
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. I want to thank everyone for joining today's teleconference. For the record, this is the 18 November 2020 edition of the ccNSO PDP working group that's tasked with developing ICANN policy with respect to establishing a review mechanism for ccTLDs, as mentioned in RFC 1591. I believe that's section 3.4.

We've convened this meeting today at 13:00 UTC. Yay to the Europeans. I want to thank those of you who've either stayed up really late or gotten up really early for your participation on today's call. It's rather early for us in the Americas, it's early afternoon for those of you near the meridian, and for anyone from Asia, I realize it's a horrible time for you. Of course, we want to thank Joke, Kimberly, Bart and Bernard for their work today with our call, and a special thanks to Kimberly who is up extremely early in the dark to work her Zoom magic for us today.

I also want to apologize ahead of time for any background noise you might hear when I'm not on mute. My village decided to get all the streets repaved this week and thus they're milling and laying down tarmac all over the business district, which I live above, so it's rather noisy out. And thank you, everyone, again for participating.

Staff will be taking attendance in the usual manner. I note there are a couple of apologies. So if there's anyone on audio only, please identify yourselves so that you're properly recorded. And our vice chair may or many to be with us today. So far, I don't see him. I know he was traveling back from Europe to Windhoek yesterday, and I think he probably got in within the hour.

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.

So that's it with welcome and roll call. Administrative announcements, I have none. Bart, Bernard, have I missed anything? I don't think so.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, none.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Nothing on this side.

BART BOSWINKEL: Great. Thank you. As mentioned on the last call, work is underway to carve out the retirement policy document developed by our sister working group so that it can be presented to the council and the [CCO] membership independent of our work here. That work is continuing. I won't go into the complexities of it. Did that at the last call. That's it for me for administrative matters. Don't have any action items.

So what we'll do today is continue with our review of the decision point spreadsheet that Bernard's been working on. The plan of the day really is to pick up where we left off last time and dive into some adjustments he's made given our last discussion on this.

I do want to thank everyone in the group for the considerable progress we've actually made on coming to consensus on critical parts of this. And with this, I'll turn the floor over to Bernard. The floor is yours, sir. Carry on. Thanks for being up early.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

No problem. It's [wintertime] anyway. All right, so back to our spreadsheet. I don't think we're going to have a really long call today. We'll probably finish inside the [inaudible] the top. So what we're doing is getting our ducks in a row so that we can talk about what kind of an appeals mechanism we want. You'll remember at the beginning of this, we said, gotta fix these things. What is it we're appealing, how can you appeal it, what kind of time frame are you looking at? What are some of the supporting mechanisms?

Once we get all of that lined up, then we can sit down and think about what kind of an appeals mechanism we want and ICANN Legal has offered to come and help us with those things, and they have a fair amount of experience in that. They're also happy that I'm working with you because as you know, I'm working on the IOT which is looking to finish producing the adjustments to the IRP for ICANN. So we're going to try and get this moving along.

With the progress that we've made so far, as I was telling Stephen earlier this week, I think we can finish this first part fairly quickly, either before the end of the calendar year or way at the beginning of next year. We are just moving very well along.

So getting back to our spreadsheet, I've highlighted in yellow the items that I have changed since the last version. We are now on 1.4. And given we don't have that many elements, we'll just go through it [inaudible] and if you have questions, don't wait for the end. As usual, just [inaudible] question.

All right, so our first subject, which is actually partially our most complex one in certain ways, is delegation of a completely new ccTLD. And our first item is failure to accept an application. Now, as we know, I've got a question there in column G. Has PTI ever refused a delegation request? As we know from experience, PTI does not tend to—and I've got the question there, so if someone from IANA is around and aware of the answer to that, I'd be happy to hear it, but I don't think. Okay, Eberhard.

