FRED BAKER:	Okay, so we're coming to order. It's the top of the hour. Let me run through the roll call.
	Okay. Cogent. [inaudible]? Do I need to wait a few minutes for people to show up?
	ICANN.
Matt LARSON:	Matt Larson's here.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. ISC. I'm here.
JEFF OSBORN:	I'm here.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. NASA.
KEITH BLUESTEIN:	Keith Bluestein's here.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. Netnod.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here, Patrik is not.

FRED BAKER: Okay. RIPE. University of Maryland.

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: USC.

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker's here.

FRED BAKER: ARL.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard is here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign.

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Kaveh is not here, I believe. Liman, I heard you, so Liaison to the CSC. Brad, you're with the RZERC. SSAC? IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. The IANA function operator.

NAELA SARRAS: Naela's here.

FRED BAKER: And the root zone maintainer.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And staff, I believe we do have Andrew, Danielle and Ozan and Steve. Okay, could you go back to the agenda, please, Ozan? Okay, there we go. So on the agenda, what we have is the usual review of the minutes and acceptance of the minutes. We have a candidate for the SSAC caucus from NASA, and we have four work items to discuss. We want to talk about ICANN 68 policy forum [inaudible] which you can imagine [Göran] has been having a bunch of meeting with his chairs on. And then various reports from various liaisons.

Anybody want to change the agenda in any way? Okay, so you received the minutes. If no other place, then when the agenda was posted. Anybody have any comment on last month's meeting minutes? Hearing none, does anybody have an objection to the minutes? Something they'd want to change.

Hearing none, when we take a vote, does anybody plan to abstain?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro moves.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So Hiro, you move to accept the minutes. Do we have a second on that?

WES HARDAKER: Seconded, Wes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So if nobody objects and nobody is abstaining, then I guess we've accepted these. Okay. Now Jeff, did you want to talk about the RSSAC caucus?

JEFF OSBORN: Sure. The membership committee for the caucus is a small group, it's three of us. The other two are caucus members but not—on RSSAC, we had one recommendation, Barbara Schleckser who was a strong candidate from NASA. Her statement of interest is up on the screen. We voted unanimously to forward the recommendation to approve her for membership, and noted that we felt it was important to be liberal in our acceptance and conservative in choosing people to not be part of the caucus based on inaction over time.

So given that statement of principle, we thought she was very qualified and seemed interested, and we could see no reason to not recommend her.

FRED BAKER: Sounds good. I can't say I know her. Does anybody on the RSSAC know her?

JEFF OSBORN: I don't.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so she's a new friend.

TOM MIGLIN: She does work for NASA. She manages a good bit of NASA's internal DNS, DHCP, IP address management, all of that. She also does work with the folks out of Ames Research Center that manage our E-root server. So she's not directly involved in the E-root operations, but she manages the DNS for the agency, and I think she wants to, as part of keeping eyes, involvement in RSSAC, as well as our management of E root, she wanted to get more involved in that community.

FRED BAKER: Sounds good. And so I'm going to take Jeff's forwarding or the committee's forwarding of her statement of interest as a motion to accept. Do we have a second for them?

JEFF OSBORN: I'll second it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So anybody opposed? Anybody plan to abstain? Failing that, I think we have accepted this SOI. So now, work items, we actually have four work items right now in the RSSAC, one of which we hope to complete today, and that is the RSO statement on the identification of root operators. Duane, do you want to talk about that?

DUANE WESSELS:	Yeah. Sure. Thanks, Fred. So this document has been—so we talked about it last month, and following our last month's RSSAC meeting, there was another round of edits to the document primarily by myself and Paul Hoffman and maybe a couple of others that I'm forgetting. Since then, it's been stable. I believe it was sent out for final review.
	The last round of changes, I would say, were just sort of terminology, wordsmithing changes, didn't really change the substance of the document. I'm happy with the state that it's in now and ready for it to be voted on.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. Do we have a motion to accept it?
WES HARDAKER:	Wes moves.
FRED BAKER:	Do we have a second?
KARL REUSS:	Karl seconds.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. So, do we have any discussion on this? Does anybody have any final comments? Failing that, does anybody have any objections? Is anyone planning to abstain from the acceptance of this? And failing

that, I think we agreed to accept this document, so thank you very much to all who were involved in it.

