
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

[CROSSTALK]

THOMAS RICKERT: Hi everyone, it's Thomas Rickert.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hey Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Hey Chris.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Everyone, just a reminder. If you're not speaking, please mute your microphone. Thanks.

[Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi. Hello?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible], I thought [inaudible] convening this call?

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

SAMANTHA EISNER:

Hi everyone. This is Sam Eisner from ICANN Legal. I think we can, there a group of people here. People might still be joining, but I think we can go ahead and start the call.

So, as you know, we're all working through the bylaws to get to a document that can be posted for public comment very quickly. And after the last round of discussions, after the version came out... If everyone can mute their microphone please.

In the last round of discussion, after the draft bylaws came out on April 2nd, there was continued discussion about the use of the term in the root zone within article one. And so we wanted to... There is a request back from the CCWG to take that back to the attorneys again to get an idea based on the issues that have been discussed among the attorneys, and reaching the language that was circulated on April 2nd.

And so we had had some further discussions and provided discussion to this group, and wanted to raise that area, to bring that discussion to this bylaws coordination group so we have a sense of how to move forward.

So we hope that everyone has seen the emails and the briefing that went out. And I know, I do note that Bruce Tonkin was going to be on the phone for a limited time today. Bruce, did you want to speak to anything before you had to get off the phone?

BRUCE TONKIN:

No. I'm just listening on an airplane. It's going to take off in about five minutes, so I'll let you [inaudible]...

SAMANTHA EISNER: Okay, great. In that instance, I will actually turn over to John to help walk through some of the specifics.

JOHN JEFFREY: Hi. This is John Jeffrey. Is it worthwhile for us to go through the briefing memo, or can assume people have seen it? What's the best path on this group to continue on? I know there is the briefing memo, a very, a long note from Andrew, which was very thorough and then a retort to that from Greg Shatan.

Do we want to talk specifically to those? To the briefing memo and the notes? Or could we just open up the floor?

I see that Andrew says we only have an hour, so we'll assume people who have read the briefing memo. And Cheryl agrees. So let's open up the floor to discussion then.

There is also a memo that came in a few moments ago, or an email that came in a few minutes ago from Bruce Tonkin with a suggestion on a resolution that we're in support of.

[Inaudible] Becky Burr, go ahead.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Thank you for sending out the memo. I think that was very useful. As I just put in the chat, unfortunately I waited a little too long to read the memo. But one thing that struck me is that there was a significant amount of overlapping for the list of things that ICANN does, and the specific list in spec one and spec four.

And I think it will helpful to this group, John, if you could identify things that are on the list in the memo about, you know, what ICANN is doing you think are not covered by the [inaudible] picket fence. I think that will help us narrow the discussion.

JOHN JEFFREY:

I haven't done a line by line comparison. We were trying to consider topics that ICANN was already performing, that could be effected by the limitation in the root zone language. I personally haven't done a comparison of all of the scope of spec one and spec four. But I think that our concern is that there might be limitations that are caused by in the root zone language in its placement that would not be understood, whether it would be within the picket fence specs.

Does anybody else want to speak to that?

SAMANTHA EISNER:

This is Sam. I think that that concern is, John, I think we need... We were having concerns that if for some reason the scope of ICANN contracting authority was ever looked at differently, that whether something was brought into, through the picket fence could somehow still not be some sort of fully part of it, because if the picket fence went beyond what's allowed, under the closest reading of the words in article one, that's really the concern if there was any sort of inconsistency between the two.

So we hadn't done a specific one to one list of it.

JOHN JEFFREY: I see Greg put his hand up. Greg, did you want to speak?

GREG SHATAN: Yes, thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I have a similar [CROSSTALK]. I don't think that just because something is in the picket fence that makes this invalid, even if it is outside the mission. [Inaudible] be the other way around... Is somebody typing? Kavouss, if you could mute, that would be really great.

JOHN JEFFREY: Just a suggestion. If you're not speaking if you could mute that would be great. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: If you look above the word hosts, there is a place where names appear and if you're name is there and you're not speaking, you're not muted. In any case, I think there is an issue. I think the root zone... If the root zone language is in there, I think it actually causes picket problems through the picket fence.

