CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Thank you. We will now begin the official recording and interpretation of this call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday the 20th of February 2019 at 19:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel, we have Eduardo Diaz, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Alan Greenberg, Alberto Soto, Bastiaan Goslings, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, George Kirikos, Glenn McKnight, Gordon Chilcott, Holly Raiche, Joanna Kulesza, Joel Thayer, John Laprise, Jonathan Zuck, Judith Hellerstein, Lutz Donnerhacke, Marita Moll, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Tom Dale, and Yrjö Lansipuro.

We have received apologies from Kaili Kan, Ricardo Holmquist, and Maureen Hilyard. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.

On the Spanish channel, we have Lilian De Luque Bruges, and also Alberto Soto. Our interpreters in the Spanish channel today are Veronica and Paula.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes, and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels, and to please mute your mics when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you, and with this, I turn it over to you, Jonathan.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: My apologies, I don't think you counted me in the roll call. I'm in the phone bridge.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Apologies. I will add you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And also not counted [inaudible] I am on the phone bridge. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: On audio only. I will note that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, everyone. We've had a great turnout today. Let's leap right in. I actually don't know what these things are on this top of this slide here about the agenda, but I think we have completed the action items from last week, and so the agenda as is normal, let's talk about the EPDP, and then get into the various policy comments that we're doing and update those. Is there anything else that anybody wants to make sure comes up as Any Other Business?

Okay, excellent. So without further ado, I'm going to hand the microphone to Alan and Hadia to bring us up to date on the EPDP.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think Hadia's with us. She's at a meeting in Dubai and it's 1:00 AM, and I suggested that maybe she wants to sleep instead. We

had a three-hour EPDP meeting yesterday, and today, we had a three-hour EPDP meeting which ran for four hours, and we are now finished, and the phase one report will go out.

Don't celebrate yet. I'll quickly recap what the changes were, if any, on the points that we raised. We raised the issue of geographic differentiation. There's no change in the recommendation, I believe. I believe there is text somewhere in the report which implies it will be discussed in phase two. I'm not 100% sure of that, but I think that is there. The chances of success, probably not large.

We also have, as I mentioned last time, a legal opinion pending as to whether ICANN's presence in Europe in the form of an office or offices there mean that we have a formal presence in Europe according to the definition of GDPR, which would mean everything that we touch has to be subject to GDPR. So we'll get legal advice on that. It will probably not be definitive, and then ICANN will have to make a choice as to whether it believes it is subject to GDPR for everything. It may ultimately come down to a ruling of the European Data Protection Board and ultimately might go to the courts.

So if we end up being European, then we probably cannot do geographic differentiation. At least that's the current view. If we don't end up being European, we have to convince the contracted parties they want to do it. That is not going to be easy. So that one, still up in the air.

The next point we made was a comment that essentially, we're going to Thick WHOIS, like it or not. Although the report never actually said that.

That has not changed. I did make the comment – a strong comment – today that if we are doing that, although technically we are not going to Thin WHOIS, we are going to some new regime which looks an awful lot like Thin WHOIS, and that would imply migration of virtually every TLD to that mode of operation, then we need to really say that very clearly, because there were people who have been participating in the EPDP heavily who did not understand that was the net implication of it.

So that should be interesting. It's not clear it will change. Basically, the general feeling among contracted parties and certainly NCSG is that there's no justification for Thick WHOIS, that the fact that dot-com exists and works illustrates that the Thin WHOIS or something close to it is just fine. It ignores all of the decisions made within ICANN on the various rounds of gTLDs and the Thick WHOIS PDP. And never did we actually look at the details and tried to understand, is there a justification or not?

So we'll come back to that in a minute. Requiring registrars to ask if you want technical contacts, there is going to be no recommendation, which implies they can do what they want. So no change on that one either.

Comments that we want a stronger ability to recognize whether messages sent by anonymized e-mail or webforms have gone through, and some better way of tracking where it is possible – it's not always possible. There is no change there as well, although some people consider it to be an implementation issue.

