ICANN Transcription

GNSO Temp Spec gTLD RD EPDP - Phase 2

Thursday, 23 July 2020 at 14:30 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:https://community.icann.org/x/TwR1C

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO temp spec gTLD RD ePDP Phase 2 call taking place on the 23rd of July, 2020, at 14:30 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no rollcall. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room.

If you are only on the telephone, could you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you. hearing no names, we have apologies today from Julf Helsingius from the NCSG. He has formally assigned David Cake as his alternate for this call and for the remaining days of absence.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists for today's call. Members and alternates replacing members, when using chat, please select "all panelists and attendees" in order for everyone to

see chat. Attendees will not have chat access, only view-chat access.

Alternates not replacing a member are required to rename their line by adding three Z's to the beginning of their name and, in parentheses, add affiliation, dash, "alternate" at the end. This means you will automatically be pushed to the end of the queue. To rename in Zoom, hover over your name and click "rename."

Alternates are not allowed to engage in the chat, apart from private chats, or use any of the other Zoom room functionalities, such as raising hands or agreeing and disagreeing.

As a reminder, the alternate assignment must be formalized by way of a Google assignment form. The link is available in all meeting invite e-mails. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Thank you.

If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the ePDP Wiki space. Please remember to state your name before speaking.

Recordings will be posted on the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and over to our ePDP Phase 2 chair, Rafik Dammak. Please begin.

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Andrea, and thanks to all the ePDP members for joining today's call. So, this is the last call this week, so I appreciate the effort in the attendance. First item, as usual, is the confirmation of the agenda. So, if there is no concern or objection, we will move to the next item.

Okay. So, I guess we can move to agenda number three. With that, they want just to make a message, just a clarification here, to set the scene. So, before diving into substantive issues, I wanted to touch upon the next steps in the process and some modification that we are proposing to the timeline to give everyone a little bit of breathing room while [speaking] with our delivery date of the 31st of July. So, looking first at the timeline.

As we discussed yesterday, you will have until 26th of July to continue working on the Google Doc to resolve category two items. And also, as we noted, it will be up to the proponent of category two items that have been objected to engage with those that have expressed a concern to see if a compromise is possible. And if so, this compromise should be clearly marked in the Google Doc by the 26th of July at the latest so that other groups can review this before the staff support team apply this to the report.

For those category two items for which there was no objection, the staff support team has already started applying this to the report and has indicated as such in the Google Doc. So, in some cases they have reached out to commenters to better understand whether comments were in support or in opposition to what was proposed. So, asking here again. So, please try to respond in a timely manner so we can move on.

For the 27th of July, the staff support will flag for which items compromised language has been found, which groups will be, then, asked to review the Google Doc. Should this have created any "cannot live with" items for groups that might have not been involved with the online dialog, this needs to be flagged and the edits will not be applied.

So, I think one of the most important days will be tomorrow, Friday, 24th of July. So, we will distribute the updated final report in which the minor edits, category two items that were not objected to and resolved category one agreement, have been applied.

Of course, as you can understand, it's not the time for further edits or flag any concerns. But if you see any change that you believe are in error that staff support might have missed, of course we should indicate as such and flag that to the support team.

So, I think maybe it's the most important part in terms of process. So, together with the updated final report, I will distribute the proposed consensus designation as outlined in the GNSO Working Group guidelines provision, which you can see in the agenda.

This is expected to be an iterative process, similar to how this was done in Phase 1. And so, I'm planning to use a table in which I will identify for each recommendation the consensus designation that I believe has been achieved, and also indicating which groups do not appear to support a recommendation or part of the recommendation, if any.

So, you can understand that my designation will not be ... Sorry. It will be [officially] be inspired by the outcome of the discussion today,

as well as any "cannot live with" items that we were not able to resolve yesterday.

But again, I say this is expected to be an iterative process. So, if you believe the consensus designation is not the correct one, or your group has been incorrectly identified or not identified as not supporting a certain recommendation, please flag this as soon as possible. I will review that input and make all necessary updates also appropriate through this iterative process. We'll hopefully come to general understanding on the consensus designation.

So, we also have given everyone a couple more days to prepare any minority statement you want to see included in the report, similar to Phase 1. These are expected to be included in the next final report. And so, please, if it's ready, share them or send them as soon as possible.

And then, after 29th of July, the support staff will wrap this all up into the final report for the submission to the GNSO Council. Sorry for this long description, but just to go all through our timeline, and also to explain about the process, how I will proceed for the council's designation. Okay. I see it's Alan and Marc in the queue. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I didn't who was going ahead, but I assume it's me because I think my hand was up first. Two quick points. Number one, the ALAC will likely be objecting to some recommendations with a conditional acceptance based on actions of the GNSO. I don't know how you want to try to represent that but I'm giving you a heads up.

Number two, I believe you do need to try to assess consensus on the items we did not address, or that were referred to the GNSO. I think that's the substantive and important part of this process, and even though there is no recommendation associated with it, the lack of a recommendation is taking action and I believe you should try to assess the support or non-support for that action. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Marc, if you're speaking, we cannot hear you.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rafik. Can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you now. Yeah, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Great. Thanks. So, I just want to make sure I understand the process that you're going to go through for consensus designation. As I recall, in Phase 1 the way we did it was each group submitted in writing their consensus designation for each recommendation in writing, and then that was included in a table in the final report.

It sounds like you're choosing not to take that approach here and that you're going to make your own determination based on your understanding of the discussions and indicate a designation.

