YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hello, everyone. Good evening. This is Yvette Guigneaux, the Adobe Connect host in the room. Welcome to the SSR2 Review Team Plenary Call #44 on September 20, 2018 at 14:00 UTC.

Attending today's call, we have Zarko, Russ, Laurin, Eric, Kaveh, Ramkrishna, Norm, Scott, and I believe Denise just joined.

We have apologies from Brenda, Kerry-Ann, and Boban. We currently have no observers at this time.

From ICANN.Org staff, we have Steve, Jennifer, Negar, Sara; and Yvette, myself.

We'd like to remind you that today's call is being recorded, so please state your name before you speak, so that way we will have you for the transcript record.

Okay, I believe that's about it from me, so Russ, I will go ahead and turn the call back over to you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. The first couple things on the agenda are updates. I think Steve Conte is going to tell us about the DNS root KSK roll and then I assume Jennifer is going to tell us about the Barcelona update.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. I just sent out an e-mail moments before this meeting started. I sent one out earlier this week. An informal announcement

---

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.

that last weekend in Brussels the board deliberated and voted to move forward with the root zone KSK roll. Sorry, Eric. Abbreviating again. Which will happen on the 11th of October which is before Barcelona. They just did an informal announcement yesterday, and I apologize, I was traveling so I wasn't able to send it out until today, but it's in the SSR2 e-mail list. ICANN and IANA will be rolling the DNS root KSK on the 11th of October at this point. If there's any questions or discussion, I just want to let everyone know and please check your e-mail this morning about 12 minutes ago and you'll see the formal announcement. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We discussed this a little bit last week and felt that our job will be after the root KSK roll to assess whether there was anything that should have been done differently, and if so, write a recommendation about it.

Okay, Barcelona. Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Russ. Hi, everyone. This is Jennifer. The update I have for you, everybody on the team should have received their e-mail from the constituency travel team. I believe that was sent on the 17th of September with the exception of one team member who the travel team are working to [inaudible]. Please let us know if there's any issues that we need to address in terms of visa letters or anything else that's outstanding from your side in terms of team members and we'll see what we can do to expedite that.

In terms of the scheduling and the rooms, at the moment, the SSR2 face-to-face meeting on the Sunday is [inaudible] room, which I explained before is the room that does not have the tech equipment and the [inaudible] phones, so remote participation is available. However, the recording is not available and their tech support might [inaudible] currently not available. That said, the schedule is not yet finalized and the meetings team are trying to find a solution if possible to be in a room with a complete tech support.

On the Wednesday, at the moment, it's half and half. In the morning, there's a regular room and in the afternoon, at the moment, it's [inaudible].

The schedule gets finalized and published on the 1st of October, so as soon as that's available, we'll connect with you all and keep you updated on the room situation.

With that, let me know if there's any travel support we can help with, but that's all I have for the moment. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Is there anyone who has not received the message from constituency travel?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I have not received it.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, Eric, thank you for letting us know. We will work with you offline and the travel team to check on that. Thanks for letting us know and sorry about that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Given that the whole team is not here, Jennifer, could you send a note to the list that says, "You should have received it by now. Please let us know if you haven't."

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Yeah. I'll do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Okay. So, the next thing on the agenda is to review the SSR1 recommendations and see if we can resolve what to do going forward, at least hoping to get through the first couple.

To that end, you received in the mail that included the agenda the table with the first five recommendations and staff has filled in for us the what was done to implement the recommendation. So, we need to assess whether that was adequate to fully implement the recommendation, whether it had the intended effect and whether that recommendation is still relevant today, and if so, what further work is needed. I hope that the people have had a chance to look at the first couple that went out so that we can start that work.

My understanding is that, regarding recommendation one, there are some outstanding questions that have not been answered. Are the

EN

responses to that necessary to make progress on this or can we determine whether the steps that were taken were enough to fully implement the recommendation? Any thoughts?

Is there anyone who thinks that the implementation did not have the intended effect? Denise, go ahead. Denise, you're still muted. Denise, we're not hearing you. Your little mute icon has gone away. Okay, Denise is asking for staff to call her.

So, Denise is recommending that we don't write the final text for this until we have the answers to those questions. Does anyone have another view? Okay, Ram agrees. Why don't we move to recommendation two, then?