Now, we have at this point three active work parties, one of which is close to winding up. Ken, do you want to talk about the local perspectives?

KEN RENARD: Good morning. The local perspective working group, work party, had a kickoff meeting last Thursday, I believe, and had some really good participation. There was some interest in being a work party leader, but we pushed off selection of the work party leader because there are folks that want to learn more about what was happening and maybe go through the initial step.

So I sent out a summary of the RSSAC caucus mailing list yesterday, actually both of these work parties, and there were a few action items from there. I encourage everyone to take a look at that mail, the summary mail. If you did not see it on the caucus list, I can resend to the RSSAC list as well. If anybody thinks that's a good idea. So, that party is getting going, there's some good discussion.

On to the next one, the rogue RSO work party, very similar situation, kicked off, had some good participation. Fewer volunteers for work party leader, but we'll again take that up as a first action item for the next call. Both of these work parties have an action item to select a time slot for the monthly calls, and guessing that'll go out soon and we'll pick up a regular cadence of meetings.

Again, take a look at the summary e-mail messages sent out to the caucus mailing list. Please, if there's any discussion on some of the topics or questions, be glad to chat with anyone through the mailing list. That's it for those two work parties.

FRED BAKER: For some reason, I tried to join the call of the first of those and that wasn't successful. The action mitigations of a rogue RSO seemed like there was a fair pushback on the concept of a rogue RSO. They didn't like the word. What's your feeling about that?

KEN RENARD: I had some thoughts over the weekend about that. I might send out an e-mail to discuss on that, the idea of just limiting the term "rogue" which has negative connotations to a certain subset and coming up with less offensive or negative terminology for some others. I'll send something out to the caucus mailing list, maybe spur some discussion.

FRED BAKER: Okay. That sounds good. Thank you, Ken. So Andrew, do you want to comment on the history of the root server system work party?

STEVE SHENG: Fred, Andrew is on vacation today. It's a Dutch holiday. So he asked me to stand in and give an update.

The work party had a call, and since the call, there were lots of good comments received on the mailing list. So Andrew went through and has about finished addressing all of them. His plan is to get it done in the next two weeks and do a 48-hour last call, and then after that, send it to the RSSAC, possibly for online vote. So that's a quick update.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thanks much. And of course, the timing might be good for an online vote or deferred to the June call. But it won't be any further up than that. So Andrew's done a lot of good work.

Let me move on to the virtual policy forum planning. In the chat room, Ozan has put a link to a spreadsheet.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi Fred. I put it actually even before the call started, so it may not be visible to everyone, but I'll just put it again so everyone can access it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And along with that, I have just dropped the URL for you guys to be familiar with time and date [and world clock.] And what I'm thinking at the moment—and you guys can tell me that you're fine, but I'm worried frankly especially about the people in the Amsterdam and Stockholm. It seems that [inaudible] up in the middle of the night in Europe, and that's just asking [inaudible].

We don't have to do our calls in the ICANN block schedule, and so what I'm thinking is to have the calls that we have outside of the block

schedule. What would still need to be within the block schedule is any calls with other parties, other constituencies or organizations within ICANN.

So, does anybody have any objections to that approach to scheduling? Failing that, if we have calls with other constituencies, my target is roughly UTC—what is it? 13:00. Okay, I'm confused. 13:00 isn't showing on my screen. How does this work? Well, I guess 13:00 is when I'd really kind of like to have the calls, and the reason for that is it's 6:00 AM in California and 10:00 PM in Tokyo, and a little bit more reasonable times in Washington and Amsterdam.

