| BRENDA BREWER: | Thank you. Hello, everyone. Welcome to SSR2 Review Team Plenary call number 55 on the 20th of December, 20158 at 15:00 UTC. |
| --- | --- |
| | Attending the call today is Alain, Mr. Matagoro, Norm, Laurin, Eric, Russ, Scott, and Naveed. |
| | There are no observers at this time. We do have apologies from Denise and Boban. |
| | From ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar and Brenda. |
| | Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to state your name before speaking. Russ, I'll turn the call over to you. And Ram has just joined us as well. Thank you. |
| | |
| RUSS HOUSLEY: | Hello. Welcome to the last call for the year. Happy holidays to everyone, and look forward to you getting back to work in the new year. The first thing is a reminder. I don't know, should the staff – is going to talk about the flights? |
| | |
| JENNIFER BRYCE: | Thanks, Russ. I believe everybody has received e-mails from travel support, and it's really just a reminder. I believe the deadline to respond is tomorrow, so if you haven't done so, please respond already. |
| | Some team members have had some problems receiving the e-mail, and we've been talking to those people offline. If you are having trouble and |

**EN**

we haven't yet heard from you, keep in mind that the e-mail actually comes – it's a Constant Contact e-mail that comes on behalf of travel support at ICANN. So again, please go ahead and book your flight if you haven't done so already, and of course, get in touch if you need any support. We are in touch with a couple of team members separately.

The actual meeting venue, I believe, has been confirmed as the Jamaica Bay Inn for those of you who are familiar with the Los Angeles area. It is close to the office, and so the hotel confirmation should be coming soon. I don't know if they'll come before Friday, but if not, it will be early in the new year. And that's all I have .happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          Jennifer, by book flights, she meant request from travel.

JENNIFER BRYCE:          Correct. Sorry. I believe you have to fill in the dates. I'm not too familiar with it, but yeah, thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          Okay. And I already reminded everyone that this is the last call for this year, and the next one will be the 10th of January. Jennifer sent out a proposed update to the workplan. I wanted to give people an opportunity to comment on the changes. If there's no concerns, we'll get it posted. If there are concerns, we'll get it updated and then posted.

**EN**

So the floor's open to any concerns.

I see a green checkmark from one and silence from everyone else. I take that to mean that the updates are okay. Jennifer, would you please post that on the Wiki?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Will do. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. And Eric sent out some preamble text. I guess it was last night, at least for me. Eric, would you take us through that?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sure. So the link I just sent out a little while ago, so feel free to, if you haven't checked your e-mail, go in, you've hopefully – it sounds like everyone got it. And I'm happy to do kind of a rough overpass. I'm not sure people actually want me to read it, but it's less than a page.

It basically outlines the sections of the bylaws that direct the work for the DNS SSR subteam work stream, it quotes a little bit of text from the bylaws themselves just to sort of motivate and justify, and then it essentially says – one of the early statements is that the methodology is going to focus on measurable issues like abuse that we can actually say are SSR concerns and make sure that we can, as described in the picture at the bottom, illustrate a causal dependency back to any elements that are within ICANN's purview.

**EN**

In other words, something that is within ICANN's purview that has a causal relationship to whatever it is that we've decided is a measurable concern would then qualify that measurement, that artifact as something that's in scope to investigate versus something that we think is really disconcerting or a problem in the Internet but that does not ultimately have a causal relationship, causal dependency on [inaudible].

So there's a couple at the very last sentence or two. There's one or two sort of half-strawman examples of what this actually means ,but the general gist of the text is as I've described. And I'm happy to sort of iterate with people. I think the ICANN SSR preamble text was a good exemplar to follow, but it had a little more meat to it because that work is a little more mature at this point.

But modulo any of that, I'm certainly happy to take questions, and I consider this a group initiative anyway, so certainly, people should feel free to weigh in in any way they see fit. How's that, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY:     So Eric, I just have a question about the difference between a solid blue arrow and a dotted red arrow.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     Yeah. They're annotated with the descriptors, so there's a little blurb off to the left saying causal dependencies, and it's pointing at the solid blue arrows. And the dotted line red arrow has a little annotation below it saying no causal dependency. Is that rendering for you?