That is as if you had a root of a tree that ran amuck in your yard and it started tearing down the picket fence. So the last thing we need is a conflict between the mission and the picket fence, and so I think that's what we've got right now. Thanks.

JOHN JEFFREY: Thanks Greg. Andrew, your hand is up as well.

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

Thank you. Let me outline where I think the... What I understand anyway, the CCWG concluded, keeping in mind that I am not really a member of the CCWG, just a participant so I have no standing. You know, I'm not a chair or anything like that. Here is what I understood what happened and maybe some of my colleagues can correct me.

I believe that the CCWG wanted this restriction because this was the place in the DNS that ICANN does direct work. That is, ICANN directly makes changes to the root zone, and does not directly make changes to other zones. And I'm just going to put a star here and say, what we've inched aside because I admit that into the into the is a special case that actually contradicts most of this.

We might have to think about that a little bit. That the policies that go elsewhere in the tree, however, are somehow covered under the picket fence. And I believe that the CCWG came down very hard that it wanted the picket fence stuff to be applied. I think that that was desired.

So ICANN is the registry for the root zone, and it, as part of the policies that it implements, it coordinates policies in other zones with the people who get registrations in the root zone. And that was, I believe, want the combination of this root zone restriction plus the picket fence was intended to achieve. If there is another way to express that, I believe it is consistent with what the CCWG decided.

And I believe it is consistent with what everybody has always said ICANN actually does. So I'm content with that. I think that Bruce's suggestion

is a possible way forward. But the main thing is that alternative, just taking in the root zone out, is too broad. It allows for the possibility that ICANN coordinates the allocation and assignment of names in the domain name system.

And that simply isn't true. It is not true that ICANN has anything at all to do with names underneath [inaudible] dot COM, which is a domain name that I operate. If I decide to add four more levels in there, but not as well within my operational rights, and that is part of the design of the DNS.

Moreover, names lower in the tree use policies that are not consistent with ICANN consensus policy. For instance, ICANN consensus policy use the LDH rule, when you have an internationalized domain name, you only use UA both for the internationalized format, A labels in the zone, but that is not true elsewhere in the DNS. We know that elsewhere in the DNS people use raw UTF labels, for instance.

So it's just isn't true that ICANN does this for the DNS generally, and I think it is dangerous to both ICANN and to the Internet for mission to permit that. I think that was the reasoning that the CCWG came to. So I hope that that makes a clearer, at least what I've been thinking, and the reason I think this is important.

I think Bruce's suggestion is one way forward, but if there are other ways that allow the picket fence to be consistent with the mission, I think that would be fine too.

JOHN JEFFREY

Thank you Andrew. I see Jordan's hand up in the chat next.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks. Hi all, Jordan Carter here, one of the CCWG rapporteurs. Look, think the discussion so far nicely summarize, and I actually agree that Bruce's text is the way to get through this. It delineates the responsibility of this part of the mission I see clearly in a way that does match the intention of the CCWG.

The only thing that I would have to say though is that if we're going to make that change then we do need to run that past the CCWG, and I think to make sure they are aware of that [inaudible] surprise. And even just a part of what the mission says, I think having this in those words along with everything else that is in those, isn't going to cause any breakages. Thanks.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Next I believe is Greg.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. It's Greg, I'll try to be brief. First, I don't think it's entirely correct to refer to taking in the root zone out. It's a proposed addition to put it into the existing mission language, which has been in place for what, 17 years or so without the word in the root zone. I don't think the attempts to, you know, legislate or to impose policies that extend down to the third, fourth, end level of meaning.

So I think it's, you know, we have to watch out for kind of overreaching in our definition of what the problem is. So you know, I think the issue is whether, you know, if you use the same example, there are issues with [inaudible] then, and not with the third level labels being, you know, put it in [inaudible], put aside the odd cases of third level domains being sold.

There were second level domains that get us down... Kavouss could you mute or stop typing? Thank you. And so, in any case, I think we have to [define?] the problem properly, and we have to look at what the... Kavouss, can you please mute or stop typing?