The inter-registrar transfer, the fact that it has been weakened and is up now to the GNSO to take action, which will likely take years, no change

on that either. The fact that the organization field is going to be redacted until registrars take some action, and then it will be up to the registrant to decide there is now a timeline on that. So that one, we succeeded on, largely due to the efforts of the IPC and the BC who put some language in which is not acceptable, but we compromised on it has to be implemented by the time the EPDP is implemented.

Recommendation 15 on retention. It was changed, so we now have retention past the one-year TDRP limit, so [you won't find your data is deleted[the moment you make the dispute request. And registrants able to say all of their data is displayed, that was accepted. There are some people who think it's already in the language, but in any case, hopefully now it's clear that that will happen.

Any other changes, trying to make cybercrime, DNS abuse more visible, there were no changes on that at all. So we didn't get a lot of changes out of these comments, but nor did we really throw down a gauntlet. You'll remember that the original comment said we cannot support certain items. We softened that to simply say we have some concerns, and so having some concerns was not recognized as an absolute refuse to agree, so that weakened our position. I'm not sure it would have made any difference, but so be it.

The good news is the statements from the GAC and the SSAC pretty well follow several of ours on the more important ones. Certainly on the legal/natural differentiation, on the geographic differentiation. I'm not sure where the GAC is. Certainly the SSAC supports it.

The registrars must ask for the tech field, they were supporting. And there were several others that we are in alignment on. so I'm expecting they will see some GAC advice going to the board in parallel with the EPDP.

We have two more kicks at the can at this point. There will be a public comment, because as soon as it goes out of the GNSO to the board, the board will put it out for public comment, so we'll have an opportunity there. We also have an opportunity to give advice to the board, and at this point, my inclination is that we will give advice to the board on issues that we feel are really detrimental to the overall structure of the DNS and the Internet because of these things that were decided not in the way we wanted to see them.

That's not clear that that will make any difference, but again, I think we have to go on record as doing it. Likely, we will see something similar from – I'm guessing, I have no inside information – from the GAC and from the SSAC, because again, several of these things are going against direct previous SSAC advice.

So that's where we stand. We have a little bit of time off right now to breathe, at least I do, and Hadia does. I think we're going to need to think about it a little bit and make a recommendation, what do we do next? The comment period is going to be going. Guess it will be going until sometime in early April, so I am presuming that both the discussion of what we do in the response to the public comment and on advice to the board are issues that we will be looking at in Kobe. But we need to look at the calendar a little bit closer on that one.

Jonathan, do you want me to take the queue, or do you want to do it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm happy to have you do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I see you have your hand up, and George. I don't know who put your hand up, but I'll give you precedence as co-chair.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I guess I wanted to ask about what became of the BC and IPC amendments and how did that conversation end up going.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, you'll recall the last meeting I implied that some groups might withdraw consent from their entire report. Now, I'll note the charter doesn't really allow for that. The charter says we must indicate on any recommendation what the level of overall support is. And they do support most of the recommendations.

They explicitly proposed changes to five of the recommendations. I believe one of them, but possibly two, was accepted in some form or another, but therefore, there are still outstanding items that they are not agreeing with, and there was a discussion today which implied that they may issue a minority report saying, "We don't support the entire report. Our support of many of the recommendations notwithstanding, we are not supporting the entire report."

Now, that didn't come from them. That's something I inferred from a discussion that was had, but I wouldn't be surprised if we end up seeing them not supporting the entire report, whatever that means. Does that answer your question?

The ones that were accepted are we now have a better timeline on responses to legitimate queries. Originally, it said it was something to be determined in implementation. The registrars – someone had proposed 30 days. When the written version appeared, it said 30 business days. Now, 30 days is approximately four weeks. 30 business days is six weeks, or at the wrong time of the year, eight weeks.

We ended up putting in 30 days, not specifying what kind of counting. And I think that normally means calendar days, but I wouldn't swear to that.

So that one was resolved. The organization field deadline was resolved, and I think the other three were not, but I don't have them in front of me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: George. Jonathan, any follow-up?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I guess I was a little interested in color commentary, because [inaudible] seem to be frustrated at the late introduction of those amendments, and there was a pushback on that and I just didn't know [if the] last two meetings were calm or if there was a lot of...