So, where we schedule meetings, that is frankly where I'm expecting to put them, 13:00 to 14:00 UTC. Does that give everybody a problem? Is that going to be an issue? Hearing none. Okay. So Ozan, you want to go back to the block schedule. I got those two times mixed around. So if we do something in the block schedule ... Here, you show LA and UTC. I don't have Tokyo here.

So my feeling—tell me if I've got this wrong—is that for meetings that we'll have with other constituencies, targeting block four which is when they plan to have the plenary meetings, or block five, probably is the best bet.

Now, the meetings that we usually have with other constituencies include the SSAC and the BTC. Russ, are you on the call? Kaveh, are you on the call? I don't think either of our liaisons are actually here. But if we have meetings with them, that's what I'm thinking about. Tell me,

what do people think about having a joint meeting with SSAC at ICANN 68? Is that something people want to have?

WES HARDAKER: I find those meetings are generally very productive or useful for the group, so I would argue we should, if there's likely to be topics of interest [in KL.] But if we don't come up with any topics, then we should disregard it. But I'd base that on topics.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. So Hiro says that Tokyo is plus one, so [inaudible]. And Kaveh is polling the board to see whether the BTC wants to have a meeting with us. From my perspective, my big question to the board every time they say what's your question, I want to know how they're doing [on the evolution.] At the moment, the GWG has been formed and they're having their meetings. and Brad will talk about that a little bit later.

So Kaveh will let us know whether BTC wants to meet with us. I don't really have a topic to bring to the board at this point. So yeah, we'll see what the SSAC comes up with. Point noted, Wes, that the SSAC meetings are generally useful.

Okay, Daniel says that he's having a hard time hearing me. Are you guys hearing me okay?

WES HARDAKER:	Your audio kind of breaks up a lot. It always has. There's something about your house or whatever that causes that. I can understand you, but it's kind of like intermitted digital drop kind of noise.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. That's not good. Okay, so I have just gone off my Bluetooth headset and I'm speaking to my computer. Does this sound better?
WES HARDAKER:	It's about the same, so it might be the microphone. I'm not sure.
FRED BAKER:	Okay.
WES HARDAKER:	I guess it should have been the Bluetooth headset if that was the microphone, so never mind, it's probably your wireless connection or something.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Or the audio processor in your box and its software.
WES HARDAKER:	Yeah, the list of "ors" is going to be really long here in a minute.

FRED BAKER: Yeah.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Which is why we have these problems.

FRED BAKER: Right. Well, apologies for whatever is going wrong. Ozan, your hand is up.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Fred. I wanted to speak about the ICANN 68 scheduling. So typically, one would expect RSSAC to have its monthly meeting during an ICANN meeting because RSSAC wanted to take advantage of the face-to-face time in the past and have its monthly meeting scheduled as part of the public meeting.

                            This time, since this meeting is a virtual one, I also wanted to throw the question whether the RSSAC wanted to have its July meeting as part of ICANN 68 or stick to the original monthly meeting schedule. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Well, any opinions on that?

WES HARDAKER: That's a valid question. I'd be tempted to stick with the original schedule just because there's no real advantage to meeting during an ICANN meeting other than if we want to attract attention to the fact

that we're having open meetings and stuff like that. If we have other work to do, because we will likely have less hours in the day sticking to a reduced schedule to meet the 13:00 UTC to 15:00 UTC time block, it might be worth saving those for the larger meetings without trying to schedule an RSSAC meeting to go along with it. But I don't object to either plan.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think we should take advantage of actually having a meeting in July so that we can offload the time that we need to spend on telephone conferences during a compressed week. So I think it's better to spread the work over more meetings, more seldom, and then having the telephone conferences around the clock at the end of June. So I vote for keeping the meeting in July.