So, in any case, I think that the language without... Saying that as a technical matter, the language allows ICANN to make policy anywhere in the DNS. So first off, it hasn't happened. And second off, we would have to look at whether in fact it does allow that, and whether there are other restrictions, and why it has never happened.

If, in fact, it's something that was in ICANN's mission, why hasn't ICANN pursued that? I think assuming that that is, that was in the mission to make rules anywhere in the DNS, because of where the current state of the language is, is kind of a fallacy, kind of correlation if not causation type of fallacy.

So I think that it hasn't happened is in fact relevant, in terms of understanding the language and its effect. Certainly restricting it only to the root zone is highly over restrictive, and I think it would lead to a lot of unintended consequences, or it may be that some who have put this in here, have consequences they intend but have not revealed.

So I think Bruce's line may get us somewhere, not all where we need to go, in terms of dealing with issues at the second level. But we need to make it clear that ICANN definitely has authority at the second level. Thanks.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Thank you Greg. I see in the chat room that Thomas has his hand up, and then Kavouss put a question on the list.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much JJ. Hi everyone, this is Thomas. Certainly I don't want to contribute to the wordsmithing, which deliberately chosen to leave that to the lawyers. But maybe I'm not being [inaudible] to your question, but we have offered some guidance with the response of 11th of April, and that doesn't speak to whether the root zone should be mentioned in there or not.

But what we've said is our lawyers should ensure ICANN is not in charge overall of names in the DNS. ICANN has policy authority over what labels go into the root zone. Additional conditions can be imposed on the registry operating the TLD, but must be in the picket fence. Let me just, what I would like is some clarification, whether there is agreement on these, let's say, design principles for what should go into the word for the bylaws, or whether there is disagreement on those.

The reason why I'm asking is that, finding the right set of words, that's something that we would like to leave to the expert group. And that we can discuss in this coordination group, that when the requirements

established by the CCWG shall be ordered or modified, there is no way for this coordination group to find a solution for that, but we would need to go back to the CCWG.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Thank you Thomas. I see that there are questions that are popping up on the chat and people are answering those. Does anyone want to raise their question out to the discussion? And I think there were two things on the chat that I saw that we probably need to address. One was a question from the queue, about what do we intend to do...?

What's the purpose of the call? What are we intending to gain from this call? And let me start with trying to answer that, and maybe that's something else to talk about. My understanding was that the use of the bylaws coordination group in this way, was to help inform the drafters where there were concerns that the drafting needed additional intention, and that if we were able to get guidance from this group, then we would include that in the draft.

But that it also might point back to the various working groups or proposal drafters to match up. So perhaps what we're also suggesting, and this is some need to reach back to the CCWG to ensure that the proposed language, the results from this call, is incorrectly stated, in consideration of the proposal.

And so, perhaps, since no one else has [inaudible], I would suggest that, could we consider the language by Bruce Tonkin, because I hear most people congealing around that. And maybe a question of whether there is anyone that still disagrees with that. I think Greg, you might have

disagreed. The question is, do you think that's a reasonable compromise?

Greg, did you want to speak to that?

GREG SHATAN:

Sure, just briefly. I think it's a reasonable compromise as to what to think about anything that we've discussed as being currently within ICANN's, you know, actions and scope of authority would be excluded by that. But if we think it embraces everything, it solves the problems in the briefing, you know, which is pretty comprehensive, you know, then I think that goes a long way toward dealing with it while shutting off of the kind of slippery slope arguments that have been made about references to the DNS.

So I'm cautiously optimistic that it's a good compromise.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Thank you. And I know there is some suggested change to the language, but Becky, if you want to speak to that?

BECKY BURR:

Yeah. I just, I'm a little concerned that, although I understand exactly where Bruce is going, the language about the allocation and refinement of names could be overly broad, or could be interpreted to be overly broad, and we certainly get some pushback. So, what I had suggested was that we say that ICANN coordinate a principle for allocation and assignment of names, which is language, well the allocation... Principles

for the allocation of names is in the picket fence, and therefore is going to be more defensible. So it's just a question between coordinating the allocation and coordinating principles, which are consistent with the development of multistakeholder policy in...