The recommendation two I don't believe we have any outstanding questions on this one. Is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's correct, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. The two overlap a little bit, but let's see if we can make progress on recommendation two. Does anyone feel that the implementation did or did not have the intended effect and would like to speak to that? I see Denise and Laurin and now Eric. So, Denise first. Okay, that was an old hand. Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I hope you can hear me, that this is working now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I hear you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Excellent. Okay. I think, for that one, it seems that reviews have taken place and the recommendation here is that it should be reviewed regularly and so on and so on. It seems to have happened. It doesn't say anything about if this was done well or not, so we can say, yes, this has been done, but we should probably recommend further reviews in the future and that ICANN make sure that the community is happy with it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, do you feel that we need to offer a frequency or just that the review ought to happen each time the SSR framework is updated?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think both, maybe. I think we shouldn't be overly, like you have to do this every two years. But I would say something on the lines of when the framework is updated and then maybe every five years, which would coincide with another review anyway, so there will be continuity. My guess is that there will be more updates than that, but that would be the absolute minimum, maybe.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. Eric?

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks. So, I think this recommendation is worded in kind of an ambiguous and difficult way in the sense that it says that a review of the definition implementation in the SSR remit should happen and it says maybe it could kind of happen this way or coincide with the review team or something, and actually for the first year, we had a lot of consternation over what exactly is the remit of this team and this doesn't clarify the prescription from the recommendation. Is it the remit of this team or not? And this recommendation doesn't even say that the SSR Review Team is the place for that to happen. It leaves it basically [inaudible] at all.

So, what Laurin said could be right, but it's not enforceable from the text. So, I suggest that a view of this is that it needs to be tightened up, so if a review of the definition implementation of ICANN's SSR should be done by this SSR team, then it should say that. And if we say our interpretation is that this will fall under the charge of future SSR review teams, then that's fine. If we say it won't, then that's fine, too. But right now it's just hanging there in a nebulous way and I think it needs to be clarified. I'm not sure whether we put text saying we're picking up the mantle or put text saying it's unclear or whatever, but I don't think we can leave that ambiguity.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, turning back to Laurin because I think he's going to clarify what he said a moment ago.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, exactly. Thank you, Russ. So, I agree with you, Eric, that this is a bit in the air. That's what I kind of started with. While it doesn't really say what has to be done, I think we should definitely clarify and maybe we just put the thing on SSR3 and that might actually be a very logical, functional approach to this where people who are interested in this will be in the room again and maybe if we rephrase our recommendation, we should also make it more clear as to what this actually means, because again, should be reviews. Okay. With what outcome? I think that would make sense. So, total agreement.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Seeing no hands, I want to know that I captured the two thoughts here. First is that we ought to have a community review whenever the SSR framework is updated and the second that each SSR Review Team should conduct a review to make sure that the statement remains or the definition, I guess – definition and implementation – are up to date and current. Is that correct?

LAURIN WESSINGER: That sounds good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Naveed, then Eric.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Hi. I left a question in the chatroom. It's a clarification, and of course when we put these implementation, how the intended effect, are we

also seeking what ICANN's perspective on that [inaudible]? And all questions related to what we are posing. So, are we going to have their assessment of the situation and what we think and then draft our response or we are just saying what we think about that [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Eric, do you want to respond first or were you raising something else?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I was going to respond to your thing and I could say something to Naveed if you want. To sort of touch back on the response, Russ, yeah, I think what you captured is really good. I just think the one thing I would suggest we consider adding is that we're evaluating whether this recommendation was fulfilled. So, inasmuch as I think we were being a little prescriptive in what we're talking about, I think we need to sort of also add something about do we think this was done … I think we could decide [inaudible] put some text in there saying it was unclear whether it was in our charge to evaluate, but it should be clarified going forward or something like that. I think that might clarify it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. You want to say something about the perspective, whether we're getting ICANN's perspective or just our own?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. My two cents, just [inaudible] is just I think our charge is to be the [inaudible] review team and provide our perspective to ICANN, not necessarily to [overly iterate] with them, but that's just my two cents.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I get that as well from the information in the bylaws that says we are supposed to assess whether the implementation have the intended effect. I think the implementation that was done at the time was done with the goal of having the intended effect and our job is to assess whether that is actually the case or not.

I see that Matogoro has put a statement that he proposes us to review the definition for SSR as given in the framework. I read that as prep for this call. Did others do that? Denise and then Naveed.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. Can you hear me okay?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I hear you fine.

DENISE MICHEL: Ah, great. So, I would just note that I agree, Russ, with you and Eric regarding the review team, assessing the effect of the recommendations and would also note that when we issue our first draft of the report which presumably will include our assessment, staff as well as the community will have an opportunity to provide their

input, so that if staff have a different assessment on our assessment, they'll have another opportunity to indicate that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I would like to add to that, Denise, that they will actually have two opportunities.