**EN**

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Yes, and so the question I have is but there's no causal dependency, but it does have ICANN purview, is how I take the lower right arrow. So, is that part of the work or not?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     No. [The figure should definitely then potentially] use some work. So I'm of course happy to iterate with it.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     I just wasn't sure I was interpreting it right, and I'll leave it to – any other comments from others, or questions?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     Also, as I said, I'm more than happy to iterate with folks on this, people don't have to use me as a chokepoint. So I think we [inaudible] and whatnot. So I know there hasn't been a huge amount of lead time, but it's definitely my hope that none of this is terribly surprising to people and that it doesn't – I'm certain that there's lots of opinions, but hopefully, there aren't too many surprises. But even if there are, if anybody wants to voice their surprise, we can certainly iterate on it now.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     So Norm asked in the chat, does "systems" include processes and procedures? He asked "inclide," but I assume he means "include."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that that's something that I could render an opinion on, but I'd be speaking with no particular hat on, I think. So I think it does. I think a lot of abuse happens above the transport layer, and that makes it not necessarily always clearly a technical issue, but I do think there are other review teams that do have charters that we could easily see it overlapping, and certainly, we had some recommendations directed at us from other review teams.

So broadly speaking, I think if we were to be overly restrictive at the beginning, that would potentially hamstring some of our results. So I think indeed, it should include processes, at least in the consideration phase. I think if ultimately we find that there are SSR processes we're worried about but we don't see them dovetail into something that is within ICANN's purview, then we boot them back out, but I would say yes. I don't know if other people have a thought.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So Norm agrees with you. Maybe there's a place where you used the word "system" where you can say, comma, "Including." It's not clear to me which of the places "system" appears is the best place to say that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: If we could just say in the beginning, like, "includes the processes" in the text, and then we can just put a footnote and say, "This means A, B and C, but we'll only refer to A and we mean all of them" so the text doesn't get super long. So we don't always have to write "processes and procedures and systems." I think that's what I would propose, but I'm

# EN

totally in agreement that we should put them in to not overly limit ourselves there.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          That works for me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:        I just added a couple of words at the t ail end of this second sentence in the second paragraph, the methodology [inaudible]. So the last paragraph, the second sentence in there, I've changed it. It previously said, "Therefore, the methodology to evaluate its SSR for those portions under ICANN's purview must start by broadly considering the actual concerns, threats, attacks, abuse," and then I added, "procedures, policies, etc." I don't know if that's sufficient or if that's the only/best [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY:          That works for me. We'll give others a chance to speak, but that works for me. And Naveed in the chat says, "You need to define dependent systems."

ERIC OSTERWEIL:        That would essentially enumerate the Internet. I'm not sure if he means – do you have any suggested text? I'm not sure exactly – any system in the Internet that we're looking at, we would evaluate as whether it's dependent on – I'm happy to take a suggestion on that one.

**EN**

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Okay. I hear [inaudible] dependent systems, but the text doesn't use that phrase at all.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     I see. Not define what dependent systems we're talking about, what we mean by a dependent system.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Right. Somebody's in a place with music. If you could mute when you're not talking, that'd be great. Alright, so Eric, we'll leave you to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     Yeah. I see what –

RUSS HOUSLEY:     [inaudible] insert a phrase or a sentence. So since only about half of the team is on this call, I'm going to ask people to review this over the next week or so, maybe two weeks given the holiday, and then we can put it to bed before the next call.

Naveed, do you want to try talking now? Go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:     Yeah. Actually, I wanted to have a kind of line or two about the dependent systems, and that [would] also include the policies, procedures as suggested by Norm. So we specify in one line what do we

# EN

mean by the independent system. That's what I wanted to say, actually. So I don't see the relation within the text and the [figure] in that context. [inaudible] that means, actually.

RUSS HOUSLEY:    Yeah. I think Eric took the action to come up with a sentence or a phrase. Okay, any more concerns with this preamble text? Okay. We're moving on then.