Assuming I have that right, can you give a little bit more of an indication on what that designation will be? Are you going to go

group-by-group how you understand it, or are you just intending to go sort of a high-level full support, partial support, no support? I'm just looking for a little more detail, I guess, on how you intend to make the consensus designation and how that will be indicated in the final report.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Marc. Okay. So, I heard two questions. First, we start with yours. So, in terms of [inaudible], if I recall correctly, in Phase 1 was also the designation from [Kurt] was shared. So, what I will do tomorrow is to first see, for each recommendation, based on the calls we had this week where we have agreement and also when we have the "cannot live with." So, identifying all the groups in their position.

Based on that, I will make that assessment with regard to the consensus designation. So, basically, I think if everyone is agreeing, it's easy to say it's full consensus. But things is how to differentiate between consensus or to end the other is strong support with significant opposition. So I guess, when I will send my designation, I will explain how I proceeded and go in more detail.

So, having also the input from every group will be helpful, so that's why if you send it as soon as possible it will help to review the designation that I will share in a timely manner.

So, going back to a comment from Alan, I'm not sure that's how we can make consensus designation in something that's not a recommendation. But anyway, I think for today we'll cover,

probably, those items in question, and then I can decide how to proceed. Yes, Amr. Please, go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Rafik. I had a request, if I may. If I understood you correctly, there's going to be an action item for all the groups to indicate their position on each of the recommendations. Would it be okay, after leadership team and staff collate all the input, to present it all to us in a table before designating the consensus levels for each recommendation?

That way we can get a better idea of where each group stands on everything in a sort of tabular form. I believe we did this in Phase 1. And then, each group can confirm that the designations in the table are correct. I think that would be helpful, for us to just visualize this before we wrap it up. I don't think we'll need too much time getting this done, but it might be a helpful step in the middle. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Amr. Sorry. Maybe I was not clear in the explanation. What I will share as designation will be in table format and it also will include the groups to be specific which group is supporting and not. So, I think that will give a clear idea about the level of support for each recommendation, and I guess that's to respond to your request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Great. Thanks.

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sorry. Okay. James, please go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you, Rafik. Good morning. I just had a question, and it's possible that I am misunderstanding the instruction, so I'm asking for a clarification. But it sounded like, earlier, one of the speakers said they would submit conditional support for recommendations like, for example, "We support recommendation X, but if the council approves recommendation Y, then we withdraw our support for recommendation X," or something like that.

It seems like that could be very complicated, if we start attaching conditions to support. I'm trying to think of what a mess that would be, if everyone did that, and I would ask everyone to try to express a support, do not support, or support with concerns or something type of level, and not kind of create these if-then statements in their position because that gets very, very complicated. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, James. Okay. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Rafik. So, to James' point, I do agree that conditional support does complicate matters. However, yesterday we were rushed through some of the recommendations and, for us, and maybe for other groups, as well, some of the issues were crucial and were "cannot live with." So, there are two options here. Either

we have no consensus, and that's possible, or we have a conditional consensus. So, that's fairly where we are, and that's just to explain this conditional support. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Hadia. I will close the queue, here. This is not supposed to be the main agenda item, so I'm hearing all the comments. But I think it's important to clarify that, to be honest, I'm not familiar with this idea of conditional consensus because, at this level, just we will say we have consensus. It describes the level of consensus.

So, if there are some concerns or something specific, there is one vehicle, I think, fits that purpose, which is the minority view, where groups can develop or elaborate about their concerns and so on.

But at this stage, just we need to decide what's the level of consensus, and that will be either to the report that will be sent to the GNSO Council for review and consideration. So, I think that helps.

Okay. So, let's move to the main … And before that, probably it's better, too, that we will share the description of the timeline and also about the process for the designation. So, if it was not enough clear during the call, maybe, written, that will be more clear to everyone.

So, moving to agenda number four. So, we just remind that we will follow the same approach as the last two calls. I'm asking kindly that you have one representative from each group to speak, so please coordinate just in terms of time. So, we have, now, a 90-

minute call and so many things to cover. With that, asking Marika to start on the first item, agenda item number four.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks very much, Rafik. So, the first agenda item here is, basically, a combination of a number of priority two items. We briefly touched upon that, yesterday, there is a desire from many in the group to have a kind of factual statement on why certain topics were not addressed or what the status of those was.

The staff support team, together with Rafik, had a look at the different inputs that were provided. We actually think that the Registries Stakeholder Group promoted their proposed language yesterday, so we started off with that and circulated proposed language to the list earlier today.

Laureen already responded with some proposed edits and, to facilitate your review, we've applied those as redline changes. So, I think that the question here, really, for the group is, does this meet your expectations on providing a factual status update on where these topics stand?

I think, similarly, there was a comment about why these were not reflected in the executive summary. Of course, if this language gets accepted for inclusion in the report, we'll also make sure to reflect that in the executive summary.

So I think, with that, probably should just open the floor and see … I don't know if everyone had a chance to review this, so I don't know if a few minutes are in order to read this. But again, the question is,

can everyone live with this as a description of both the legal and natural and the feasibility of unique contacts topic?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Marika. Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rafik. Thank you, staff, for putting together the draft of this. I did have a chance to review it and I do support the staff versions. I'm not okay with the edits from Laureen.

On the first one, on legal versus natural, I think the idea that the staff version as neutral and factual … The edits from Laureen seem to put in opinions and feelings and get away from the plain, factual nature of the staff version. I don't necessarily agree with the redlines that were added to that one.

With feasibility of unique contacts, likewise, I don't agree with the redline. I think that is actually a creative editing of the language that came out of the legal sub-team, and I think what the legal sub-team actually said on that, I'm putting into chat, is that while masking of personal e-mail addresses is a valuable privacy technology, the publication of masked e-mail addresses is still considered publication of personal data.

