand, the recommendations are what they are, and they're written in the way they're written, and we will have by July 25th the Board's resolution that will make some decision on them. So this resolution will be important. And I'm just saying that through the implementation process, we cannot substantially change the recommendation, the nature of the recommendation because it has to be read by the next review team and judged, has it been implemented according to the way it's written?

So having said that, without any major moving away from the set road, we are very much looking to work interactively and listen to you.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

Thanks and noted.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Russ, and then Larisa. Sorry, Larisa, is it in relation to the previous question or on process maybe?

LARISA GURNICK:

Yeah, sorry, I can go after Russ, but it was on the process and also to address KC's question in the chat.

---

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Maybe Russ will have some additional comments on that, so maybe please explain about the process first. Sorry Russ.

LARISA GURNICK: Okay. Very good. So to answer KC's question in terms of what's expected in the next 12 working days, there's no expectations. I think the work is primarily on Org and caucus and Board to prepare all the materials that Danko was talking about, but the implementation shepherds have a very important role in clarifying what the intent was and providing context where maybe some things are not clear to the teams that are analyzing the recommendations and indeed, trying to make connections and linkages to other areas.

So the expectation and the hope would be that that clarification opportunity would come after the 25th of July, particularly on the groupings where, as you can see, things will be put into a pending category waiting for some specific information or clarification or some discussion. So in that regard, there will be good opportunities to hear from the implementation shepherds and have those discussions between the Board and the shepherds and Org. But this would not happen before the 25th of July deadline. Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yeah, and my understanding is that's how the process is written, actually, the implementation shepherds are related to the

---

implementation part that is only upcoming after the decision. Russ, please.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So I guess I'm trying to understand what the implementation shepherds, what your expectations of the implementation shepherds are on each of these five categories.

So what I would gather is that the first category, there's not much to say except perhaps review and implementation plan. The last category, there's nothing to do because there will not be an implementation, and the middle three is where you'll be seeking additional information. Is that right?

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Yes, although I have to comment that speaking about our discussion on the intent, we also want very much to hear maybe some additional comments on the first and the fifth category from your side to understand more what you as the review team think is important, even if it hasn't been fully captured, the recommendation as it is written. But yes, two, three and four are the key to our future work in my understanding, and also reviewing of the implementation plan as normal for all the other reviews.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you.



---

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

So, seeing no more hands, I believe we can have 10 to 12 minutes back. Thank you, everyone, and especially thank you to the implementation shepherds for giving us your time even in this initial stage. We have a lot of work in front of us and this is really important not only for this caucus but the whole Board. Thank you. We are adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]