EBARHARD LISSE:

Sorry for being late, I just came in from Germany. Technically, they did not refuse, but UM is a case where it was applied for, it was delegated, and then the US government came in and said "Undelegate it." So I would take this as a refusal to delegate .um. .um is the outlying US minor islands inhabited by a number of radioactive penguins and two biologists. So I can understand why they don't see the need for it. But it can happen and this is one case.

Then how do you deal with contending applications when two apply for it at the same time? It's a separate issue.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yeah, that's our second line.

EBARHARD LISSE:

Okay. Good. I would think if somebody applies for UM, they will be refused.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I would think so. Well, they might have trouble getting the local Internet community's support, especially penguins are difficult to corral into agreement. So on this one, probably mostly an edge case, but the reality is it's the applicant—if there is an official refusal ever, then one would have to make sure that IANA has a procedure to formally notify the applicant that they have refused the application, and then what we're saying is the applicant 30 days after that notice, he received it, his or its application has been rejected, they can appeal.

Now, you will see in column E I changed this. Well, column D I changed to just applicant. You'll remember that earlier, we had all sorts of other specifications in there when we were thinking that there could be other people who could apply to contest this, but in our last meetings, we said the only person who can apply who can contest this is the applicant. So there we go, applicant.

In column E, 30 days after the decision is published, that was the same as it was [inaudible]

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bernard, we've lost you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Before, what I've added in there is tolling for other mechanism. Hear you. Anyone else hear me?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, now we can hear you again.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. As I was saying, tolling for [inaudible]

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You're breaking up again.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Other mechanisms. What does that mean? It's very windy here so my Internet connection may be [inaudible]. If that is the case, if I break up again, let me know and I will change connection.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Will do.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. So, what does tolling mean? It's [inaudible].

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You dropped out again.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, I'm changing connections now, and that should work fairly seamlessly. I may drop off when I do that, so please be patient with me for a second.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Not a problem. It's our new world.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

EBARHARD LISSE: At least it is not Meetecho. They use this at the IETF and I am totally unimpressed. It uses enormous resources, much more bandwidth, gets my CPU on the Apple hot and the exhaust turning, which is not even noticeable now. And now I have spent enough time for Bernard to get back on the floor.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you for backfilling for me, Eberhard. Is this better?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you for that routine. Yes, it sounds a little bit better to me. Carry on. Thank you sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. So as we were—tolling, I was saying a term lawyers are fond of using. What does it mean? It means if you're going straight into an appeal, then you would have 30 days after the decision is made. But the point is we've said there may be other mechanism. If there are other mechanisms, you may want to allow the applicant to use those other mechanisms and not be punished, because those other mechanisms will most probably take longer than 30 days.

So if they are formally engaged in one of those other mechanisms, then you are pushing back the 30 days until the other mechanism has completed. So that's what tolling means, and we are going to have to decide if we want to use that. I personally think it makes a lot of sense, but that is for the group to decide. So that is the change, tolling, and other mechanism. And the other mechanisms are actually going to be, once we finish the section, our final section. Once we decide on some other mechanisms, after that, we're ready to start looking into an appeals mechanism.

So I'll stop there for that first line. Any questions or thoughts? Okay, nothing. Our second line is the delegation of a new ccTLD is accorded to a party. There was another applicant. So the only person who can appeal is the losing applicant. I've got an S in there in case it's hotly contested by many, as it can happen. Similarly, we've got the same thing, 30 days after decision is published or tolling for other mechanisms. I've explained what that means.

The decision point in this is clear, it's the ICANN Board minutes when this gets applied. Now, as we have said in the past, what this means is even if the board approves it—and as PTI has told us, they usually went pretty quick to include it in the root. Now, if one of the key elements of this appeal process is they should not do that because as we have agreed, unwinding an insertion into the root is going to be very bad. So probably, once it gets approved by the board, there should be a hold until the timelines for appeals have passed and then it can be put in the root. Eberhard.