Moving on to the next agenda item, which was each of the review team members was asked to put together some text for an SSR1 recommendation for the final report. There was a Google doc sent around for people to do that, so I'd like to spend a little time going through each of the additions [that have] appeared since the last call.

I see Jennifer's typing. Oh, thank you. Jennifer has just posted in the chat the link for that Google doc. So at first, it has the preamble text that we spent so long doing, and the first one in there is recommendation four, which we went through last time, [inaudible] template.

The next one is number six, which I did over the last week. So if people would take a look at that and see if there's any concerns or suggested improvements. If they're just edits, please go ahead and make them right on the document.

I'm not hearing any comments, so I'm taking that to [mean] we're happy with this. Sorry, Laurin.

**EN**

LAURIN WEISSINGER:     Sorry. I had my hand up, but I'm not sure if [it always registers.]

RUSS HOUSLEY:     I know. I was looking at the Google doc. Sorry.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:     No problem. Essentially, I just want to say I think this is good, it's very clear, it's obvious. I think it's another one of those, a bit like the one we talked about last week that was really, do X, X hasn't really been done so it is quite clear what our assessment and recommendations are. So I think it's good.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Okay. So not seeing any other hands. I'm also not seeing any other additions to the documents since last week, so please, get this done so that we can get SSR1 behind us completely. I will send a reminder for people. Hopefully, you can find some time during the break to get this completely done so that on the next call, we can finish it.

Okay. The next thing on the agenda is Any Other Business because I thought we would have a lot more text in that file to go over. One of the things in Any Other Business that I would like to bring up is given the pace that we're taking, my expectation is that we will need a face-to-face meeting in May. So if people could start thinking about when on their calendar works.

What we will do when we get together in L.A. in January is see how far we get at that meeting and then put together a placeholder for May in

case we're not done coming out of Kobe. Does that make sense to everyone?

Okay, not hearing anything. Scott, I notice you're on the call. Are we able to finish the two recommendations in SSR1 that you haven't filled the table in on those two because we're waiting for an announcement?

Not hearing Scott. Okay, KC, you have your hand up. No, I can't hear you, KC. Okay. KC wants to talk about recommendation 23. My understanding from the e-mail discussion is that she understands what to say in the where we got – or what was done on terms of implementing, but she would like to talk about a follow-on recommendation, and she's going to dial in to see if we can hear her.

Okay, KC has put in the chat that while she's dialing in, can folks read recommendation 23 and consider what can be recommended? She does not think it's easy to fix.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:          Quick question. Where are we reading? So we're all on the same page.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                I assumed she meant the table.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:          Okay.

**EN**

RUSS HOUSLEY:     But maybe she didn't.

KC CLAFFY:        Hi. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY:     [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY:        I mean the old recommendation. We could go look at all the documentation that I've put in there, but for starters, it would be fine to just read the SSR1 recommendation for 23. Some of the things I've put in there is that – and as a higher-level comment, I'm sort of nervous that the process here is everyone go off and write a new recommendation, because I feel like some of these need some discussion.

And this one in particular, I'm not even quite sure where to start. So maybe I've been out of the loop on some of the strategic efforts of this, but there's going to be a whole set of additional recommendations after we're finished with this SSR1 analysis, or not? Or are the recommendations really going to be teed off of how we restructure these?

RUSS HOUSLEY:     So KC, what we're trying to do at this point in terms of recommendations is only ones that are follow-on to SSR1. The other work streams will lead to their own [recommendation.]

# EN

KC CLAFFY:                       Okay. So [inaudible] this one. ICANN must provide appropriate resources consistent with demands placed on them. I think for the SSR-related working groups, what I've observed is that there's sort of no upper bound [to the demands] or the expectations that are placed on them, and I've heard people say [inaudible] expecting volunteer groups like SSAC to be able to catch all the balls that are thrown in SSR context is not reasonable.

So this looks like an easy sentence to say and a whole lot buried underneath it. Indeed, I think when one of the documents that I read about the visit to L.A. and the discussion with OCTO about OCTO's plans for next year looked like there's an enormous amount on their plate as well, and I think that one comes later. The very next one, 24.