I think that's taken from the report that the legal sub-team gave us, and that was the language that was included in the initial report agenda. So, I think that—

RAFIK DAMMAK:	Marc? Marc?
MARC ANDERSON:	Support the staff version but not the redlines.
RAFIK DAMMAK:	Sorry, Marc, for interrupting. You were kind of fading in and out. And so I think, at the end, we could not hear you well.
MARC ANDERSON:	Apologies. Do you need me to repeat any of that or did you get enough?
RAFIK DAMMAK:	Maybe the last part, I think. That will be fine, yeah.
MARC ANDERSON:	Okay. So, I'll go to where feasibility of unique contacts … Again, I support the staff version but not the redlines. I put in chat what we heard from the legal sub-team in their report on the Bird & Bird memo, and what was included in initial report. So, I think I don't agree with the sentence that Laureen added. I think that's a little bit taken out of context from what we've heard from the legal sub-team.
RAFIK DAMMAK:	Thanks, Marc. Milton?

EN

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. I could live with either of these formulations, speaking about legal/natural. However, I just wanted to raise the question, do you really think it's accurate to say that we couldn't reach an agreement on legal/natural because we didn't have this report? I've never been convinced that this report is going to suddenly make us agree on that.

It would be maybe more accurate to not say that, but if that holds us up I'm perfectly willing to accept the proposed language. Pretty much the same editing toward the pseudonymization, as long as we have a clear statement that the publication of uniformed masked e-mail addresses does, in fact, constitute publication of personal data.

I don't think it matters a lot whether we praise it as a useful measure or not. I think it is somewhat unnecessary. But again, if it gets us going to agree, let's go with that. That's all.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sorry. Thanks, Milton. Okay. Volker, I'm not sure. Volker, you lowered your hand.

VOLKER GREIMANN: No, I didn't. If it was lowered, it wasn't by me.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Okay, so please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I agree with everything that Marc said. The original version was fine. The other one adds too much color and one-sided [interpretation]. There is just one edit that I would suggest. I sent up a mail just now, but probably too late for anyone to read.

The word "some before the discussion" should be changed to "substantial preliminary discussion," simply because of the fact that the time we have already spent on this was quite substantial, and the word "some" does not give justice to the time that we've spent on this. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Volker. Alan, and then Laureen. Alan Greenberg, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I do support the changes that were made and I have one other additional change that I believe is important, and that is on the second paragraph at the end of the third sentence, the third line. It says "feasible." I believe that should be "advisable."

"Feasible" implies there is no physical way to do it. There is. The real issue in question in this issue—and I'm not suggesting we raise it in the paragraph—is it is not forbidden to publish personal data.

You have to do a balancing test and say whether the merits of it are worth the potential impact on the data subject. We did not do that, and I believe that has to be done, which is why I believe more work has to be done. But to say it's not feasible implies you can't do it at

all, whereas we made a decision not to do it without actually considering the pros and cons. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Laureen, please go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. I just wanted to respond briefly to Marc. I'm not sure why Marc is making personal comments this morning but my language is factual. I don't see any feelings involved in those words. Perhaps Marc has some creative interpretations.

And speaking of creative interpretations, the language that I quoted is from the Bird & Bird memo verbatim. What the legal team decided is rather irrelevant. That's why I wanted to quote from the memo itself, which, as Alan pointed out, this issue is nuanced and that's an important addition that we thought would give further context. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Laureen. Sorry, Steve. As we say, there is one person by a group to speak. Okay. So, I think the question here, really, is we have a language that was proposed by staff. There are several edits but I think it is really important if other groups, if they have concerns, can live with the proposal we had from staff.

At the end, those items, the priority two items, are for the GNSO Council consideration and it's a factual fact, or factual matters, that

they were just discussed a few hours ago at the council meeting today in terms of the next steps.

So, I think we need, really, focus just to have some kind of summary that should not be controversial, just to be assessing the current situation. I mean, for all the groups, they're having interest in the topic or expressing concerns, that's on the table of the GNSO Council. So I'm just asking here, is this proposal something you cannot live with? Yes, Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is just a point of order. Accuracy isn't dealt with here, and that was one of the issues that were raised by the groups as being absent. I'm wondering if we're going to have a separate discussion of that.

So, just a question … For accuracy, there is a conclusion in the report, but it isn't mentioned in this summary. I think that's what several groups had raised. I'm happy to go back and look at this and come back to it later, but I think several groups raised that it seemed to be absent from this opening language.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Laureen. Marika, maybe you can clarify.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Rafik. So, for all priority two items, apart from legal/natural and feasibility of unique contacts, there is content in

the report. And I think the one on accuracy is, basically, a factual description of the status in relation to that item.

That's something, as well, that I think the leadership shared in their proposed approach for these topics. We know that there are very strong views on this and potential disagreement on how the council has dealt with this.

But I think, at least from a staff perspective, the question is, is the final report really the place to have that conversation? And I think, also, the question is, how likely is it that the group will agree on how to reflect that issue, even, noting how controversial that topic has been.

So, the conclusion is really a factual statement of where things stand. But I think, as we noted, as well, in of our responses on the list, of course, nothing prevents groups to provide their input to the council on this topic and help inform further consideration of that one. So, that's why it's not included here, as there is already language in the report that, basically, indicates what the status of that topic is.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Marika. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rafik. So, I understand your question to be asking if we can live with the staff version of this. And if I understand the question correctly, then yes, we can live with the original staff version of the legal/natural and feasibility of new contacts language.

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Marc. I understand that you are supporting the staff language. But I have this question for those who asked for the editing/expressed concern. So, I just want, here … For example, I will ask Laureen something, really, she can live with. Yeah.