And I think that all of the things that you had on your list, John, was literally in the bottom-up, multistakeholder principle developed processes.

JOHN JEFFREY: Very good. Thank you. I see Steve Crocker's hand up as well. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. Becky, I appreciate the point you're trying to make but I wonder what would happen if you tried to make that point in the middle of an IETF meeting. The reaction might be, what do you guys mean, we make the principles? You guys execute.

BECKY BURR: Should I respond? I mean, I don't... But the language is coordinating. So, I think that if we, as opposed, I mean... I see your point Steve, but I think we have to somehow tie this in, coordinate the development of principles for the allocations and assignment of name, or something like that.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. I'm playing devil's advocate here on purpose in order to... Andrew is on the call. He can carry this even more strongly than I can, I would imagine. But my feeling is that the folks over in the IETF and the IV, would take the position that they are the ones that establish the principles for allocation, the principles for coordination, etc.

The minute you put the word principles in there, I think you'd have to be pretty careful to control the scope of that, lest we run into trouble with our friends over in the tech community. Andrew, let me invite you to tell me if I'm overdoing it on your behalf.

ANDREW SULLIVAN:

All right. You're overdoing it on my behalf. But actually, I mean there is a subtle point that you're getting to, and I think that that is right. For instance, the IAB has this note some time ago about the principles for allocation of labels in the DNS, which said something about, you know, the kinds of things you would use to make up labels as you got closer and closer to the root.

And this was a principle about conservatism and so on. And I think that, you know, those are sort of technical principles that I think the IETF is confident to talk about and so on. But there are additional principles there, and I see that John is mentioning in the chat about this thing about coordination, and I think that that's right. There are policy principles that, you know, I don't believe the IETF or the IAB really feels they ought to have an opinion about.

I don't want to speak for anybody, right? I mean, I know. But that's my opinion of what the IETF is confident to talk about. I don't want to get

hung up on that issue. I think the key thing here is that, you know, ICANN doesn't actually coordinate things through the DNS because the DNS is designed precisely to prevent the need of coordination all the way through the DNS. And that's...

And the reason, I guess the real reason, maybe people don't understand this but part of the real reason I'm concerned about this is precisely because we know that there are people who would really like somebody to be the boss of the DNS, and that would be a bad thing. And so I don't want to give them that tool.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Thank you Andrew. I see that we have three hands up. Thomas, Chris and [inaudible].

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks JJ. And sorry for replaying some of the sound bites, but you've heard from me a couple of minutes earlier. But I really would like an answer to my question, whether anyone in this group does not think that there is guidance from the CCWG is workable. You know, there was no answer to that. Maybe we should ask the question the other way around, because those who object to or have an issue with those principles, signal this in the Adobe room.

But again, I think if we're trying to go beyond what's been suggested by the CCWG, this would not be the place to have this discussion. We should just take the concerns and take it back to the original group. Thank you.

JOHN JEFFREY: Chris, you're next.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. I'm going to try to respond to Thomas's question as well, but before I do, I'm concerned about the introduction of the term principles. We've got a sort of classic phrase, which has been around for a while, which is [inaudible] allocation and the assignment of names, and then etc. And what we're really talking about here is the insertion of the words in the root zone.

I think Bruce's suggestion goes a long way to splitting the hair between the two positions, so I'm fine with that. With respect to your question Thomas, my view, and it's just my view, others may disagree. But speaking as a lawyer, it would be extremely difficult, the easiest way of sticking with the CCWG guidance would be to produce a closed list of everything that might conceivably be deemed to be outside of the root zone of the domain name system that ICANN does, and lists that. And that's an almost impossible task, and would be extremely difficult to do.

So from a drafting point of view personally, I would find it very difficult to satisfactorily respond to the guidance that, at least my interpretation of the guidance given by the CCWG. Thanks.

JOHN JEFFREY: Thank you Chris. Sam I believe was next.