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, no. There was pushback, "How dare you propose language at the last moment," but almost every part of the group rejected some recommendation even though tentatively had consensus on it going forward. There are a fair number of them which do not have consensus at all.

There are some that have a relatively weak consensus, and there are several where we simply have divergence, that even though we thought we had talked about it – geographic basis was one of those – we simply do not have agreement. So we'll see where that flies.

Now, in the past, the GNSO has chosen to not pass on to the board recommendations that did not have some level of consensus. They have tended to reject ones that had strong support for significant opposition. Kurt Pritz, the chair, has evaluated a few things in a way that I would have considered consensus, but not full consensus, and he has sort of downgraded it to strong support with a recommendation to the GNSO that they accept those and pass them on to the board. So we'll see where that goes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: In terms of message, I think part of that was rhetoric, at least I think two of the five that the IPC were complaining about had not actually been agreed to by consensus. The wording that was on the table was proposed essentially at the last meeting or after the last meeting. And pretty much every group rejected something, so I wouldn't worry about that part. George.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. Thanks. I just want to ask a multi-part question about the process going forward, and I just posted a link in the chat room which talks about the composition of the GNSO council and how it's slightly different than the composition of the EPDP, because the SSAC and the GAC are not members of the GNSO council that will vote on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Nor the ALAC.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: The ALAC has membership. I'm not sure if they're voting or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we have a liaison. We are not voting.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: So because of that different composition, is it possible that some of the consensus level designations will change when the voting happens in early March?

And then the second part of my question is, what happens after it goes to GNSO council, goes to the comment period and then it goes to the ICANN board? So pragmatically speaking, is it possible that the board will modify some of those recommendations based on the input that's received, or is it just going to vote the whole report up or down? [inaudible] voting the recommendations individually? Or what's the process there? If we're not going to have much of an impact, it's hard to maybe invest the time in the comment period. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. In terms of the vote, we're going to have to wait and see. There have been cases where a constituency disagreed with something in a working group but then since there was consensus coming out of the working group, and because the GNSO council at one level is just managing the process, so because there was no problem with how the process was run, even though they didn't like the outcomes, they have supported things. Others have chosen to follow the path of their members within the group and disagree.

So I don't think there is sufficient lack of support in the GNSO to stop any of these from going forward if the GNSO decides that they are accepting something. So as I said, ones with strong support but significant opposition in the past, the GNSO has decided to not accept as a group. So we don't know how that's going to come out. Those were

different issues with different impact, so it's not at all clear how it will come out.

In terms of the way going forward – sorry, and the last thing on voting is, yes, as I've said, the ALAC, the GAC and the SSAC in some cases have been quite aligned with each other because our interests tend to reinforce each other, and we don't have a vote there. So if we had had a vote, if we had a vote on the GNSO, would we support the consensus going forward so that we have something to replace the temporary spec?

We might well. But we don't, and I'm expecting the bulk of this to be accepted by the GNSO, perhaps all of it, and then it goes to the board, the board puts it out for public comment, and the board does not – according to recent definitions and the new bylaws, the board does not have the ability to replace a policy. They can remand it back to the GNSO and say, "We don't like that, we can't agree with it. Do something different." The GNSO might do something different, or it might toss it back at them again. There aren't a lot of examples of this happening.

I think the board is free to accept some recommendations and not others, should they choose to do that. But they still have the problem of the temporary spec expiring. What are you going to do? So I can't predict future any better than that. Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Alan, I think your inferences were pretty on spot. I don't know exactly where IPC and BC stand, but I think there was a feeling that not enough had been accomplished in today's meeting to make it a clear yes vote.

So I'll have to watch this space. I think one of the most important things that wasn't achieved was the more specificity and purpose as to – or rather recommendation to the purpose section, the question about whether there will be references to things like cybercrime and intellectual property and other such things, or whether it will be more general, whether it would be in a footnote.