So, that's why I'm asking all the groups to say if they can live with this version. And giving one or two minutes just to … Yeah. Thanks, Marika, for the clarification. Okay. So, giving one or two minutes just to have a chance to make your mind, and then we try to move on on this. Okay. I'm hearing/seeing no reaction, but I see that Margie wants to speak here.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. Yes, I'm just not understanding what we're commenting on. Is it the language on the screen or is it something else? And if it's something else, can you put it on the screen? Because it's hard to know what we're talking about. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. I think there is a way. It's the version without those edits in red and blue. So, the version that was shared a few hours ago by Marika. I mean the staff version. So, Marika, is it possible to share the first initial version? Okay, thanks.

MARIKA KONINGS: Berry is just putting it on the screen.

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS: [First] the blue language.

RAFIK DAMMAK: The blue language, okay. Okay. I see a lot of reactions. Okay. I should have closed the queue, but we'll go with Laureen and Margie, and then closing the queue. We have to move on with this. So, Laureen, please go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'll keep it quick. In the interest of compromise, I would stand with the legal versus natural language, as staff suggested. I do think it's important for context to include the language that was part of the Bird & Bird memo. That is what I offer in the nature of compromise, here, to move things along.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Laureen. Margie, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we keep the modified first paragraph to know what Laureen [has agreed to not accept?]

RAFIK DAMMAK:	Okay, I think that Alan asking to keep some version. Okay. Sorry, Volker. I already closed the queue, here. If you want to comment, can you do it in the chat?
MARGIE MILAM:	Rafik, did you call on me?
RAFIK DAMMAK:	No, no, no.
MARGIE MILAM:	Okay.
RAFIK DAMMAK:	I'm sorry. Okay. So, we have this suggestion from Laureen, a way of trying to compromise here. I understand that there is a preference to the modified version but I don't see people saying that they cannot live with the staff version.
	So, I was asking here if this kind of compromise from Laureen is something acceptable or not because, really, we need, kind of, to move on and close on this. I mean, it's just a description. It's not a recommendation.
	So, I think we need to weigh this, the time we are spending here. Okay. So, I think in terms of … I mean, already past, I think, half of the time allocated for this call. So, I will close this in two minutes. I want your reaction on this. Okay. So, I think there is no change in the position.

So, I understand a preference of the different group. At the end, the difference between [that line] is some edits, and this is just, again, a description. This is a summary. This is not recommendation. I understand that it might be referred later on for some deliberation but, for us, we want to deliver. That's the most important, for us, policy recommendation.

So here, I think we need to move on. What we can do is just accept to go with the version supported. I mean, sorry, the version provided by the staff. But we can recognize or acknowledge the disagreement from the group with this current language. I know this, maybe, is not enough, but at least that will be on the record. And just, also, we need to move to work on the other remaining item of importance.

Okay. And again, just to remind everyone, if you really want to express a specific opinion you have the minority statement for that purpose. You can develop it and elaborate. Okay. I think that's it.

MARGIE MILAM: I'm in the queue, Rafik. You said you'd close the queue after me.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I thought I asked you, Margie? No? Oh, sorry.

MARGIE MILAM: No, you didn't.

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: I did miss … Okay.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sorry for this, [I'm sure].

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. What I was trying to say was, in the staff version, I objected to the second sentence, there, as a result per the ePDP Phase 1 recommendation, "Registrars and operators are permitted to differentiate," because I think that implies that we revisited it and confirmed that we support that approach when, in fact, in Phase 1, we agreed to it with the understanding we would talk about it in Phase 2, which we haven't done.

So my suggestion is if we stick with the staff version we need to delete sentence two, because it implies that we did more analysis than we actually did.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Margie. Okay. So I think, here, I might think an assessment. [And I guess] that just we will go with the language, the initial version from the staff. Again, I acknowledge the disagreement and all the edits. So, we will take note of that. Again, if you want, really, to elaborate, do it in the minority statement. With that, we should move to the next item. Marika?

EN

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Rafik. The next item here is item B. Basically, it's a question for the group; any further items flagged after review of the proposed approach documented in the Google Docs following the call, as well as the updated Recommendation 8 language that was posted?

I note that, at least on those, I think there was a concern expressed by the Registries Stakeholder Group on the proposed updates for Recommendation 8. I believe some members of the small team may have reached out and tried to explain some of the thinking behind it.

So, I don't know if that concern still stands or if there are specific suggestions that the Registrar Stakeholder Group has, but I know at least that is one. Laureen or the GAC has also flagged one item just prior to this meeting in relation to language the group agreed to yesterday in relation to financial sustainability. That was item 27. So, that may be another one that the group wants to talk about. We did not receive notification of any other items that groups flagged.

I do note, as well, that we did close, I think, one of the conversations on one of the topics where, because we ran out of time and there seemed to be a sense that, maybe, for the time, would get groups together. I think that was on item 34 in relation to the Standing Committee, and I think we did encourage groups to, potentially, think about compromise language on that.

So I think, at least from a staff side, those are the three items that we had on our radar screen for this particular agenda item. I think

I'm waiting for someone to raise their hands to either talk about their concern or introduce the topic they have flagged.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Marika. Alan Greenberg, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to note that, given other obligations, as some of us have whose life if not fully focused on the ePDP, there just aren't enough hours in the day to respond to these things and review everything, given the timeframe that this somewhat artificial schedule has imposed upon us.

So, I'm just noting that, certainly, I have not reviewed the documents that were sent out yesterday, or even fully reviewed the ones that were done in the meeting for an overall perspective. So, we may end up with something put in our final statement that wasn't raised here, and I don't see any other alternative to that. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Okay. So, I understand the concerns were expressed by the registrar. Maybe if they can speak here and can try to work on a compromise? Yes, Marika. Please, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Rafik. Maybe the registrars need some time to think if they want to talk about this issue. As said, Laureen also had a concern about a specific item. I don't know if she wants to talk about

that here or whether … Well, there is really no other time to talk about it.