SAMANTHA EISNER:

Sorry, coming off mute. So I think the issue has already been raised by multiple people the concern of the word principles. I just wanted to remind the group that this is just the introductory sentence to that section. So we would still have the reference to the policy role, which comes right after that, which says, in this role, ICANN's scope is to coordinate the development and implementation of policy.

And so I think that, if the principle was being proposed to help preserve that policy role that we actually already have that covered, and then there is the reference to the picket fence, and a bottom up consensus based multistakeholder process. So I too share the concern about the confusion of the term, the confusion that might be brought in by the term principle, but I think if one of the drivers behind it was to reserve policy role, the policy role is already reflected other where else.

So I ask where within that first paragraph.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Thank you Sam. I saw that Thomas had a question regarding my [inaudible]. I didn't realize I was [inaudible]. I think that what we were intending to do as the drafters of the bylaws, and I welcome Rosemary, or Holly, or anyone from the lawyer teams to participate, is to stick with the intent of the proposal, and in particular, although this was guidance language, it specifically stated at the beginning of five that there was, it was not the perfect language yet.

So I think what we've been seeking throughout this process is some way to get to language that reflects the intent of the proposal. So if you believe that it is necessary to go back to the CCWG to test that, then I

think our task today is to put the best language together from the lawyer groups, and to send that back to make sure that it matches with your understanding of the intent of the proposal.

That said, we have a very limited window of time in which to work with in order to meet the deadlines this week. I actually... Kavouss has his hand up now, go ahead.

Kavouss are you on mute?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. Can I talk?

JOHN JEFFREY: Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. I don't believe that we need to go to much detail about how established principles, who established policies, who [inaudible]. The current text in the CCWG, initial text, coordinates [inaudible] and then coordinates what? Allocation and assignment of names in the domain name system. Very [inaudible] and not to go to the [inaudible]. The more detail, the more difficulty we create for ourselves. Thank you.

JOHN JEFFREY: Thank you. I see no more hands up. Would anyone else like to raise a point? I think, a point of order. I think the task that we would take from this is to draft according to this discussion, and to provide that

back to the bylaws coordination group, if the bylaws coordination group participants in the CCWG wishes to do so, it should then take that language back to the CCWG. Objections?

Thomas, are the points you've been raising in the chat worthy of bringing up in the conversation?

[Inaudible]

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Thomas can go first maybe. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks Andrew. I have to get off mute, so I apologize for the delay. Actually JJ, the reason why I'm asking over and over again is that, and I've put this in the chat, if we can go to the CCWG and say that this group found a set of words that I best believe covers our requirements, then I'm more than happy to do that. But if there are folks in this group, or in the broader legal team, that think that we need to do something else, or bend or otherwise change the guidance that the CCWG gave, then we need to go back to the CCWG.

This is why I'm trying to find out so much, you know, what people think about this. Chris's answer has been very helpful, but certainly in terms of process, it would facilitate in [inaudible] enormously if we could come to the first option, i.e. that we can go back to the group and say, this is what the BCG thinks, tell us our requirements that adequately reflects that in bylaw language. Thank you.

JOHN JEFFREY: Okay. Thank you. Mathieu, did you want to speak?

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you. That's a kind of a forward from Thomas. I think there is, the MOU that you shared with this group is extremely valuable because you are providing actually concrete examples of activities that I understand there is a concern that they would be excluded from the ICANN mission, according to some readings.

And on the other hand we have a number of concerns in this group, and in the CCWG as well, that by changing the wording of the mission, we would unintentionally extend the scope of ICANN's mission, to new activities that may not be [inaudible] today, and would not be wished by everyone on a basis of consensus.

So my recommendation when drafting and before going back to the groups, is to really use this set of examples and try and provide some analysis, and maybe our CCWG lawyers can be helpful there for an outside looking review of that, of whether there is, what type of risk level we have that these activities could be not considered to be within ICANN's mission.

And I think this speaks to Becky's point earlier in the call that, I mean mapping this to the activities to the picket fence is totally something that is going to be needed, if only to demonstrate that to the groups and the wider community, that the drafted mission is appropriate.