EBARHARD LISSE: Pardon my ignorance. As I said, I was in transit. One case, Western Sahara where there were two contending or conflicting applications, IANA at that stage took the easy way out by [inaudible] saying sort it out among yourselves. Would that [inaudible] two applicants, one gets it, the other one can appeal. What happens in these cases of two appealing?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Two appealing because they did not get it?

EBARHARD LISSE: No. Polisario and the government of Morocco applied both, or sponsored organizations applied both, and in [New Delhi,] it came about that IANA said we leave it until they sort it out among themselves, we won't delegate it at all. Which one of those ... Would that fit into this one, or do we need a separate case for that?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think we need a separate case for that, because if you look at the procedures, it's very similar to the local Internet community working it out, and if there are two applicants and IANA uses ... it's not a refusal, it's basically a point of both parties. I'm unsure that an appeals mechanism would be very useful in this case. What an appeals mechanism would do is as I have said in the past, it's about changing a decision that has been made. In this case, there has been no decision. And you'll remember from our earlier discussions, we talked about the

point, well, what if it's taking too long for IANA? Saying there is no decision.

And that is so highly variable and there are so many elements, I really have some serious doubts that we could construct something that would be useful and effective as an appeal mechanism, and therefore, I think it would be the same thing here. I think our point is if IANA wants to say "you guys work it out," then you guys work it out. If they eventually make a decision, then according to what we're proposing here, the losing applicant could appeal the decision and then there would be something to look at. Does that make sense?

EBARHARD LISSE:

Yes, but what if PTI says or IFO says, "No, not delegating." Yes and no. This is not the local Internet community problem, but basically, we are looking at if IFO says "Sort it out among yourselves," then we could say, okay, after a certain time, we can force IFO by way of an appeal mechanism to make a decision. But leaving it in limbo is something that I don't want.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Well, as I said, let's put a pin on that one, because as they say, we can come back to it. I understand your reservations, Eberhard. I think the other reservations are also quite serious. And part of the problem, I thin, to a certain extent would be asking IANA to make a decision as to which government has sway over the local Internet community, which is a pretty big decision. If you think about it, the UN has a working group on this. They are very strict about these things. And when they do not

have a decision, it's pretty big. And there are pretty good reasons for that.

Anyways, as I say, I'm proposing to put a pin in it. Eberhard.

EBARHARD LISSE: What does putting a pin in it mean?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It means we will come back to it next meeting [inaudible].

EBARHARD LISSE: Yeah, okay. Not next meeting even, we just reflect on it and we think about it, and then we'll bring the topic up again. That's good for me.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, thank you. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry. Just remember that since I was in the board, we had this talk about these two groups and two CCs independently and together and with UN. And it's something that is out of our decision to suggest something. It's a very big issue inside the UN. And I agree with you that we cannot really interfere in these diplomatic issues not related to us, related to who has the possession of this piece of land. So it's something that I understand Eberhard's issue and we have this

discussion in that time, but even that, I believe it's not for us to put our hands on that. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Vanda. I will note that on our second line there, already opens the door, if there is a delegation to one party and it's another government that is appealing the decision is already a sticky wicket. But hopefully with the approach we've taken, that will not happen.

However, there is one point on the second line, and that is we're saying the losing applicant. Now, what we discussed last time was, do we want to put something in there, minimum requirements or a timeline to avoid spurious applications? Spurious meaning really poor or unjustified applications that are made just to jam up the process. I don't want to get into the discussion today, but the point is if we don't do anything, basically, someone could see that it's on a board paper to be approved or not as a delegation, could send in a contesting or opposing application and say the board delegated so I'm a losing applicant and I can appeal. That's some of the worst-case scenario if you will, and we may want to avoid that. So again, that whole line, I guess, as I said, is going to be slightly more complex than the other ones and we will get back to that.