So, I think we're really here trying to see if there are any further items that can be resolved by having a conversation with the group, here. As said, there is further time to, hopefully, resolve a number of the category two items. But category one items are, of course, critical for the consensus designation, and I think that's what we're trying to do, here.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Marika. Okay. So, I see Laureen and … Sorry, Hadia. I think, again, we have already spoken, so [we're expecting] to do so later on. Yes, Laureen. Please, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Procedurally, we're not talking about item eight anymore. You would like me to address Recommendation 14, the concern I had put down in … There are too many documents here. But what I wanted to add to item 27 is that we're concerned that the current language in the recommendation, not in the language on the implementation, which is what was added yesterday, that may unduly restrict the way the whole SSAD gets financed, and with unintended consequences for public safety.

My rather specific concern is that it's very unclear to me how this system is going to work in terms of how it gets paid for. And if the restrictions we have in place now, which, of course, represent a very valid concern that data registrants shouldn't have to pay when

folks request their personal information via this system, that's a valid concern.

But when we put a blanket restriction, basically, then all the costs are funneled back to the folks who were requesting the information, many of which are either concerned with public safety, or cybersecurity, etc., if those fees become so high that it actually creates a disincentive or an obstacle for people to get this information, that calls into question the foundation of the whole system.

So here, I would like to echo SSAC's input of their paper, SSAC111, which really focused more in-depth on this issue. Before we start setting restrictions on charges for RDS access, there really should be a more formal assessment of how that's going to impact users and how it's going to impact security and stability. So, that's our concern here. And this has been brought up by the SSAC, and we echo that concern.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Laureen. Just let me … Okay. First I will try to clarify with Marika, because you went to Recommendation 27 while we were discussing about Recommendation 8. So I ask, first, Marika, for clarification. And also, since you move it to 27, if you have a specific suggestion … I think you expressed the concern that we need a suggestion in order to work on that. Marika, first.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Rafik. I'm just trying to understand, because Laureen's comment was put in response to the language that I think

we agreed on the call yesterday, that talks about involving prospective users in the discussions around fees and how that should help inform IRT deliberations. But when I hear Laureen speak, it seems to go to other parts of the financial sustainability recommendation.

I'm just trying to clarify what is exactly the concern in the language that was discussed and agreed on the call yesterday or whether it is something else, and if it's about the language yesterday, if there is any specific suggestion on what could be changed there to address that concern. I'm not really sure what it is in that proposed language that has triggered the concern that is expressed. I'm sorry if I'm missing the point.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And I'm sorry if I have unintentionally confused the situation. First of all, I thought Marika was asking for me to address this comment. I was confused that we were jumping from eight to something else. So, this is a confusing process.

But to answer Marika's question, I'm concerned about the language in the recommendation, and I think that the discussion yesterday was around the language in the recommendation and had proposed a solution that really dealt with implementation. My response is, I don't think that solves the problem.

And more specifically, I don't think you can solve a problem with the policy recommendation by saying, "Well, we'll have input by the users in implementation." If there is a strict restriction on no costs being passed onto the registrants—and I don't have the language

specifically in front of me, although I can call it up—the implementation is not going to be able to change the policy. I'm fearful that the language is unduly restrictive and could have unintended consequences.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Laureen. Yeah, there is confusion. I was confused by jumping. So, I understand you have the concern. You went into all this explanation. We'll cover this. But what I really urge is, if you can make a language-specific suggestion? Because we went through this yesterday, and we end up with compromise.

What you are bringing seems a different issue. But first, let's go back to recommendation number eight. Again, if the registrar can speak up here? Also, to respond to Hadia … I mean, Alan started as a speaker for the ALAC for this topic, so please coordinate with him if you have a point for this topic. Okay?

So, going back to recommendation number eight. So, we have the concern expressed, but I also want to hear from other groups if they are fine with the suggestion or edits that were suggested by the small team yesterday.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Rafik, if I may just ask about the process? I'm not sure. Are we going in order of recommendations, like now we are tackling Recommendation 8, and then we are moving downward, or we are raising all of the recommendations? We can talk about any of the recommendations that Marika mentioned?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. I mean, we are at the Recommendation 8, so there was some kind of confusion, like jumping to another. But for now, we are at eight, so we need to just discuss here. If we don't reach consensus or resolution, we move to the next.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, apologies. I thought that we are not at eight, and I was going to speak to another one. So, thank you for clarification. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. No problem. I think we have so many things to cover, so we need to focus. It's various enough. It's easy to get confused. Okay. We have a big size, here, and I don't see so much reaction about this Recommendation 8. So, okay. Yes, Amr. Please, go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Rafik. Kind of a reaction, I guess, but more of a question for the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Reading the text in Recommendation 8, including the preamble and the additions that were proposed yesterday, I'm not clear … Or at least, I don't share the concerns that the registrars do.

                       I think, obviously, we want to get to the same place as they do, but I'm kind of missing the reason why they have the concerns that they do. I think they have explained their concerns but sort of not … I mean, they explained what their concerns are without providing as

much clarity as, at least, I think I would need in terms of understanding what in the text, specifically, has raised those concerns.