And I think the issue there is not so much the language in and of itself, but the question about how that sets up phase two and work on an access model. [I'm concerned that the language] there is not specific enough. That may have a very negative effect on phase two. Not sure if that concern is well-founded, but it's at least a reasonable concern. So overall, I think there are still a number of problems.

In terms of crystal balling the GNSO, NCSG is always a bit of a wildcard because their councilors vote their [contents] and not by instruction, so who knows which way it'll go. They certainly, I felt, exerted a great deal of influence in the group and got a lot of what they wanted, but nonetheless, it's entirely possible it wasn't enough for them. So we shall see.

With a supermajority being three quarters of one house and a majority of the other house, or two thirds of both houses, it's entirely possible if the contracted parties are happy and any seven noncontracted councilors are happy – and that includes the NomCom appointee – that it might go through in spite of both NCSG and two thirds of CSG – as Milton Mueller refers to BC and IPC – are voting no. So we shall see.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Greg. I don't think there's much doubt this will go through in council. They may not pass all of the recommendations on, but in general, I don't think there's any chance it will fail. The GNSO would take that as a measure that the GNSO has failed, and I don't think anyone there wants to see that. Well, there may be one or two, but not many.

So the chances of putting back in words like DNS abuse and consumer protection into that purpose was absolutely zero. There was no chance that was going to happen. Those explicit words were debated for a long time, and we're talking hours and hours, and it was quite clear that that was not going to be acceptable to certain parties, and there is no chance it was going to be changed at the last moment. So as much as I would have cheered to have it done, it wasn't going to happen.

In terms of the impact on phase two, well, if you read the statement we submitted, we said exactly that. The fact that these words were so repugnant to people that they weren't put there does not bode well for phase two. But at this point, we'll have to wait and see. Queue. We have George back again.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Greg raised the issue of wargaming [inaudible] ask maybe a speculative question. I'll note that none of the European data protection authorities have taken action against ICANN or any of the registrars due to the temporary spec that's been in place for the past almost a year, and so I was curious whether any thought has been given as to if this falls apart, is it possible that the temporary spec is renewed for another six months

or some parties that maybe didn't get what they want might use that as a negotiating tactic, that they'll try to make the temporary spec last longer than it was intended? Can you speak a little bit about that? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The temporary spec will not be renewed. Now, the board [could] come up with a slight variant of it and say, "Oh, we're starting again." I don't think they have the intent or desire to do that at all.

Does the board have a fallback position? If this all falls apart, I don't have a clue. I'd like to think they do, but I'm not privy to it, and I certainly don't know what it is if there is one.

What would happen if it expires is, well, if everyone continues to play the game, there's no real issue. They can just continue to follow the same rules and presumably, the board will do something akin to what we are recommending they do in the interim, and that is tell Compliance to not take any action against people as long as they're doing basically what was in the temporary spec.

But past that, I can't predict. I think most of this is going to go through and we will have a new policy, and it won't satisfy everyone. But that's my guess. I don't see any more hands. Back to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Thanks a lot for the update.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. Bye.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	And thanks for all your work on this. Evin, let's bring up the open comments, and then as part of that, we'll have a presentation from Greg. Did he get you some slides?
EVIN ERDOGDU:	I don't see any slides from Greg, but he is on the call, so perhaps – Greg says in the chat he's trying. So we'll keep an eye out. Thanks.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Alright.
EVIN ERDOGDU:	And I think the presentation is loading. Not sure. Okay. Thank you. So for this week's policy comment updates,, there were three statements recently ratified by the ALAC. You'll see those in the screen, and they're also noted on the agenda as well as the executive summary page on the Wiki workspace.
	First being ICANN Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2021 to 2025, and there were two separate comments submitted for the ICANN draft FY20 operating plan and budget public comment. First was the main statement, so to speak, and the second one was submitted in lieu of an additional budget request. There was a change to the procedure of additional budget requests, so instead of submitting one of those for

two extra travel slots, one was submitted to this public comment. So those executive summaries summarize those.

