

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
May 14, 2015
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me. Recordings have started.

Woman: Thank you, operator. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the BC members call on May 14, 2015. On the call today we have Elisa Cooper, Steve DelBianco, Jimson Olufuye, Paul Mitchell, Ron Andruff, (Kate McGowan), Angie Graves, Andy Abrams, Andrew Harris, J. Scott Evans, Ting Chen, Cecilia Smith, (Ellen Blacker), Chris Wilson.

We have apologies from David Fares, Phil Corwin, Stephane Van Gelder, (Unintelligible), (Brian Newsman), Andrew Mack, (Carolyn Ingraham), and Mahmoud Latouff. And myself, Yolanda Jimenez. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, for transcription purposes. Thank you, and over to you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Yolanda. And welcome everyone today. I don't have a lot to cover, but I do want to give you a heads up that I'll be sending out a request to you to ask you which topics we should focus on at the upcoming meeting in Buenos Aires.

And as soon as we get some more finalized agendas from the CSG in terms of who we're planning to meet with - this particular meeting is being organized by the ISPs in terms of the CSG meeting. I'll send that out as well.

But before we kind of move on, is there any other business or any other items we should put on our agenda for today, that people would like to talk about?

Angie Graves: This is Angie. I have one.

Elisa Cooper: Oh, sure. Go ahead, Angie.

Angie Graves: Hi, yeah. Angie Graves here. I'm in the SCI, as a BC representative there. That's the standing committee on improvements implementation. We're looking for an alternate, and I'd just like to speak about that very quickly for a moment. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Why don't we - since you kind of started, maybe you could tell us a little about what kinds of things you're working on, and what the time expectations are.

Angie Graves: Thank you, yes. The SCI is tasked by GNSO Council - and I did note that Ron Andruff is here, and he has served on the SCI for much longer than I. I served as alternate, and thanks to Ron, I have a much better idea about the SCI than when I joined. But now I'm moving into the primary position, and we have an open space for an alternate.

So in terms of what we do and how long it takes -- to answer your question, Elisa, thank you - I thought I heard somebody's voice. Sorry. We are tasked by the GNSO Council on mainly procedural issues. So it's very specific, what we're tasked with. And generally it takes anywhere from a few weeks to

several months to sort out what the guidance would be, which is the response back to the Council on whatever procedural item it is.

And I'll just give one as an example. We did a few issues in the recent months, and one was reconsideration of a motion that had been put aside by the Council -- what happens if a motion is dismissed and the individual or group that brought it originally would like for it to be reconsidered? Under what conditions can they do that? The passage of time? Or rewording of the motion? Et cetera.

And we don't really generally meet more than once every two months, other than that. And Ron, I'd love for you to add anything if you have it.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Angie. Ron Andruff for the record. I think you've said it right. Basically the workload will expand and contract depending on how much activity the GNSO sends to the SCI. But it's really about looking at things and taking the extra time needed just to kind of flatten out the rough edges.

But I highly recommend any one of the members to join Angie as the alternate, because it is very interesting work, and it's a very collegial effort that takes place within that group. Thank you very much.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks. So is there anyone who would be interested in acting as an alternate? It sounds like you meet typically every other month or so. Is there anyone on the call that would be interested in (this)?

Angie Graves: Or even interested in learning more. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: I'm waiting for that rush of hands to raise, but I don't...

Ron Andruff: Yes, Elisa, this is Ron again. It's really critical that we do have two, an alternate and a primary. Both individuals don't have to be at every call, but it is important that we have an alternate and primary. At this point, I think the BC is one of the few constituencies that is undermanned, as it were. So if someone could just step up and pitch in and give Angie a hand, that would be really helpful. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Well perhaps people can think about it, and I'll send out another reminder on the list. And if you have interest, that would be great. So thank you for that, Angie. Any other items that we should make sure we cover on today's call?

J. Scott Evans: Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I do think we need to offer our thanks to Steve and Phil for - while they weren't representing the BC yesterday, I think that they presented some fairly reasonable and even-keeled comments to the committee yesterday in the hearings on the Hill. And I also think we need to briefly discuss (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I agree. And perhaps we can do that in the policy discussion coming up next. Any other items? I know Steve has to get through security, or maybe he's already past security. He's traveling. Steve, can you take us through policy? And can we discuss yesterday's hearings, and also have a bit of a discussion about the Vox Populi letter that was sent to ICANN? Did we lose Steve?