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Once when we put ours out for comment and then also when the board puts out the comment at the end.

DENISE MICHEL: Correct. Then, I guess to hear more about Matogoro's proposal to review SSR definition, given in the framework. I think part of the directive that I [inaudible] under previously and [attained] in the SSR1 work track was that staff working with the community [inaudible] definition. So, I guess understand further Matogoro's idea about why he feels it's the review team rather than staff and community, or is he suggesting that the review team kick off a staff and community discussion of these terms? Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Hopefully, he will either put his hand up or type something. In the meantime, Naveed?

EN

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Let me try to rephrase it. My understanding [inaudible] mailing list and conversation and some of the material is that it is kind of a perspective of ICANN that most of the recommendations [inaudible] already and were considered … They did whatever was required.

But, I don't find any material that supports that kind of claim. What I'm asking as a clarification is whether we are going to ask them about the supporting material before we put our [thoughts] or we just put and draft our response about what we have currently and what we could get from what is available, for example.

So, that's what I meant. Before dropping this [inaudible] to this question, are we going to consider the perspective of the organization itself?

RUSS HOUSLEY: My interpretation of the briefing that's in the Wiki is that staff believes they have implemented fully all of the recommendations. So, it is our job to assess whether that implementation has had the intended effect and they will have the opportunity to point us to other things. In some cases, we have asked to be pointed to other things now and those are the outstanding questions. If you think there's a question we should have asked that we have not, then let's ask it. I'm not seeing any hands.

So, to recap what I think we have said is that we believe that the implementation of recommendation two has had the intended effect. However, it's unclear whether the word review in the recommendation

meant that the SSR Review Team was being tasked or someone else, so our takeaway from that is that we ought to have a community review whenever the SSR framework is updated and that each SSR Review Team should review the definition and implementation going forward. Anything else?

STEVE CONTE: Russ, this is Steve, if I may. Actually, let me pause on mine because Matogoro just typed some. I'll let you digest that and I still got my hand up when you're ready.

RUSS HOUSLEY: He's still typing some more. So, what I interpret is he wants to look at the definitions that the statement has already provided us and do an additional assessment as to whether the implementation has met those. Is that correct? Am I interpreting your text that you typed in the chat correctly?

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yeah. You interpret it correctly. I'm concerned with the definition that is provided on the framework and it's [based off] for us to assess its implementation and [inaudible] definition are still varied. As we are all aware, a number of changes are already happening so we can still see that for those definitions which were given in the frameworks are viable. Thank you.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. What actions or information do we need in order to do the assessment of the security, stability, and resilience? Steve, do you want to go ahead?

STEVE CONTE: Thanks, Russ. I want to draw back to what Denise said – and Denise, if I'm putting words in your mouth, please correct me. But, one of the things I suggest to the review team to carefully word this if you are going to go down this path because the definitions should be a community effort as well, in conjunction with ICANN Org. I sense that there might be pushback if the review team is making new definitions on their own about community consultation. So, I just wanted to raise that and make sure that if we do go down this path, that we do so in a collaborative mode with the rest of the community to make sure that everyone agrees if we do decide to change the definition.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Steve, that's not what I heard her saying. Let's let her speak for herself.

STEVE CONTE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because how we got to where we are, the statement went through the consensus process, so I think the definitions if we wanted to change

them, we could propose new ones, but they would have to go through the consensus process as well.

STEVE CONTE: Yes, I would agree with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: I think they didn't actually go through a consensus process that proposed them as indicated on the website and had discussions with the community or did I miss the public – Steve, you can correct me if I missed the formal public comment and response. Are you diffusing the work to [term] consensus [inaudible]?

STEVE CONTE: I believe, if I'm [inaudible] John here, if I remember what he told me, that when the first framework which is where the definitions live, it was put out for comment, and at that point, that's where he would have solicited community input on this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's not totally in synch with my understanding. When the definitions were first put out in a statement and that statement had a community review in September of 2012, and then based on the community review,

it was updated in October 2012 and then from there, they were put into the SSR framework. That's my understanding of the steps.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I had the same understanding. So, I would want to have I think a [inaudible] conversation with the review team to make sure that we're clear that we all think we have the mandate agreement to ourselves to open up these definitions and potentially change them, rather than recommending that this be done and recommending that staff run this process with community input and discussion. I think that's a key point for me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What I think I heard you say is the review team can suggest changes but they cannot be adopted without community consensus.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. We don't have a very precise language when it comes to what we can and can't do, so yeah, I think theoretically it's within our remit to send [inaudible] a change to definition. And if we did that, [inaudible] that would be recommending, consider that, have a discussion with the community, go through a public process of considering that it's appropriate updating the definition.