There are currently no public comments for decision, no new ones. There are three current statements being developed by the CPWG and ALAC. Two of them are now out for vote. The deadline for public comment is today within the next couple of hours, and they were submitted to public comment confirmed by Maureen Hilyard, ALAC chair. And those two are Updated Operating Standards for Specific Reviews, and the First Consultation on a Two-Year Planning Process

So there's one other statement currently being drafted by Greg Shatan, as we just noted, and that's the Initial Report on CSC Effectiveness. I guess I could turn it over to Greg if you'd like to say some remarks on this statement.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I've reviewed the CSC effectiveness review, and based on my review, my preliminary recommendation is that a statement is not needed unless we just want to issue a statement of general encouragement and keep up the good work.

The CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, performs an oversight and monitoring function over the IANA naming functions, replacing, if you will, the US government in the post-IANA transition world.

This is the first effectiveness review. There's already been a charter review. Having reviewed the Customer Standing Committee against, I think, roughly 15 metrics, the effectiveness review found that all but

three were fully achieved. A few were not applicable because they anticipated things that had not yet happened, but so they were in there as metrics. There was nothing to measure them against.

Where they did not fully achieve their goals, it was in a couple of very – well, one was having a documented process on how the CSC intends to deal with individual complaints. So there is a recommendation that they document and publish a procedure for that, [for complaints from] individual PTI customers.

And also, meeting attendance requirement of liaisons. There are a number of liaison seats, and apparently, attendance hasn't been great, and the remark is that it may be possible that the organizations don't realize that they're supposed to have a liaison or that their liaison is not meeting the attendance requirement. So that needs to be cleaned up. Both the appointing organizations and the CSC need to consider [the] meaning of the liaison role.

The review team [inaudible] that the CSC was overall highly effective and that the CSC people were committed, knowledgeable, and expert, and that the vulnerability is if there aren't such people in the future. And those are coming from various appointing organizations, so there's a recommendation that CSC develop an overview of skills and expertise required on the CSC so that there's essentially a job description for future CSC members.

I think the appointing organizations are the Registry Stakeholder Group, the ccNSO, and maybe the ASO, kind of more on the technical operational side. So those are the recommendations, and also kind of an

onboarding program for new members and liaisons as they come on. So overall, it seems to be a well-conducted review, and thankfully not too long of a report.

But as I said, there really seems to be no particular concern we should identify, no decision that needs to be supported or not supported. So therefore, unless we want to have ALAC submit a comment essentially for the [inaudible], I would recommend not doing so. Thank you. Any questions?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Christopher Wilkinson has his hand up. Christopher, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Good evening. Sorry to arrive late, but I was on a previous call with Work Track 5. Basically, Greg is correct. [inaudible] do it that way. I've participated in several CSC meetings, but I'm not representing a particular constituency in that context.

The problem with CSC is that its members are the canary in IANA. If there is something wrong in the future with IANA and PTI, is it's going to be one or another member of the CSC that will feel the problem and will report on it and seek action.

But in my opinion, the likelihood that the kind of [inaudible] would arise is sufficiently low that a number of participants would be tempted to ignore the CSC and just assume that as long as things are working well, there's no need to do anything about it.

And the [inaudible] IANA function is sufficiently critical and important that we actually need – which I shall describe again, figuratively speaking, as the canaries in the pit. Somehow or another, people must be motivated to participate and keep track so that if and when there's a problem, we will know about it as soon as possible and something is done about it.

Meanwhile, I think Greg's recommendations regarding this particular document [and the response required] are correct, and you should support them. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Christopher. Anybody else have questions for Greg? Because I think the recommendation is that we don't need to file a comment on this, the document's fine.