Woman: He's probably exhausted after back-to-back hearings.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Hello?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, is that you, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Elisa Cooper: Oh, okay. We can hear you.

Steve DelBianco: Great. So why don't we cover the Vox Populi legal threat and letters that BC and Vice BC had put in. And, Elisa, I'll let you manage that queue, since I can't see Adobe.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, sure. Yep.

Yolanda Jimenez: Sorry, should I put the policy on? Sorry, should I put the policy on?

Elisa Cooper: I think you should, but I also see J. Scott's hand raised. J. Scott?

J. Scott Evans: Well I just think that there has been a letter raised, although we have not received one specifically. We have seen the one that was sent to ICANN. And I think it's clear that they're going to be extremely aggressive.

And, you know, while I find it terribly ironic that the group that swears that the reason trademark owners shouldn't be upset is because - just wanting everyone to engage in healthy discussion and criticism, that when people start criticizing them, they threaten a lawsuit. So I'll put that out there for you, how great their plan works.

But I think it belies their legal strategy. And so I would suggest that from now on when anyone speaks their dissatisfaction with this business practice, or with dotSucks, that you express it in the form of an opinion, because opinions are not actionable. So if you were to say, in my opinion I think what they're doing is terrible - so those are the kinds of things you need to do.

And don't talk about them. Talk about the effect of what they're doing. And those two things should at least soften any attempt they might make to come after you or the leadership of this organization.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, J. Scott. I don't know if people saw Greg Shatan's response, but he came out with it. And actually Phil Corwin had sent around a link to that article. But he comes out - I mean his comments are exactly to that effect, that it's concerning that they were talking about sort of the ability to speak freely, and their actions are pretty much having - have the potential to have a chilling effect. Other thoughts or comments or questions?

Steve DelBianco: Elisa, it's Steve. Can I get in the queue?

Elisa Cooper: Go ahead. I'm sorry. We couldn't really hear you before.

Steve DelBianco: Sorry about that. So I did notice that in the legal (cases).

Elisa Cooper: Steve, can you hear me? Because you're breaking up.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, I can hear you fine but(unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: You want to try again?

Steve DelBianco: Just interrupt me if it's - and I'll give up. (Unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, Steve, you're really breaking up.

Steve DelBianco: All right, never mind. I'll put in the chat when I get in.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, will you be in a place that you'll be able to take us through the calendar? Or should we go through the calendar on our own?

Steve DelBianco: I'm actually sitting in a lounge now. Maybe I need to redial in, because if the connection's no good, I don't know what else to do.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. You're fine now, so maybe - however you're sitting now, works.

Man: Yeah, I'm getting you much clearer now.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: And you just moved. Maybe try calling back in.

Yolanda Jimenez: Would you like me to ask the operator to call you, Steve?

Elisa Cooper: While we're doing that, maybe let's jump ahead in the agenda a little bit, and hopefully Steve can come back on. So can we move on to you, Jimson? Do you have any updates from finance and operations?

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you, Elisa. Good day everyone. Let me apologize in regard to the background, if you might be hearing some background noise. But basically, our operation is running smoothly. The onboarding of (unintelligible) more value to our operation. And (unintelligible) down the line.

(Unintelligible) got to a Web site upgrade and migration to adaptive designing. And I also expect some feedback from the (unintelligible). So I really want to recommend that everyone takes a look at the budget draft that I sent. So apart from that, I think there is nothing more. Thank you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: All right, thanks. Let's see if Steve is now available. I see he's on the Adobe Connect. Steve, can you hear us? Yolanda, are you calling - is the operator calling back out to him?

Yolanda Jimenez: I don't have Steve's number.

Elisa Cooper: Oh, okay.

Yolanda Jimenez: But I can ask the operator. I'll ask Steve his number, and I'll ask the operator to call Steve.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Let's just give him a second here.

J. Scott Evans: Well in the meantime, Elisa, this is J. Scott. I do want to go back to the hearings real quick and just - I watched all of them. And what I found most telling was some of Phil's...

Steve DelBianco: Elisa, this is Steve. Can you hear now?

J. Scott Evans: Is Steve there?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I think he is.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, I'll turn it over to him.

Elisa Cooper: Steve, are you there? Okay, J. Scott. I think you should continue with your thoughts. So in terms of what you thought was most interesting...