So that's a suggestion on the way forward to provide clarity for the groups outside of ICANN of legal expertise. Thank you.

JOHN JEFFREY: Thank you. I see Greg's hand up and a question from Becky to Holly and Rosemary in the chat. So Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: I just wanted to respond briefly a part of what Mathieu has said. Certainly we share the concern that we don't inadvertently extend ICANN's mission or authority beyond where it is or where it is intended to be, but I think there is a corollary to that, which is we have to be careful about restricting ICANN's mission intentionally or otherwise.

So that it is overly restrictive, and includes things that we believe ICANN should be able to do. So I think that talking about extension without talking about accidental over restriction is only looking at half of the issue. And I think in this particular case with this language, the issue that we have here is language that appears to be over restrictive. Thank you.

JOHN JEFFREY: Very good. I see no other hands. I think there was a question from Kavouss about what example Mathieu was raising. I think you were talking about the examples at the bottom of the legal briefing memo. Is that right?

All right, Greg, is your hand still up or is it up again?

Greg, are you on mute?

So it sounds to me we have a path which is to work with [inaudible] teams to come up with some language from this conversation and to return it to it as quickly as possible. So is there anything else we wanted to raise on the call?

Mathieu, I see your hand.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you John. I just said in an email, maybe we can use five minutes to get an update on the various milestones, and the expected back and forth documents, and next round of bylaw drafts on this, in this group, before the public comment starts. I don't know if there is any [visibility?] on that.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Sam, do you want to talk about where we are in the timeline? Or do Sally or Rosemary want to speak? Sam is coming off mute.

SAMANTHA EISNER:

Hi everyone. So we've been working... We've all been working at a very fast pace with the attorneys, and have an interim draft that they're looking at that we're exchanging from additional revisions on. We got some new items last night and we'll be returning some comments today. So I know that our hope is to have a version of the bylaws that can be shared with [inaudible] coordination group, no later, hopefully at some point, tomorrow, but that's [inaudible] at some point by Tuesday

the 19th, because we would then need to have the, to remain on track for everything that needs to happen to give the NTIA enough time to perform their work.

We need to have the bylaws open on the 20th, and so we've had some interim [inaudible] shared among us so that we can clear items to allow for both the CCWG Council to provide an assurance to the CCWG, that the bylaw text meets with the proposal, as well as for ICANN Legal to provide that same assurance to the Board before we go into the public comment phase.

So I think that the goal is that this coordination group would provide a full text at some point tomorrow, if not at latest, by Thursday for, I'm sorry. Not Thursday, Tuesday the 19th, to take a look at. Those would be accompanied by the certifications that the proposals are reflected or fit within the bylaws draft that you see, and then we'd open up for public comment, have an opportunity for comment, and firstly go on that formal public comment path, for that period comment period will then close on May 20th.

Do any of the other lawyers on the call have a different understanding of the timeframe?

All right. So Mathieu, did you have further questions?

MATHIEU WEILL:

I noted that in the chat Holly said that [inaudible] would need two full days once there is a final draft to provide the assurances to the CCWG and CWG. I would assume that this implies that there is no expectation

for the CCWG and CWG to issue a formal approval of the bylaws in time for the start of the public comment. Honestly, I would not see that happen, but I would like confirmation of that so there is no expectation that is not fulfilled in this process.

SAMANTHA EISNER:

Mathieu, this is Sam. I'd agree that it really isn't possible even that before the 20th to expect for that to happen. I think that that's part of the community process that will happen during public comment. We would expect for everyone to come a point before the Board approves the bylaws, in fact when everyone has been, has had the opportunity to look through and make sure that there are, everyone agrees that this is the bylaw, the set of bylaws that implements a proposal.

So we have this opportunity because the bylaws will still be in draft form, and still be looked at during the public for the CCWG, and the CWG, and the ICG as it may also want to weigh in to take that broader look at them.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you Sam.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Were there any other questions? Or other matters we wanted to cover in this meeting?

If not, then thank you all for your participation, and thank you for your cooperation, and for spending part of your weekend helping us with this problem. We're greatly appreciative of your time.

And with that, we'll end it.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]