So I just feel like I'm not even sure how to scope this. And again, the back pressure is always ,"Oh, this is mission creep for ICANN, this should be somebody else's problem" but this came up a lot in the context of the DAAR.

So DAAR is this nice data system they put together to try to help understand more about DNS abuse, but at the moment, it's not clear to me how that's being used, and it seems like there are limitations on who can get access to that data, so I'm just really struggling with how to even scope a fix to this recommendation.

And the second sentence is similarly complex, because it talks about making sure that decisions are reached in a way that's free from external or internal pressure, which seems to be inconsistent with the

# EN

whole multi-stakeholder model which is all about external pressures sort of cancelling each other out, I think.

So I'm interested in thought form other people on just what you think about this area in general. And this seems to be central to a lot of the other recommendations, like what does it mean for there to be appropriate resources for the SSR-related working groups? And I'll speak in particular on behalf of SSAC, which I've watched for many years sort of struggle to get much done that they thought was important because of the volunteer nature of the group.

RUSS HOUSLEY:        Just reacting to what you said, this recommendation clearly doesn't include any of that complexity, and maybe the response needs to say that that's the case, and then we need to determine whether there's any work we want to do or to recommend going forward. Because it seems to me there's not even a list of what are the SSR-related working groups, other than the thing from recommendation – I think it's six that asks that RSSAC and SSAC's roles be explained.

KC CLAFFY:        Correct. I think there are more SSR-related working groups today than there were when this recommendation was written. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY:        Right. So I think it may be that this is overcome by events, and that it's too complicated to go into all of that. Maybe we explain that the

landscape has changed, and I hear Eric disagreeing with me, so I'm pleased to hear his perspective.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Sorry. I didn't know if you want me to –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Sorry. I wasn't sure if I should jump the queue with my hand up. So I have a personal opinion about this based on the stuff that a bunch of us talked about for a while, so I'm going to inadvertently or on purpose throw Zarko under the bus a little bit just because of some conversations [I remember with him] in particular that I thought personally I hadn't seen clearly before, but he convinced me, so I'll espouse my own opinion but blame Zarko for having it, which is that in doing these recommendations and reviewing their implementation, our job isn't really to sort of unwind what the proper way to do things would be or how we would fix them, it's to be very empirical, very clinical about just yes or no.

It simplifies our job a lot to not say, "You know, that's a really tough thing to really evaluate properly," because to fix it, it's very, I think, [common really] for me to start figuring out how to fix a problem even though I'm just trying to describe it. so I think it's really important for us to stay very clinical about, is the patient healthy or not? Not like what's the diagnosis and what's the prognosis, just, is it healthy or not?

So I think we spent a lot of time on SSR1 recommendations coming up with discussions about methodologies to just clarify why did we say the patient is healthy or not. So it is good to say, "Well, we took the patient's temperature, we took the blood pressure, and that's why we think the patient is or isn't healthy." But what the diagnosis is or what the prognosis is, not something that we should worry about in reviewing SSR1 recommendations.

And to KC's point early on, I think if something really gets stuck in our coral that we want to put into a recommendation of our own, whether it came from SSR1 or not, I think that's a separate issue. So yes, certainly, we can have recommendations that dovetail or stem directly from an SSR1 discussion. But that essentially is independent as a review team, [if there's] something that we think we should recommend.

And I think we've all sort of beaten a horse to death about we will do a better job of making our recommendations more measurable than these. So I don't mean to unpack that again, but bringing that back to number 23 here, it says, "ICANN must provide appropriate resources for SSR-related working groups and advisory committees consistent bla bla."

And I think whether there were a different number of advisory committees or whatever back then or not is kind of not really the point in my personal opinion. It would be that we would say, "As of today –" like part of our methodology would be to say "These are the groups and committees that we think are referenced by this recommendation today," and kind of yes or no.

**EN**

And of course, KC, your follow-on point, ICANN must ensure decisions [are reached in working groups and ACs in objective manners.] I don't know how we would ever diagnose that. So I think my two cents would be a clinical review of this is [inaudible] talking about, any review of the documentation that we have at our disposal would suggest they're complaining they don't have enough money or not, so yes or no, and it's just not really clear how we would measure influence. So we have no data on that.