So if, maybe, Owen, or Volker, or someone else from the Registrar Stakeholder Group could really walk us through this, that would be helpful. Maybe we could come up with a solution. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Amr. Yeah. So, we need them to speak up here. So, otherwise, we will go with what's proposed here as a version. Okay. So, if nobody is expressing concern right now, or any issue, I guess that we will go with this current version and language and, with that, to move to the next item. Yes, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Rafik. I didn't have any other specific items. I was confused. I don't know if Hadia had a new one she wanted to bring up or her comment was already addressed.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Yeah, I guess we can clarify, here. So, people are raising other items that they are not listed here in the agenda, like Laureen did for 27, and I think Hadia wanted to add another item. So, that's what you are asking. Yes, Marika? Are we on the same page?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, correct. This was a relatively open item. Of course, we had hoped that people would submit specific items prior to the call, but

EN

we recognize, as well, that it's a very short time. So, from our perspective, if there is anything further we can address here, I think now is the time. Hopefully, we will also have some time for category two items. As said, a couple of groups flagged some items that they want to talk about as well, so hopefully we can have some time for that, too.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Marika. So, I understand that Hadia wants to raise another item. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Rafik. Yes. Actually, my comment was in regard to item number 34. I think that, yesterday, we weren't able to make it clear that we are not suggesting anything new and that we are actually open for any other language that could clarify the intent of our comment.

So, actually, our comment in relation to 34, the intent of it was not to actually limit the GNSO Council's ability to decide on what is policy and what is not. Our intent was only in relation to adding new cases for automation. And as we understand that this was an agreed-upon item, and also … I can't recall/remember the line, here.

But in the beginning of the report, when describing the roles of the different components of the SSAD, it is also clear that new automation cases would be added. So, it's already there in the report in a different part. So, we just wanted a clarification in this part that automation would be possible through implementation and

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Hadia. I see the comment from Marika to highlight that there was some proposed language from it that was made yesterday. Saying that, I will go with Amr. Amr, please go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Rafik. I actually had another question on Recommendation 8, but I'm not sure if I missed the opportunity to speak to that. I don't know how you're managing the agenda, so let me know if I can speak to that now, or should I just move to a later time?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Amr. I mean, for recommendation number eight, I think we're waiting for a while for people to speak up. So, that's why I moved on to we ask for other recommendations that people want to discuss. So, I'm kind of concerned, here, we'll go back and forth without really achieving so much.

     Just let's try to resolve one problem at a time, and we can try to maybe go back to recommendation number eight. Okay. So, sorry. Yes, Marika. Please, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Rafik. It has probably been helpful to finish up on 34 and see, indeed, if there is some agreement. I just want to clarify, I

---

don't think … And Milton, I know, is next in the queue, so he can speak to it.

I'm not sure if he was making a specific proposal but, when I put that in the chat, it seemed to be an accurate statement of what the Standing Committee can or may do, and also specifically clarify that [not], per definition, additional automation use cases are excluded in any way.

So, when I read that, I thought it might be a bit of a compromise between trying to be too specific on what it can do to making clear what is in scope and may happen. So again, Milton can probably speak further to it.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Marika. Milton, since you proposed this, can you …? Yeah, you can maybe comment on this.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. So, my comment in the chat from yesterday was not really intended to be a modification of language. It was meant to be an expression of my statement of what the policy already said, that, under the Standing Committee that was created—I can't remember the recommendation, number 18 or 19—it could make recommendations that were either policy changes or not policy changes, just implementation changes. In which case, obviously, they would not have to go through the GNSO.

So, in a debate yesterday, the people who were supporting Alan's [amendment] were saying, "Oh, my gosh. If we want to add a new

automated disclosure thing, we're going to have to go through a policy process."

And I just thought, that is not true. There is nothing in the current policy that says that every such change is a policy change. However, it is possible that a new form of automation, or some kind of recommendation proposed by the Standing Committee, could be a policy change, which is why I opposed Alan's addition where he says, "Recommendations related to disclosure decisions to be made by the SSAD are deemed to be implementation and do not require policy development."

So, in effect, he's creating a categorical statement that any recommendation related to disclosure decisions would be implementation, and we can't support that because it's not clear.

So, if you want to use the language I've proposed as a clarification or a footnote, that's okay with me. But my main point is that we cannot accept Alan's language because it seems to indicate that any recommendation related to disclosure decisions is categorically deemed to be implementation, which may or may not be true. We have to decide when we see the recommendation.

I hope that's agreeable. I don't want to create another sticking point, here, but I think that Alan's proposed modification was based on a misunderstanding of what was in the policy, and many of the people supporting Alan's proposal were also misunderstanding the idea that any recommendation made would be a policy change. That's not necessarily true.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Milton. Brian?

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Rafik. Thank you, Milton, for that helpful explanation of your language and what it was intended to do. I appreciate that. We're sympathetic to the concerns that Alan raised and the ALAC raised with this language, and we do think that we need to be clear about what we're saying, here. I'm hearing our colleagues here that this perhaps isn't clear enough, yet we still have the need to do what this language is trying to do, so let's work on that.

I understand that Milton's concern is that it will be problematic to kind of preordain decisions that this group could make as not policy, and we need to decide that certain types of recommendations or decisions that this group makes will not be policy, and perhaps we can be clear to limit that to decisions to automate or centralize more or different types of requests.

Hopefully, that gets us a little more limited and something that our colleagues can live with. So, I think it would be wise to spend some time here, given how important this is to a lot of the groups, including the IPC. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Brian. The problem is that we don't have that much time. And so, that's the challenge here. I mean, we are already bringing back a topic that we discussed yesterday.

And also, I see that people are unhappy with the rule of one speaker by group. I know it's not pleasant, yet it was one attempt to make

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I would appreciate, if I'm being quoted, that I be fully quoted. The text which was rejected yesterday, and I'm willing to move on from that, did not say any recommendation will be deemed to be implementation.