All right, so before we leave the new ccTLDs, are there any other questions? All right, not seeing anything. Okay, so on the transfer, failure to accept an application, well, if PTI is not accepting an application, the only person we have to worry about being notified is the applicant, and hopefully, again, there is a process whereby the

applicants would be notified that the transfer request has been rejected. They would have 30 days and tolling possibly to appeal. And is this transaction eligible for an IFO review? Yes, obviously, as we know for transfer, the existing and new manager have to apply, so the existing manager can use the IFO review.

And this idea of the IFO review could be some of the things that we want to consider as those other mechanisms which will allow to extend the timeline on which you can appeal. So that's why that's there.

Transfer. The transfer is approved. Can anybody else appeal? No. As we confirmed last time, there is just nothing to be done about that. It's between two parties. If the PTI has decided that the transaction is okay, then the only people who can appeal this are the applicants if it was rejected.

Any other questions on transfer? No? Okay. Then we move on to retirement. As we know, we added a few meetings ago another element. We had forgotten that the change of status was appealable. That's the—

BART BOSWINKEL: Bernie, before you go, I think Patricio has his hand up on the previous item.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Patricio, please.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Bernie. In the transfer, would it be a possible scenario where the domain is going to be transferred but there's more than one candidate to be the recipient of that domain? So when the transfer is approved, there is one party that feels they could complain that it was given to somebody else and not to them.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Interesting question. I don't think so. I think the thing that jumps to my mind—and please—I see Eberhard. He usually has good examples.

EBARHARD LISSE: I don't think so. A transfer is by definition between from one to another party. IFO will discuss with significantly interested parties which is the venue for people who are opposed to enter, but it is from one to the other. It's not, "Okay, I'm giving it up, we're putting it up for auction." And don't forget, it is with consent. So there is a lot of—

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Requirements.

EBARHARD LISSE: [inaudible] by the incumbent to decide, "Okay, we're not going to [inaudible] we have got this one," and then IFO does the usual checks and balances to see whether they are technically capable and whether they have got the support of the local Internet community and significantly interested parties. So I don't think that the concern that there is two parties should be addressed with the appeal. That should

be addressed when they verify significantly interested parties saying we agree that the new one is okay. if there is sufficient problems with saying we don't agree, then another applicant could come in. But it's not that the incumbent says I'm giving it up and putting it up [for auction] and whoever wants to apply can apply.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Right. Thank you, Eberhard. Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE: I can imagine a situation where a ccTLD being managed by someone from [inaudible] and now it's decided that a different setup should be established with domain being managed by a group of stakeholders that should get organized civil society and whatnot. But two competing groups form and they both apply to be the new manager. And there is of course the due diligence by IANA and they decided one has the support of the local community. But the other group complains that IANA was unfair in their evaluation, perhaps they were friends with one of the groups or something, and they feel that they have a right to a transfer review.

EBARHARD LISSE: I don't agree with what Patricio is saying because a transfer is a transaction between two entities, the incumbent manager and the one that the incumbent manager agrees to. It's not that it goes, "Okay, I'm giving it up, PTI, sort out who gets it." It's a transaction between two parties and there is no third party involved.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. And to your point, Patricio, I think that using Eberhard's point, if someone just gives it up, then it would probably go to the delegation of a new ccTLD instead of a transfer [process. it probably looks like it more.] The other case where I thought it would be interesting is where a country splits up in multiple parts, as we saw with Czechoslovakia where a part of the domain went one way and a part of the domain went another way. But again, those were new domains. So I tend to side more with Eberhard on this one. If there were two parties vying for this, it would be the current manager that makes the decision. And that application would then come with those two parties, the current manager and who the current manager has accepted.

Now, does PTI accept that based on the information provided from the local Internet community? Maybe, maybe not, and that's why we have an appeal. But the corner case you're describing, Patricio, I really don't think will happen, I don't think is valid. Is that okay?

BART BOSWINKEL: Bernie, may I suggest that we put this on the list of stress testing at one point?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, yes. Absolutely. [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: These corner cases are very good to test the ultimate outcome again when you have it in written form, and that's one. And also, it depends probably we need to look at the framework of interpretation and how it's stated and how it's going to be interpreted by PTI or the IFO. So in that sense, it looks like, yeah, not necessary, but ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I'm taking a note on the stress test for a transfer and multiple parties.