Okay. Back to you, Evin. Is there anything else in your presentation, or are we done with this agenda item?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Jonathan. Yeah, we're finished with this agenda item. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Alright. So my Windows scrolled down to the Spanish agenda. So, Any Other Business? Does anybody else have anything they wanted to bring up? Evin, you wanted to talk about prep week?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Jonathan. Just a reminder for those that were on the call last week, this was circulated as well. ICANN 64 prep week is next week, and there will be a series of webinars in advance of ICANN 64, and it requires registration by this Friday, the 22nd of February. And form for registration is linked to the agenda, and I'll share it in the chat shortly. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Does anyone else have Any Other Business? Christopher, I'm assuming that's your old hand up. I didn't notice.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Indeed, old hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thanks, Christopher. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. And I was typing it, but I'll quickly say it. I think it's important as we're on call rotation – and I'm a supporter of that, as you know – that we also note that because of other call rotations for other ICANN calls and Work Track 5 calls, 90-minute calls, the other work tracks that have been in this space recently have only been 60-minute calls. We've fallen foul today of a 30-minute overlap, which I know affected Marita and Christopher, and perhaps to a lesser extent, me.

But if we can just have a look at those rotations and maybe adjust accordingly after the Kobe meeting, it might be a simple matter of switching one of our 13:00s and our 20:00 or something so we're out of sync. But yes, obviously, Justine and I, we're getting good at multitasking. But if we can avoid having to be in multiple places on the same topic at once, it would be really good. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl, and let's definitely endeavor to do that, because it's great having this kind of turnout on these calls. What would be the next call in our rotation? I guess I'm asking Andrea, probably.

ANDREA GLANDON: Hi, Jonathan. We have kind of gotten out of the rotation, but technically, we would be 13:00 next Wednesday, the 27th.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And does anybody know of conflicts for that? Sorry, go ahead.

ANDREA GLANDON: No, that's okay, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was just forging ahead, because that's what I do. But I didn't know if you had more to say about that. I was just going to ask if people knew of other calls.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah. I was just going to say the three time rotations that we used for the call are 13:00, 19:00 and 21:00.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We just have to check about the Auction Proceeds call, because it's every two weeks and it may be clashing with this one. [inaudible].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, the Auction Proceeds is also at – it's at 14:00 UTC.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So that's a small clash with that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, it depends on whether we have a short or a long meeting. We might have another short meeting, actually, with the respite on the EPDP. If we had a 13:00, would that work for most people on the call?

HOLLY RAICHE: Painful.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg, is your –

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, but then some of us will have to –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Leave after an hour, right, Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yeah, so let's find a 60-minute call at 13:00 UTC next Wednesday. Greg, you have a comment that's related to this timing, or something else, other business?

GREG SHATAN: Actually going back to my presentation, but let's finish the timing thing. and I also had to leave the Work Track 5 meeting early for this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Alright. So it sounds like we're good for 13:00 on the time, and then we'll give Greg the floor again briefly before we close up shop.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah. Thank you, Christopher, for your remarks, and also thank you for attending some of the CSC meetings. I think by and large, the members – it's only a four-person group, I believe. The rest are liaisons. And attendance is really almost perfect for the actual members. When they don't, apologies are virtually always sent in. So I think that they themselves need to be taking it quite seriously, and of course, recognizing, as I remarked before, that there could be – that they need to have a similar caliber of people come up after this current group. But they've already been through a bit of a rotation.

In terms of the liaisons, attendance is somewhat spotty. Although some liaisons are doing quite well, and others are not, if I'm correct in my very quick review, I believe that ALAC may be the liaison that they are referring to when they're referring to the one that seems to be MIA, missing in action.

So that is something that needs to be reviewed and taken care of, however that needs to be taken care of. I hoped I wasn't understanding correctly, but it does appear. Carlton and Kaili are our liaisons? I don't believe so. They're not on the membership list. Maybe I'm wrong. Mohamed El Bashir is listed as a liaison, so I don't know if he is our liaisons, but he appears to be having some attendance problems. So not quite sure, maybe need to identify – yes, I see that from Heidi. So yes, that appears to be a conversation that needs to be happening, and maybe a different liaison be in place for that. Thank you, Heidi.

So that's that, but I would say that aside from the very minor problems noted, this seems to be one of the places in the ICANN ecosystem that works well and without drama, so that's a very rewarding thing to see. And hopefully, whatever little drama we're contributing will also become a thing of the past. Thanks. Bye.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. If there's no other business, then this call is officially concluded. Thanks, everyone, for being on it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Bye.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN.   Bye all.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining this call. This meeting is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]