It says, "Anything requiring decisions of the [SSAD] in full support and agreement with section 9.3, which delineates exactly what the qualities had to be." So let's just, if we're going to quote each other, quote each other accurately, and not omit convenient phrases. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Alan. Sorry. Okay. So, trying to see how we can close this one. So, are you fine to add the language from Milton?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're asking me, Milton is making a true statement, but irrelevant to this context.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, I don't care whether it's added or not. As Milton said in the chat, we rejected this yesterday. Let's move on. We have the ability of not supporting the recommendation because of the vagueness of the text. Each of us will make our own decision.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. That's noted, here. Okay. So, Brian, and I think I will close the queue, here. Brian, please go ahead.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Rafik. I would like to try to get us to consensus, here. I think we might be closer than we think. I don't entirely hate the language that Milton put in there. I think it needs one bit of minor refinement in order to probably work for us.

I'm just a little concerned that it says, "That may include disclosure automation," because if that implies that it may not, then that's a problem. But if the language that Milton put forth can say "which includes disclosure automation," after that final comma, I think that would probably be something that we could live with. I'm trying here, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Brian. Okay. I'm not seeing that support. I mean, we discussed yesterday this topic we are discussing today. My assessment in the evaluation that we are not making progress, [even] we thought that, maybe, some language will be helpful.

So, I think we'll just go with what we have already and, again, if there is some disagreement or you want to express that, you have all the vehicles to do so. We are just trying to do as much as possible.

Okay. Let's move to the next item. I think I understand, here, maybe the registrar will speak up about recommendation number 8. And Amr, also, it says that you have a comment. I know this is confusing, going back and forth, but also we are trying to accommodate everyone in terms of coordinating, and [caucusing], and just to make their mind about the recommendation. So, we will come back to recommendation number eight. Okay. Yes, Amr. Please, go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Rafik. Apologies for not speaking up earlier. I think I got a little confused. I was quiet when you were asking for feedback because I thought we were strictly discussing the preamble. I had a question about another section that came up in the course of the small team's review of this recommendation.

It's really a question, at this point. I don't have a proposal. I'd just like to hear feedback from the different groups. It's about section 8.5, specifically the first part of the first sentence: "Absent any legal requirements to the contrary, a disclosure must not be refused solely for the lack of any of the following." And then, it goes on.

So, my question is specifically to the first part of that sentence, before the first comma, "Absent any legal requirements to the contrary." I'm not clear on the purpose of adding that here and have

a bit of a concern … I appreciate that this wasn't added recently. This has been in there for a while, now. But like I said during the course of reviewing this over the past couple of days, that's kind of when it raised a bit of a flag.

So, like I said, I'm not clear on what this is, what purpose it's supposed to serve in the context of section 8.5. And I have a bit of a concern that it is suggesting that there may be some kind of legal requirement to disclose data, and I don't understand what that means.

Is this suggesting that legal proceedings may be taken in order to process disclosure requests within the SSAD? I really hope that isn't what it's suggesting. But it seems a little, at best, confusing, and at worst it might be significantly problematic, both, I think, to users and to the operators of the SSAD, as well as the parties that need to interact with it.

So, I would suggest that we remove it, unless there are objections and reasons why it needs to be in there that I am not aware of. So, maybe if folks from the different groups do have an objection to removing it, if they would clarify to me what purpose it serves, I might be convinced that it does need to be in there. But as things stand, I don't see it really needing to stay in there. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Amr. You are bringing, I think, totally different topic here. Yes, Margie. Please, go ahead.

EN

MARGIE MILAM: I'm sorry. I don't agree with the deletion of 8.5, if that's what Amr is saying. That has been in there for quite some time and I'm not understanding what his request is. This is a very important section to our constituency.

AMR ELSADR: Margie, if I may respond, I'm not suggesting we delete 8.5. I'm only suggesting we delete that first part of 8.5, absent any legal requirements to the contrary. So, what I'm proposing is that 8.5 begins with, "Disclosure must not be refused solely for the lack of any of the following."

MARGIE MILAM: Oh, okay. I think that's fine. I don't remember why that language got in there, so I think that's fine.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Margie, for this. Okay. So, let's see if there are any concerns. Okay. So, okay. It looks okay. So, okay. Oh, we have James here to speak. Yes, James. Please, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Hey. Thanks, Rafik. I'm not saying that I object to deleting that phrase. I think it makes it cleaner. But I also, like Margie, don't remember why or how it got in there. I think we just need a little bit more time to noodle on that. So, thanks.

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. So, we have Franck, then Alan. Franck, please go ahead.

FRANCK JOURNOUD: Hi. Old hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Alan Woods, please go ahead.

ALAN WOODS: Yeah. Thank you. I think I can jump in, there. I can refresh people's memories. I'm putting my hand up and saying, yeah, that was my fault. I think it was just we needed to make sure that there are instances where the law may require us to actually say, "Oh, you need to get a court order in this instance," and there was probably an over-abundance of caution at the time.

I think if we are all agreed of the law is the law, and the law, of course, will override a policy where it does not agree, then I can't see any issue at this point, knowing that we have a further understanding of this and the underlying requirement to remove that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So, for my understanding, you are suggesting to keep the language?

ALAN WOODS: No, no. No, no. Happy to get rid of that.

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks. Okay. So, it seems support of removing that language as suggested by Amr … Okay. So, let's check if we covered all the concerns here. Okay. If no … Okay. Sorry, I'm having some problems with Zoom. Okay. Yes, Milton, please go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I don't understand why we are proposing to delete that initial phrase, and I don't understand why Amr proposed to do that. I agree with Stephanie that it's dangerous to remove it and it accomplishes nothing positive. What do you gain by not having that there? You've made the report shorter by six or seven words, but you have made it clear that …

On one end, you've giving requestors a big, fat gift. You can't refuse to disclose for five reasons ticked off. And then, you're saying you're removing the thing that says, "If it's illegal to do that anyway, you can't." So, why are we deleting this? I don't get it and I can't accept it. It's just not going to happen.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Milton. I mean, at the end, it was raised by Amr, another NCSG member. So, you can understand that it will confuse everyone in the call here.