BART BOSWINKEL: And I think you'll have the same with revocation and multiple parties. So after revocation, and then the transfer after the revocation, this is where the transfer is a bit different.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We will get to that one. You're getting ahead of me there.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Good one. So that would complete transfer. Retirement. As I was saying, you'll remember there were two points we can appeal. The first one is for the exceptionally reserved, is if there is a change of status, then PTI can look at that change of status and decide if the ccTLD should be retired. If PTI makes the decision to retire the ccTLD, they will

send a notice of retirement as per the retirement process. that kicks off the procedure, and there you have it, column C, notice of retirement is the trigger.

Then we have 30 days' notice or tolling. The manager can apply for a review. And yes, they're eligible for an IFO review. So I think that's rather clear. The only person who can appeal that is the current manager, and they're not happy that PTI has made the decision that they're going to be retired. And yes, that is probably a real interesting case to hold.

The second one is failure to grant an extension. So basically, we've described the procedure whereby if the current manager wishes an extension to the five years, they will produce a retirement plan and ask for an extension, and PTI will respond to that request formally. And if they reject it, then we said there could be an appeal.

Now, there's probably a couple of variations here. The first thing is I think this process covers it okay. Let's say the baseline is five years, of course, they ask for another five years for the full ten years, PTI comes back and says, "No, not really, we'll give you another three years for a full eight years." Technically not a rejection, but yes, if the manager has asked for ten years and gets offered eight years, doesn't accept it, then they could appeal. So I think that's covered.

The thing I'm more interested about is in column G. In a lot of the other things, we're talking about the existence of a ccTLD. Here, we're just talking whether it's going to exist a little longer or a little less longer. So, does this have to go to the full appeal, is my question, or could we be

happy saying, "Listen, between the IFO review and mediation, we should be able to handle this?" So that's the question I'm posing. I'm not definitely asking for a resolution, but I think it's one of those things where I'm going to leave with you to think about. Sure, we can go to a full appeal process, but my concern is this seems pretty lightweight for a full appeals process as far as key decisions are made. We're not making a decision if a ccTLD will go to one party or etc. It's really a lower level decision.

And there are some mechanisms. There is the IFO review, and I have been talking about for a while that if we're going to have an appeals mechanism, we probably should think about asking for mentor mediation before we get into that. So maybe that could be available to that too. So anyways, these are some of the things for retirement. Do we have any other questions on that? No? Okay.

Revocation. You'll notice in column C, I've got a green text. Does the ICANN Board have to approve the revocation? I don't think we have history of that. Does anyone know? I don't think we had ever had a revocation per se.

BART BOSWINKEL:

I think if you go back a long time ago, there was something like an immediate delegation or redelegation or something it's called, and it was very close to an [unconsented] redelegation at the time, so therefore a revocation. I think it was .us, but I'm not sure.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. And I think there was one in Northern Africa also. Eberhard.

EBARHARD LISSE: From revocation, I would think .um was revocation. No? One could call this was revoked. Then the incumbent manager didn't agree to it, it was revoked on the instructions of the US government.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes.

EBARHARD LISSE: So that would be appealable now. I'm not saying it was right or wrong, I'm saying it would be appealable. .ke when it was given to current management, was also not consented. It was at some stage, if I recall correctly, decided that Dr. Ochuodho PhD didn't respond actively enough, and it was just done. And a similar thing happened with .au. I think the guy doing it there decided he wasn't academic and he decided not to fight too much about it. But those are corner cases. .um is probably the most likely case where it was revoked. There may be others. I don't recall them, but this is a good case.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. I think those are good examples. But they were also examples before we changed the rules with the FOI working group, and hopefully those could not occur as those did anymore. But getting back to my question, if someone was revoked, we would have to be clear, is that

something the board would approve or not? I think it's important to track that.