FRED BAKER: So tell me, Ozan, the July meeting would be on the 7th? Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Quickly checking. Yes, it would be on the 7th, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, let's have the meeting on the 7th as opposed to putting it in the KL schedule. Okay, so moving on in the agenda, we're supposed to get comments from myself and Brad as far as chair's comments. I think the big comment that I have is that the various chairs have been meeting with Göran and trying to plan the ICANN 68 [and so on.]

[inaudible] A lot of crazy stuff going on there, but there have been those discussion. Brad, do you want to jump in on that?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. There's really nothing to share other than there's been lots of discussions about this remote meeting and what the schedule will look like.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. So I guess that's the report that there's a lot of talk going on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Do you have a feeling for how does the larger ICANN community actually function in this context? Does it continue to work well because most of the work is carried out on teleconferences anyhow, or something that is a major showstopper to people?

FRED BAKER: My perception is that life continues apace. As you say, most of the actual work is done on phone calls and Zoom calls anyway, and that is happening. I'm not hearing a lot of strain in the [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I think work continues but there is less people, which is a concern for ICANN, a concern that if you want consensus, the people who are engaged are—you've lost a bunch of voices potentially and that's a

concern. So there is discussions around that, how you get the participation back in this non-face-to-face world.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Frankly, just reading the press and people talking about, so what happens when we go back to work and so on, I see a lot of, gee, we've gotten used to sitting at our computers and maybe some people [inaudible] do so or go to the beach or something. So yeah, there's concern with the number of people involved in the discussions.

Ken comments in the chat room that we're missing the hallway discussions. Yes. There is no hallway. Actually, in the IETF, which is meeting a couple of weeks later theoretically in Madrid, one of the questions is how to simulate hallway discussions, how to facilitate [chat with so many] people. I suppose—and Liman says plus five. Okay. So that's my report. Kaveh is still not here, so we won't hear from the ICANN board. Liman, you want to talk about the CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, just quickly. From the CSC, we had our monthly meeting as usual. And once again, we had a report from the PTI which stated that they met the SLAs to 100%. I'm getting used to this. And we have a set of changes for creation and [redelegation] of TLDs, which is currently doing the circles for approval from ccNSO and GNSO. And just two days ago, I received a message from Katrina who is the chair of the ccNSO that it

has passed their scrutiny, so they've approved it. I know that it's on the agenda for the GNSO, but it missed an opportunity due to bad timing, so it will happen during May here sometime.

We continue our discussions regarding metrics for the KSK ceremonies and how we can audit that they actually function according to plan, and these are still discussions on the very early stage. So it's tossing ideas and looking at various possibilities. And we are also continuing our work and support with the IANA functions review team, so I will be taking part in the IFRT meeting later this month. I don't know the exact date. It's been postponed a couple of times, but it's going to happen later this week. So that's my report. Any questions? Hearing none, tym back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. So Brad, you want to comment on RZERC?

BRAD VERD: Not much to share here with RZERC. Last month's meeting was cancelled and I know that there is work underway on some documents that they're doing, but really nothing to report.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Russ is not here. Russ, are you here? Daniel, words from the IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, no, nothing to report.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Naela, do you have anything from the IANA functions operator? I believe you just opened a comment proceeding.

NAELA SARRAS: Correct. So yeah, I'd like to highlight those—I sent a couple of e-mails in the last week or so to the RSSAC, and I wanted to bring those up again. So yes, I sent an e-mail regarding an open public forum for the PTI strategic plan for FY21 through 24. This is the first PTI dedicated strategic plan and we're putting this out per the bylaws for the PTI to have its own strategic plan separate from ICANN's strategic plan.

It opened on the 20th of April and it remains open for public comment until the 1st of June, so we're asking the community to take a look and see what the plan looks like, and certainly give input. And then related to that, what the PTI board and staff plan to do during the meeting in Cancun which obviously didn't happen in person was to go around to the different communities and talk about the strategic plan and how we're prioritizing or what we're prioritizing for the next four years.