But, coming back full circle, personally I'm not convinced that it's a good use of our time to try and change the definition, just in terms of prioritizing our work, getting through the SSR1 recommendation implementation and starting our attention to all the other items that

we've identified we want to tackle. It's also a matter, I think, of our priorities and how [inaudible] our resources and time. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Matogoro, I'd love to hear your thoughts about that either in typing or to grab the audio. Naveed is typing but does not have his hand up. So, Naveed is supporting what was just said, that we can recommend changes but we cannot adopt changes. That requires community discussion and consensus. Matogoro says, "Yes, let's move forward while [inaudible] that." Denise, then Naveed.

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry, old hand.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yes. By saying that we can provide opinions on the terms, I mean that we can [dissect] the definitions, analyze them, and only provide our opinion regarding whether there's a need to change those or not, but we cannot [inaudible] those changes, I think. I just want to clarify what I think about it. We are not adopting, as I understand, and we cannot also suggest any changes. We can only say that there is a margin of modifying or updating and then it should be [offered] back to the community. That's what I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, is there any place where you think the definitions fall short that you want to recommend be reexamined?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, I don't have any critical objection on the current definition. I'm just saying that, to me, this is the mandate that I understand we have.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I agree with that. What I'm trying to gather is whether anyone on the call thinks that we need to ask for review from the community for any aspect of these definitions or if we're satisfied.

JABHERA MATOGORO: My concern on the way that the definitions are, it is somehow discussed to [assess] and quantify to the extent to which those definitions are being implemented as by ICANN remit and [inaudible]. So, that's why I was thinking that it's better for us to check on these definitions, and if possible, to put a kind of recommendation that can help, because this is the first review team on the SSR. Maybe on future, there might be another review team as per ICANN bylaw. And as we are having this definition in the way they are, it is [inaudible] for one to assess the implementation as for ICANN remit and [inaudible]. That's my concern.

So, that's why I wanted that. It's better for the team also to assess. If they're not coming up with a new definition, because I have seen that it's [inaudible] community support and such kind of procedure, but for

putting the [inaudible] first review team of the IANA transition. So, it's better for us to assess and see the process that went through and the way that this definition, there is still need to retain [inaudible] room for the review team in case we want to assess to what extent that this definition allow the implementation or the interpretation for ICANN bylaws. So, that's also my concern, that it's better for this team to see that this definition is still valid.

For example, they are saying that security is the capacity to protect and to prevent [inaudible], and stability is the capacity to ensure. So, if we are saying the capacity, [inaudible] measure of parameters, [inaudible] may read to someone to come up with the different interpretations because [inaudible] capacity to protect might mean different things. So, that's why I thought that you can [inaudible] the stability of saying the capacity to ensure that the [inaudible] operates as expected and that [inaudible] confident that the system operator is expected. And for the [inaudible] they are saying resilience is the capacity of the [inaudible] system to [inaudible] other disruptive [inaudible] without disruption or professional [inaudible].

So, my concern is that if we retain these definitions as they are, it is not giving a clear picture for one to assess and see to what extent that ICANN achieved that capacity as per ICANN remit and [inaudible]. Thank you.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if I can summarize that, what I think you're saying is that the current definitions make it hard for the SSR Review Team or anyone else to assess whether the implementation is adequate. Is that correct?