MILTON MUELLER: I don't think I'm confused. I think somebody else is confused, but we'll work that out privately.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, but … Okay, anyway. So, okay. Amr, I guess you want to clarify, here, but at the end we have not so much time left and we just need to wrap this. I mean, my question, is it really that important to discuss that specific point for the removal? Just we can keep as-is, and we can move on. But Amr, and I will close the queue, here. Amr, please go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Rafik. No, this isn't a terribly sticky point. Like I said, I really wanted to offer this up as a question, originally. But just to clarify what my issue with this part is, in the course of our work, I think it's becoming a bad habit that we have to keep pointing out that legal obligations of contracted parties need to trump consensus policy.

This should be a given. We shouldn't have to bake that into every policy recommendation we come up with. It should be something that is beyond dispute and beyond any form of misunderstanding. So, if that's the purpose it's serving here, okay, fine. I mean, if it doesn't cause any harm.

But then, when you combine it with a few of the other parts of this recommendation, that's where I think it gets a little confusing. It says that disclosure must not be refused solely for the lack of any of the following; a court order, a subpoena. Those are two of the examples.

I don't understand how there would be a legal requirement for a contracted party to refuse disclosure when a court order has been submitted, or a subpoena. I just don't really get it. It seems a little strange to me. It's confusing, and that's kind of why I asked for clarification from proponents of why it needs to be baked in, there.

But like I said, to me, and I think it should be to everyone, to all of us, to anyone involved in the IRT, to any contracted party that is going to implement the policies once it becomes an ICANN consensus policy, local law always trumps contractual obligations to ICANN. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Amr. We close the queue here, and I think it's a good time to wrap. So, I think we tried to hear as much as possible about the concerns. We will go with the current version. With that, we close the discussion about category one. So, we already reached the top of the hour. I'm not a fan of that, but we will add five/ten minutes just to wrap and give the clarity about the next steps instruction, particularly about category two. So, Marika, please go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Rafik. So, we had hoped that we would have some time to discuss category two items on the call today. We actually had a number of groups that already flagged some items they would like to discuss, but unfortunately we've run out of time and we don't have further time to actually do that online.

But as we already indicated, the idea is that those groups that are proponents of category two items and strongly feel that they would like to see that included, but where groups have responded that they oppose or cannot agree to it, we really encourage you to engage with each other and try to find a proposed approach forward.

I know that, in a number of cases, groups have provided some rationale as to why they don't like the suggestions. In certain cases, groups have just put, "We object." So, it may also be a question of having a bit of dialog around what the concern is, and if there are other ways to address that concern that meets, as well, the objection of the other group.

So, as said, your action item, here, is really to try and engage with those that objected to the category two items that you care deeply about. Hopefully, that will result in either an agreement on the language that was originally proposed or some modified version.

As Rafik noted, we'll send out the timeline, but the idea is that by Monday at the latest we have a clear idea of which category two items an agreement has been reached. We'll then flag that clearly in the document.

So, we'll notify groups to indicate for which numbers there has been a language agreed by those that proposed the original changes, as well as those that had expressed a concern so that those that, maybe, did not care too much about it or did not engage in a conversation at least can have a last look and see if the proposed changes have resulted in a "cannot live with" item. In which case, the change would not get applied.

As said, we're talking here about category two items, where we'd really like to see the change. But at the same time, you know, willing to die in a ditch for it. So our assumption is that, if there is no agreement, it will not get applied.

Hopefully, there are actually quite a number of items where no objection was expressed. So, those items, we have already started applying. In the Google Doc, you can actually see, for those that we've applied, we have indicated that … In the last column you see here, for example, by number 50, "change applied." 51, the same.

There are a few where we weren't exactly sure what comments meant, so we may have reached out to some of you to clarify whether your comment expressed support or objection. And in a very few cases, as well, the comments that were provided actually suggested a minor edit, or there was some duplication of language.

So, again, we've made clear … For example, in 55, there seemed to be a duplication, the original language that was proposed, so we've made clear, as well, what change we have applied.

And as said, we'll be sending out a redlined version of the report tomorrow so, again, you can see all those changes in there, as well. So, again, I think that's the homework for all the groups. We'll be sending out the timeline, as well as the link to this Google Doc.

We know there are still quite some items in here, so we do encourage groups to prioritize and focus on those items that you care about the most and think will make a real difference to the report. I think, with that, I hope you have clear instructions and can get to work.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Marika, for the explanation. Okay. So, we're going to wrap up soon, but I see that we have Stephanie in the queue. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Old hand. It was answered in chat. Thank you. Sorry.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks. So, with that, I think we are reaching, here, the end of this call. But before that, I want to thank you all. I know it was not an easy process. It can get confusing easily. I know that you had to put a lot of [housework] and there is a lot of unhappiness. I acknowledge that. But at the end, that's, I think, to some extent, the nature of the PDP.

We have the deadline in the commitment to the GNSO Council, and that's why we have to deal with this timeline. So, I acknowledge that. I understand. But now, I think we did as much as we can.

So, it's just the last steps toward finishing time. So, I will ask you just to add that extra effort. It's not empty words. I really count on you all, on this. And so, let's do it and finish this Phase 2. Thanks, again. With that, let's adjourn the call for today.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]