J. Scott Evans: I thought it was most interesting what Phil said about, you know, the claims notices so far outweighing the registrations, and that his suspicion that he either knows or suspects that, you know, people are gaming that system to find out what trademarks are registered in the clearinghouse, because so that they can then make them premium names.

I found that - the funny thing that I thought that no one really brought up, that no one has pulled the veil out on top of ICANN is, you know, I've been involved in this for a long time. And everyone kept telling me we need new gTLDs because there are no short, snappy domains left in dot com, and all the small businesses can't get domains, right?

Well the truth is, all the registries and registrars have made all those smart, cute, quippy domains optionable or \$25,000. So the whole point of helping out mom and pop get a low barrier to entry? Totally washed down the toilet. And I don't think anybody's talking about that -- the fact that that was one of the main purposes for this.

I thought it was also interesting the way the LegitScript guy took after Momentous, and pointed out the fact that many of the people that they have problems with find havens at Momentous registry - registrars, and...

Steve DelBianco: Hi all. It's Steve. Can you hear me?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, Steve. We can hear you.

J. Scott Evans: Go ahead, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Yeah, so I'm very sorry about that. It usually doesn't happen. But did you conclude your discussion on the Vox Populi?

Elisa Cooper: We're still kind of in the middle of it.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, great. Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, that's a very interesting point. Are there any - so I know that a number of people probably listened in or actually attended. Are there other questions or thoughts or comments about the hearings that we should discuss? Or that people want to know? Jim Baskin?

James Baskin: Yeah, thanks, Elisa. I had a little bit of concern, not on the Vox Populi piece of it, but on the statements made by - I don't remember his name, but the fellow that was representing the other two-thirds of the IANA functions with the...

Steve DelBianco: Bill Woodcock.

James Baskin: Yeah. That basically they had done - their work was done and they were ready to move forward. And he was really pushing strongly to separate the pieces. And, Steve, I think you had responded pretty well to that.

But I am concerned, and I'd like to know more about why those people think that they need to move forward more quickly. Is there a problem they're facing today that they're going to fix? Or are they trying to somehow derail or change the way things are moving otherwise? Any thoughts?

Elisa Cooper: I see Steve has his hand raised. Maybe it's in response to that.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Elisa. I did talk to Bill Woodcock before the hearing. And I pressed him on this point, that he wants to go forward with IETF and the numbers organization. And we're saying then no, we ought to do all of them together to maintain the leverage necessary to get ICANN to accept all these accountability measures that we're trying to impose on them.

He said, I have some sympathy for that, but the numbers and protocol people feel like they're ready and want to move (forward). And I pressed him on why. What problem could possibly motivate them to get out of the status quo? He had nothing to offer. So we are going to have to try to work from the inside to understand why. It doesn't hurt them to wait, but in fact it helps all of us if they wait.

I'll add one other item. As you know that ICANN is pushing back hard on the annual renewal of the numbers and IETF contracts, saying that they don't want to have a situation where they might have to give up the IANA functions if customers wanted to move them.

So the only possible way that separation of IETF and numbers from naming works, is if they're able to establish a new precedent for us, by getting ICANN to agree that the numbers and protocol guys can terminate - since there's an echo, I'll just stop there and stop torturing everyone. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: I think the operator's working on that. Thank you, Steve. Any other thoughts, questions, comments? All right. I think we should actually try to turn it over to Steve to take us through the policy calendar. So, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Just type into the chat if the echo is unbearable. There are six items listed on the recently refilled and (unintelligible) come through with lots of fantastic comments on - different public comment periods as well as the two letters.

But when you scroll down this policy calendar the current comment page is full of items we need to comment on. There are two that are relatively urgent, one that closes May 16, that's the first one; one that closes May 20th, which is the second one.

On the first one, which is IRTP Part C - grateful to Susan Kawaguchi who drafted a comment that is extremely preliminary. (Scott) is going to take a little opportunity to look at it when he finds a little bit of time. But the draft has been circulated for everyone but we need comments from BC members because they close on the 16th which is day after tomorrow.

Is there anyone who wants to add to IRTP Part C or has a comment on Susan's draft?