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yes, that's correct.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. Is there anything else about recommendation two that we ought to capture? Okay. Let's see if we can make some progress on recommendation three, then. It also is related to the SSR remit. Did the steps taken have the intended effect? I'm not seeing anyone advocating yes or no. Laurin, yes?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I hope you can hear me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, I hear you. Go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, I think it's a bit similar to what I was commenting on and Eric was commenting on. [inaudible] descriptions and [inaudible]. It appears to [inaudible] what's going on elsewhere. Again, it's a bit of a measurement problem.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, by measurement problem, do you mean it's hard to assess whether the terminology is being used consistently throughout ICANN?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Exactly, because we cannot review every document that might do that. So, it appears the important ones are okay. So, I would kind of say as far as we can see, it seems to be working, but we would underline that people should be made aware or something like that to kind of keep this going.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And what, if anything, should we recommend to improve that?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Question for me, I guess.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, you're the one who raised it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: My mind is still thinking about this right now, but maybe if we just recommend something along the lines that, yes, we see there is glossary [inaudible] encouraged to be in that material, so we would recommend that these activities continue to ensure that this is done as much as possible.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, one of the things, actions taken, say is that the key terms were added to the glossary, and on an ongoing basis, they're reviewed. As SSR activities evolve, terminology and descriptions will be updated. So, in a sense, I think they have said that they are doing what you just said.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, it does, exactly. This is what I mean. It seems they're doing and I would just kind of add that we recommend that these attempts continue, essentially. I think that's as far as we can go. As I said, we don't know if it's used everywhere, but we can see that ICANN is trying to do it and we just say that [inaudible] continue doing so. That should be [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, seem to be doing the right things. Please continue to do so. However, it's not possible for the review team to review every document, so it's hard to determine whether the terms are used consistently throughout ICANN.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Exactly. Perfect. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Eric and then Naveed.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, Russ. I have to drop in a minute. I really resonate with Laurin's first point, but I think I lost [parody] towards the end there. My view of our job on the review team is specifically not to propose remediations or actions. It's to simply review recommendations and their implementation. So, the recommendation is broad. I don't think it's our place to solve it or to narrow it. So, I really think Laurin brought up a good point. The recommendation is to say that the organization should use consistent terminology that's been vetted and it looks to me – and this could just be me. [inaudible] and subject to other people's disagreement. It looks to me like the responses, we put a glossary in place and that doesn't mean that communications are following the glossary. We could issue a communication and not even look at the glossary and we go all the way through it without being checked, potentially.

So, my view on this is that the implementation is not complete because the organization who had the purview to make up their mind about how to implement things and it's not our place to suggest it or to brainstorm about it because we're just a review team, but the organization has not put any safeguards in place to make sure that statements they issue are consistent with their glossary. So, certainly the glossary seems like a good first step, but the recommendation is that ICANN should utilize consistent terminology and description of this statement in all materials. So, something needs to be done to ensure that, if they wanted to hire a contractor or do it themselves, whatever. But, I think that part is missing, by my reading. Just my two cents.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I think we're going in the same direction, Eric. I also thought things are being done. We can see that. Then we say, "But, obviously …" Let's say the glossary that you rightly mentioned. That's not enough. So, we say we see something is being done, but we recommend that steps are taken that things like glossary are actually used. I think that kind of goes in the same direction, if I understand it correctly.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we just need to be careful not to be prescriptive. The team has gone around the [inaudible] about this for about a year. I think planning out that there is a deficiency is one thing, but then saying anything about what they could do about it … I mean, certainly we'd love to offer help but I think it's been made very clear that our job is not to engineer a solution. So, I think pointing out what has been done and what hasn't been done is probably the limit of what we should do. But that's just my two cents.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. That makes sense, too. Then we can just say we see some stuff has been done and then we can recommend further steps maybe and that's it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think that, Eric, you're advocating a statement that says we could not find procedures that ensure the terms in the glossary are used in all communications.

ERIS OSTERWEIL: Yeah, something like that. Communications and materials. That sounds find. Something like that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. I'm happy with that, too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. There's two points, actually. One is that looking at the response and the slides that were referred, I don't think enough has been done to do that. Maybe it is done, but it is not clear. That's like similar things [said by] Eric. So, I think there must be something more to see whether it was done or not, what methodology they took. With all this online material available, this documentation and all, it's very easy to do a profile link seeing which things or parts of the documentation were updated and on which dates; for example, [kind of like] profiling. I think ICANN can easily do and provide us, like [inaudible] the consistency that we put into after the recommendation. So, this is the first point.

The second, not related to exactly this thing, but the remit and the terminology or [inaudible]. Are we considering [inaudible] by these definitions. We are assuming that these definitions are consensus driven but within the ICANN. So, I would also like trying to see that they are consistent with this [inaudible] to some other ICANN organizations or other global organizations, how they see this security, stability, and

resiliency or we are happy with whatever the consensus-based definition ICANN has come up with.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin, your hand is up.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, sorry, this was old.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Eric needs to drop and we're one minute from time. So, if there's anything pressing about recommendation three, I'd love to hear it. Otherwise, I'd like to move on to the wrap-up items on the agenda.

Okay. Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Russ. I captured one action item only regarding the constituency travel e-mail to the entire team [inaudible] support. [inaudible]. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Any other business? Alright, then we'll end the call on time today. Thank you very much and we'll talk next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]