That would be my sense, and then we could decide that we want to pick the slides up and put something into a recommendation right at the end of the review separately. That's just my two cents. But I kind of pushed back on the [OBE] because I feel like we could say something, we should just try not to – I think we shouldn't try to overdo these things. That's my two cents.

KC CLAFFY:          Thanks, Eric. That helps a little, but I was stuck on the part about, should we rewrite the recommendation or have a new recommendation now? The [inaudible] I think I know how to write, but it's that last part about what should the new recommendation be here, and I hear you saying punt on that and wait until we get to the rest of the process. Am I [inaudible] that right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     Yeah. Let me make sure I'm not missing something. You mean just the inherent, we want to do a better job of adjusting this? Because what do you mean write a new recommendation?

KC CLAFFY: I thought the last question on the survey that we're doing for each of these is, "If so, does the recommendation still apply? If so, how?" Kind of. I don't have it in front of me, but I thought there was some question about how would you write the recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The question is, did it have any intended effect? And if not, is it still relevant, and should we make a recommendation as part of our effort?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]. Yeah, go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, I understand much better now what we're discussing, because I guess I missed that last part. Sorry, my memory is probably stale on this one. I don't think, personally, we should insist on coupling the SSR1 recommendations with whether we'll have a follow-on recommendation. I think they should be decoupled. I certainly think we could inform our set of recommendations from these if we choose to,

# EN

but I think SSR having recommended that all SSRs should be numbered one or two is not very likely to endure. So yeah, I don't think that we should presume any SSR1 recommendation necessarily results in a follow-on recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     I agree that there is not necessarily a follow-on, but there's judgment applied to make that decision, right?

KC CLAFFY:     Right, and for six, the one we just talked about, there are two recommendations that come out of the old six, it looks to me like, in the doc. And it would be super weird to me if this 23 didn't have a related recommendation coming out of it, because I, again, does seem to me, central to many problems that are happening in the ecosystem right now [that there aren't] resources being applied to to even study them, much less navigate them. So that's where I got stuck.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     Okay, yeah. That was just my personal [view] and I'm happy to [go with what the group wants]

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Okay. Laurin is next in the queue, and then Naveed.

**EN**

LAURIN WEISSINGER:    I think a lot of what I wanted to say has been addressed. [inaudible] put in like a two-sentence thing on the follow-up recommendation, I think Eric's point really is what I would also kind of go with for now, which is to think about, do we have some way of measuring, say, what is going on at the moment and what we could recommend at a very high level that ICANN could do to kind of going forward see which groups would be under the remit of this recommendation, what resources do they need, etc.

And I think KC, you mentioned specifically – this is what I want to say – a long time ago on SSAC where you have kind of the [insight] of stuff that should probably be addressed not being addressed, etc. So the question I think there – and it would be a great starting point to think about, okay, why is this not possible? What are the issues? Is it that it's volunteers? And that might be a limitation that cannot be fixed, but if there are other kind of limitations, that might be something that is indeed [addressable.]

KC CLAFFY:    Okay. I'll think about that.

RUSS HOUSLEY:    Go ahead, Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:    Yeah. I was trying to figure out this recommendation, and I think the context in which this recommendation was written matters a lot, and for that, when you dig into the SSR1 recommendation [report,] there is

a text of around one page that actually is followed by this recommendation.

So if we read that text, it says that during the discussion of that review team with SSAC, it was apparent that sometimes, [they felt] pressure to do some task within a specific period of time, and I think this is just natural. We always have deadlines, so I don't really understand why there was this recommendation.

We need to understand why it was needed to see whether it is still relevant or not. So reading that text, it becomes very diluted kind of problem, because it talks about that some of the working groups complained about the staffing and the other resources, not mentioning what those other resources are.

So it is important how we think that this recommendation means. For that, we need to read the SSR1 recommendation report to better understand the context. This is what I believe. And then we can actually evaluate whether something was done related to that and whether it is still relevant or not, because it will always be relevant.