Susan Kawaguchi: Hey, Steve, this is Susan. I just joined the call. I'll try to get something out in the next few hours to - because I did get a little bit more information, I just haven't had the time to draft anything.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, that would be so helpful because there are three areas in your draft where you highlighted in red.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: That are questions for discussion. And the way the BC comment period works is when people put questions in and just sort of comments into a draft it isn't as if somebody feels compelled to respond to answer the questions, it's better

for people to draft actual language for others to consider than just to raise questions.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, I get that but I didn't have comments because I didn't understand what was going on. I have a clearer picture now after talking to James Bladel. And it's probably not something we want to respond or support. So anyway I'll try to get some language out without questions.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, thank you very much, appreciate it.

J. Scott Evans: And, Susan, this is J. Scott. I saw your comment after talking to James and I agree with you that that is not something we want to support.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, so, I mean, I think it's going to be a short comment.

Steve DelBianco: And that would be fine.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Susan and J. Scott. The second item is the cross community working group - or CWG on the IANA Stewardship Transition. Those comments are due May 20, early next week. We circulated the draft already that Aparna had worked on and I had a hand in it too.

But there are many, many questions in the public comment (unintelligible) and there's a pretty good chance that we both missed many of those questions (unintelligible) members.

(Unintelligible) of AT&T was very helpful in doing (unintelligible) comments and that's in the attachment, the second attachment to today's policy calendar.

I'll take a queue now on those who want to comment on the naming functions transition proposal. Let me ask this, is there anyone who intends to read it and comment on it before the May 20 deadline?

Ellen Blackler: This is Ellen. (Unintelligible) I'm sure it's great.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible). Yeah, this is about the naming so anybody in the business of having even a dotBrand TLD is going to be a customer of the IANA naming function and therefore might have something to say about (unintelligible) and do review, escalate problems and even start to (unintelligible) ICANN to run the IANA functions.

Go ahead, Andrew.

Andrew Harris: Thanks, Steve. Just to note that I did send in additional language supporting - making sure that we offered support for the notion of separation. I thought that was important to make sure we got that out front so sent that in just a few minutes before this call.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Andrew, appreciate that. Yolanda, would you be able to scroll the list lower? So Items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 - Yolanda, you're off of Channel 1. This is Channel 1 - thank you. All of these items give us quite a bit more time, the earliest on there is the 3rd of June. And for that one I will take the lead of drafting something and circulating it since I'm the rep for the CSG on that group.

Are there any volunteers who want to sign up for 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7, the ones that are on the screen right now?

Elisa Cooper: Do you see that Ellen Blackler says that she'll engage on Number 7?

Steve DelBianco: That's fantastic, Ellen, thank you. We're going to need more volunteers than just that because there's quite a bit of work to do in the walk-up to Buenos Aires. J. Scott, thank you. Ron Andruff, with your expertise at dotTravel, it might be some unpleasant memories but what do you think about taking on Number 5?

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Steve. Unfortunately I'm just too up to my ears in other things right now (unintelligible) do that. I don't see that there's going to be a whole lot about the renewal agreement on dotTravel we really need to comment on. I will have a look at it, though, and come back to the group and if there is any reason, otherwise that's one of those things I think we can probably pass on through. But I will have a look at that and come back to you and let you know, okay?

Steve DelBianco: Ron, thank you very much. That's it for the policy calendar part on Channel 1. I would like to turn it over to Susan to cover the Council, which is Channel 2.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Just for the record, Andrew Harris and - sorry Alex Deacon also said that they would help with Number 7 and J. Scott said he would take Number 4.

Ellen Blackler: Can I ask - this is Ellen Blackler, can I ask a clarifying question? Do we not have anything started on the accountability comments? I thought we did but maybe I'm just confusing the many groups that are commenting. So I think that...

Elisa Cooper: I don't know. Steve, do you know?

Steve DelBianco: I'm sorry but I was unable to hear that question.

Ellen Blackler: Do we not have anything started on the CCWG accountability comments?

Steve DelBianco: Oh, thank you. That was the first one I mentioned because I'm the CSG rep on that group. And I will take responsibility of getting the first draft...

Ellen Blackler: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...of BC comments and I will get them around early next week.

Ellen Blackler: Super, thank you.

Steve DelBianco: But I'll also take it on that you're interested so if you want to send me your thoughts ahead of time I'd be happy to work them in.

Ellen Blackler: Okay, I will.

Elisa Cooper: I see also Andrew Harris has his hand raised. And he does not now. So I think you were turning it over to Susan, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: That's right.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so it's pretty full agenda. And to be honest, you know, most of these topics we've covered in the past but we'll cover again. If there's specific points that you would like the GNSO Council to really think about on the CWG on IANA naming functions and the accountability then please let me know. One of the things that was interesting, and I'll forward to the group, was a

document about the new ICANN meeting strategy that'll be hitting us sooner than later, I mean, 2016, a blink away in my opinion.