Since that didn't happen, and in lieu of that, the PTI staff and board are doing a couple of webinars to introduce the plan to the community and gather input, and those webinars will take place on the 14th which I believe is a week from Thursday, 14th of May. The goal here is to talk about the strategic plan and then allow enough time for those

communities that wish to comment and get their comments in before the 1st of June.

So those are the updates I wanted to give related to the strategic plan, and gathering input about that. One other quick item is that the 23rd of April, the PTI finished the root KSK for the ceremony for the [inaudible] for the root KSK. There was some impact due to the stay at home orders and COVID-19. There was some impact on performing the ceremony, but it was successfully performed on the 23rd of April and they produced the ZSKs that we need for the next three quarters. And then during that time, the PTI and IANA and the community will be working on plans on how to proceed further, whether there'll be changes to conducting the ceremonies, etc.

But we were able to complete the item that we set out to do on the 23rd of April. And that's it from me. Unless there's questions, back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Yeah, as I recall, the principle problem that you had with the role was that one of the operators wasn't able to physically make it so you had to play some games there. Did I miss something?

NAELA SARRAS: Right .So the ceremony calls for the trusted community representatives to be physically—[asks that] of the trusted community representatives to be physically available in the room where we perform the ceremony. And obviously, because of the ban on travel, they couldn't be there. So

Kim and the team had to basically modify procedures to allow some of the TCRs to send in their materials via mail, and there was extra auditing of making sure that the materials arrived and the TCRs saw exactly what was happening to their materials. So those are the adjustments that needed to happen.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Cool.

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: So Duane, let's move on to you. Word from the root zone maintainer.

DUANE WESSELS: I think Brad's hand is up. I don't know when it went up exactly.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. Brad, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, Naela, I was just curious regarding the strategic plan for IANA, is that something that you would like RSSAC to comment on, or anything like that out of RSSAC in support?

NAELA SARRAS: I would like that at least—so yes, of course, additional comments or at least review from the community is helpful. I think what Kim and the PTI board are looking for is, are we focused on the right things here? Because this is our first ever strategic plan. So I think as you and Fred said earlier in the call, participation from the community is helpful and knowing that we have wider understanding that we're doing the right things here. So yes, if there is a chance for the RSSAC to comment, that would be helpful.

BRAD VERD: All right. Thanks.

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so from that perspective—I'm sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: You have another hand, Fred, before I go.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think I was about to say what you started to say, which is that given the background that Naela just gave us, I think it would be helpful for

the PTI if the RSSAC actually gave a statement as RSSAC and not only as the individual members submitting a comment. So I think we should make an effort and actually produce such a comment from RSSAC. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So it would be fairly simple for me as chair of RSSAC to just write something that says "this is great, go do it." I can imagine that various RSSAC members might have comments, and since you haven't had time to think about that, let me suggest that if you have a comment that you would like for the RSSAC to make, let's discuss that on the RSSAC list. And can we, within our procedures, simply hold that to the coming week and decide what we want to do that next week? That's a question.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If it was directed to me, yes, definitely quite okay.

FRED BAKER: Okay. As much as anything, I was thinking about RSSAC 0, our procedures document [inaudible]. Anybody who has a comment that they would want RSSAC to make to PTI, let's post that during this coming week to the RSSAC list and we can discuss it. Failing that, Duane, let's turn to you.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks, Fred. I don't really have anything new to report, but I wanted to piggyback on what Naela was saying about the ceremonies.

As someone who participates or tries to participate in most of the KSK ceremonies, I just want to say they did a really great job on this one, given the circumstances. It was about the same amount of time as the regular ceremony, but this time they had to wear masks and take other precautions, and there was somebody who essentially held an iPad the whole time for those of us that were remote so we could see what was going on, and I really appreciated that.

One thing to note, just in case it's not obvious, that was different with this ceremony was usually, there's one quarter's worth of mixed key materials done at a time, but now we've done it for three quarters, so that gives us headroom to see where to go next. So, thanks a lot, Naela and to all of the IANA staff.