This kind of text will always be relevant. No matter what you do, you'll always be having discussions of meeting deadlines and we're always going to have the complaint about the lack of resources [and all that.] So I don't find how can we say that this is still relevant or this was not implemented, or it was implemented. It's very difficult to tell, actually. I see silence, so is it I'm disconnected? Or I don't know.

KC CLAFFY:                  No, I heard you, Naveed.

RUSS HOUSLEY:               Just giving people time to [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY:                  Yeah. I'm just still trying to digest what that means in terms of answering the last part of this about what further work is needed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:           [inaudible] the text of the SSR1 report, if you just read that report, it says that what review team – why they talked about this recommendation itself. So that context, I don't see that really a solid really grounds to have a recommendation. Some part of the SSR team [inaudible] there is some pressure sometimes, and that [inaudible] it seems to mention that the pressure was about the limited timeframe, the pressure was not kind of political one.

So it can be implicitly a political one because you need to have something very quickly and you don't want people to dig into that, but I don't think we are going into that [inaudible] understanding this statement. But it [has] very kind of vague meaning when you read it, and that should not lead to that kind of recommendation. And it's very difficult to evaluate whether this was implemented or not, and even if someone feels that it was implemented, how can we assess that [inaudible] and what can we [inaudible] more about it? Because it's not political kind of pressure that this recommendation is talking about.

**EN**

KC CLAFFY: So, does that mean, Naveed, that you think based on your reading of this text that there's no further work needed for this recommendation?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just suggesting that if at all, then we need to come up with something that, again, as we discussed before, that can be measurable, because saying that it should be [come up with] something that has no internal or external pressure does not make any sense, because [there's always] timeframe pressure, there can always be lack of resources no matter how much you provide. So I don't see the sense of that recommendation in this context, in the context that the review team itself is presenting in the report.

I'm just trying to [inaudible] if we make this as a generic recommendation without reading that context, then we can debate about many aspects that it can cover, but I don't think we need to go into that, because we need to come up and understand why this recommendation was made at that point in time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin, you have your hand up.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry, that's old.

**EN**

RUSS HOUSLEY:          So KC, I'm not sure you got what you wanted out of this.

KC CLAFFY:             Not yet, but that's helpful even so.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          Does anyone have anything they want to add? Okay, then I think we're at the end of the agenda. Staff, can you take us through the decision and the actions?

JENNIFER BRYCE:        Sure. Thanks, Russ. So the action items on this call, first of all, staff to post update [inaudible]

NAVEED BIN RAIS:       [inaudible]

JENNIFER BRYCE:        Sorry. Naveed, were you trying to speak?

NAVEED BIN RAIS:       Yeah, I just wanted to say something. Can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY:          [Yeah.]

| | |
|---|---|
| NAVEED BIN RAIS: | I just wanted to say that I'd be happy to work with KC on this offline if she wished to do so. So we can discuss this offline as a – |
| | |
| KC CLAFFY: | Thanks. I'll reach out. |
| | |
| JENNIFER BRYCE: | Okay. So I'll add an action item at the end there, but we're going to post the approved workplan that was agreed today on the call to the Wiki page, and team members to review the DNS SSR preamble text that Eric shared via e-mail, and share any additional comments on this ahead of the next plenary call which is the 10th of January. Team members to input draft text into the SSR1 recommendations Google doc using the findings recorded by the review team. Russ will send a reminder and penholders are indicated in the document. |
| | Team to discuss a potential face-to-face meeting in May 2019 during the [time between L.A.] and staff to give travel meeting team a heads up about this discussion. And then I think there was an action item there for KC and Naveed to get together to discuss recommendation 23. I have no other action items. |
| | |
| RUSS HOUSLEY: | [inaudible] SSR1 text into the report, and please enjoy your holiday break. Thank you. |

**EN**

JENNIFER BRYCE:          Thanks, everyone. Bye.


LAURIN WEISSINGER:       Thank you, everybody. Enjoy the holidays.


NEGAR FARZINNIA:         Thanks, everyone. Happy holidays. Bye.


**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**