If it was revoked, obviously, the current manager would have to be advised, and so they would fall in the standard timeframes for appealing the decision. And given that the manager is currently the manager, then it would be eligible for an IFO review.

So again, before PTI took any decisions, all the appeal mechanisms would have to be exhausted before they could go ahead and look for a transfer. As we have said, revocation is not a retirement. A revocation is removing it from the current manager and transferring it to another manager. So as Bart was saying earlier, the removing part can be appealed. Then there is a delegation to a new manager. Is that a transfer, and can that be appealed? Or is it all included in the revocation? So some of the questions we're going to have to get our heads around for those things. And that's revocation. Any other questions on revocation? Yes, sir.

EBARHARD LISSE:

I think a revocation is separate from the ensuing delegation. The delegation would then be delegation and contenders could appeal not being given. It's not a transfer, it's separate from a transfer. Transfer is one to one, but this can be one to many.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, so basically, are we saying that it's a revocation in that it's removed and it would be technically a delegation of an unassigned ccTLD code?

EBARHARD LISSE: The ccTLD is not removed from the root. It is management changes. The ccTLD revocation means the ccTLD manager is removed.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I understand that, Eberhard. I'm looking at the appeals procedures. So removing the current manager would be—

EBARHARD LISSE: Appealable.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Appealable, yes, agreed.

EBARHARD LISSE: And then a delegation becomes appealable by the losing contenders if there are any.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, which would be our line number two in this. It would be similar to the delegation of a new ccTLD. I'm just talking procedure-wise.

EBARHARD LISSE: Yeah. It is identical to the delegation of a new ccTLD but it's not a new ccTLD.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Exactly, so we're going to have to correct the text in column A if we're going to use it here. I think that's a very good point. All right, excellent. Anything else on that point? No? Okay. Great. and then our final line remains failure to accept the proposed IDN ccTLD string. We're having that there for more as an information. As we know, there is a policy working group on IDN ccTLDs and we'll have to see what they come up with, but we may want to have hooks so that we don't have to reinvent this appeals procedure when their work gets done.

All right, that's it from me. I'd be glad to take any closing questions. Thank you, everyone. Stephen, back to you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, sir. Thank you, everyone, for the discussion. We've had a good discussion on the group chat as well which will be on the Wiki, which we need to pay some attention to. If there are no further questions for Bernard, then thank you, Bernard, for walking us through those changes. Looks like a little more homework to be done based on the discussion.

Let's see. I want to thank everybody who contributed. I also want to thank all the Europeans who came in a little late. We'll give you a pass on that one, but thank you guys for all pitching up. We have the agenda up again. As you can see, we have two more meetings scheduled for this

year. 2nd of December at 21:00 UTC, so kind of in the evening for those of you in Europe, and 16th of December at 05:00 which is an ungodly time for you in Europe. Not a great time for us here in the Americas, and a somewhat better time for those out in Asia Pacific.

We'd like to hold both of them so we can continue our progress, and at that point, I think we will take a serious break and reconvene in the new year sometime further on in January. Other than that, that's it. Any Other Business that anyone might have? If you have issues with the schedule, etc. Anybody want to raise a hand on anything? And I do want to alert our host and cohost that for reasons unknown to me, I do not see hands being raised. So if any are being raised, please advise me.

BART BOSWINKEL: No hands, none at all.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, that's good. Yeah, my Mac upgraded overnight and we're getting some wonky consequences from that. Given that, I just want to thank Bernard, Bart, Kimberly and Joke for their support and contributions, Joke especially for her notetaking. And again, I implore everyone to stay safe. Virus has again reasserted itself, at least certainly here in the US. And with that, I will pronounce this meeting adjourned at 49 minutes after the hour and thank everyone. Kimberly, you can stop the recording. As always, thank you for your technical support.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Happy Thanksgiving for all you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bye guys.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]