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you, Duane, for the kind comments.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Liman, your hand is up. Are you asking to comment?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Old hand.

FRED BAKER: No problem. Okay, so we're at the AOB point. Does anybody have anything they'd like to bring up at this point? Matt.

MATT LARSON:	Hi everybody. Fred, I have a brief AOB item if that's all right.
FRED BAKER:	Go ahead.
MATT LARSON:	I just sent to the RSSAC list an e-mail about an RFP that ICANN opened last week that might cause some questions if you didn't have the context for it. I think my e-mail is self-explanatory, but as long as the call was going on, I wanted to mention it.

The original IANA transition proposal called for a study to be done looking at the root zone management process, focusing on the root zone maintainer. Well, the two parties involved, ICANN and Verisign, basically. So it's taken us a while. That was on the backburner for a long time. But we finally got the RFP open and we're going to be selecting a contractor to do that study. So this is open simply because the original transition proposal called for it and we wanted to follow through. There's nothing else. What you see is what you get, there's no other subtext for this. So, be happy to answer any questions now or e-mails on the list. |
| FRED BAKER: | Okay. Thank you. Is there any discussion with Matt at this point? Failing that, Wes, your hand is up. |

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, there was a discussion in one of the working groups about how hard it would be to change your name as listed as a root server operator. We went through that process because we wanted to expand ISI to Information Sciences Institute, and that went smoothly and painlessly, and PTI did a great job of making that happen. So just FYI, it's not only possible, it's fairly straight forward.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Any other AOB items?

BRAD VERD: Fred, you wanted me to comment on the GWG. There's really not much to share. The GWG has met three, four times. They're still kind of getting their feet in it, and right now, the discussion is kind of like the scoping of things on like what's in and what's not. Liman or Hiro, feel free to add. I know that we've talked—Fred, I think you've had a conversation with the chair also, Ted Hardie, but they would like to have open conversation back and forth between RSSAC and the GWG if necessary. So anything we want to share with them, they're more than willing to hear.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so yes, I had a conversation with Ted and I should have mentioned it earlier. The fundamental comment was that he thought the process that we went through with RSSAC 49 was cumbersome and far more than what the GWG needed in order to comprehend what we had in mind. He would like to have a fairly free field of discussion there.

So what the GWG has done—or so he tells me—is deputize the three RSSAC members, three root operators that are on the WGW as liaisons to the RSSAC. And from my perspective, they can be mutual, they can be liaisons back informing the GWG of what's going on in the RSSAC. And if we need to put together a statement, we can certainly make comments directly to the GWG if we literally just have a comment to make. It would be easy to also imagine that we wanted to make some sort of a comment that expressed the sense of the RSSAC and then you have that recorded for posterity.

In that case, we would need to go through the usual process of discussion and preparing a document and voting on it and sending it to be published for posterity, but the GWG would like to have it link to the Google doc early and be able to basically comment with us as it's being developed as opposed to adding it at the tail end of the cycle, which makes sense to me.

So let me ask, does anybody have a problem with sharing comments with the GWG as they're being developed?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: For the general case, I think that's a brilliant idea. Should there be something that we actually have conflict, I think we want to make a reservation and say that we want to be able to edit things on our own. We don't make a promise to them to share everything, but as a general rule, I think it's a very good idea.

FRED BAKER: Okay. [And clearly, I was] talking about the general case. Okay, so thank you, Brad, for bringing that up, because I had forgotten to mention it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: One more comment. Brad and Fred, can we suggest that we add the GWG to the general agenda for the RSSAC meetings under seven for reports? As long as it's an ongoing thing.

FRED BAKER: Yes. Ozan, would you please do that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: What we've done in the past is had that part of the chair/vice chair report, but yes, let's have the GWG in there.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: And with that, does anybody else have any AOB items? With that, I'll close the meeting. So our next meeting is the 2nd of June 14:00 UTC, and we'll talk with you then.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Stay safe, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]