And so there is more detail on that so I will send that document out. I should have done that already. And so if anybody has comments on that because it's really - first of all it's pretty confusing and then how these meetings are going to work and how we're going to get our work done at the meetings, how there'll be time. So that's about all I have.

Elisa Cooper: All right great. Any questions or comments, anything for Susan? Now I know David Fares is actually not on the call with us today, he was unable to be here. But as I mentioned at the top of the call we are working through the schedule for the BA meeting with the CSG. And we've already got a number of meetings lined up for our CSG meetings but we don't have a sort of final schedule for that. But as soon as we have that nailed down we'll be sure to send that out.

I don't think - I think that pretty much covers it...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: ...know if there are any other topics or items for us to discuss.

J. Scott Evans: I think Steve is trying to say we have Channel 4 to go through.

Elisa Cooper: Steve?

J. Scott Evans: He was cutting in and out but I think that's - BC statements and responses during public meetings.

Steve DelBianco: Can you hear me?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, we can. Okay, go ahead, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Great, thanks a lot. This probably isn't going to work very well but I'm happy to take questions on Channel 4 which is the two congressional hearings. I included links to both hearings, they include all testimony that was given as well as video of the entire hearings. And it's a grueling affair to listen to all four hours, 4.5 hours, and I can tell you it was pretty grueling to stand there and answer questions for 4.5 hours.

But overall I think it went very well for those of us who believe we ought to proceed with the transition but use the leverage opportunity to get the accountability powers that we've been designing both in the CWG and CCWG. I'm happy to take any questions about the hearings if you wish.

J. Scott Evans: Steve, what was the tenor in the room after both hearings?

Steve DelBianco: J. Scott, can you hear me?

J. Scott Evans: I can...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: I can now. Does anyone not hear Steve because I'm not hearing him?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, no - Steve, we can't hear you.

J. Scott Evans: Is there any way, Steve, you could just type us out a short report about sort of what the feeling was in sort of the hallways as you were - how everyone felt,

what you were hearing from people? The one thing I heard from someone was that after the first hearing they look over and it looked like Jamie Hedlund looked as if he'd been kicked in the stomach. So and Jamie is the government relations guy for ICANN.

I felt like clearly, this is my perspective, that it's clear the Republicans are not thrilled with the transition plan but I didn't hear anybody say that they needed to stop it. What I heard was most of the panelists agreeing that September 30 deadline is completely unrealistic.

I think it was Phil Corwin or maybe Steve that suggested that perhaps a six-month extension was needed but that we were on the right track and then there was grumbling about the way ICANN has set up the public comment period. I think Phil has made this comment on more than once, you know, we got a draft report and no opportunity to comment when they put out a final report and that's just unacceptable. And I think that point was made yesterday.

But I didn't hear anyone say stop, this shouldn't happen. I think there was some alarms raised about the role of the Government Advisory Committee and how ICANN was sort of playing over them. I thought Steve did a very clever job because he basically took the dotSex problem and put it through the stress tests that he has been advocating showing how we probably would never have gotten to this point had we had sort of an accountability mechanism in place, one that he's working on with the others to put together.

So I thought that was kind of clever because it highlighted how it could work in a better fashion. And I think Steve also highlighted - but the main concern is that we fear that the board would just ignore whatever recommendation put forward to them. But I didn't hear anyone say the transition shouldn't happen and the US government should continue oversight.

Steve DelBianco: J. Scott, can you hear me? (Unintelligible)...

Elisa Cooper: Steve, you're really warbled so unfortunately we can't really hear you. Maybe if you could send out over the list any additional thoughts or comments that would be the best way to handle it?

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I'd be interested in anyone else's perspective if they watched it.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris Wilson from 21st Century Fox. J. Scott, I would agree with your assessment having actually sitting in the room myself, I can attest that I think there was a general - frankly both hearings - I sat in both hearings and, you know, I think the tenor was that there's a lot more work to be done but that we were on the right track.

I think certainly in the second hearing where there had been some more - stronger push from certain Republicans about whether this transition was smart at all. I think there was more of a recognition that it was, A, going to happen and, B, that there was things that were, you know, the wheels were in motion. I don't think, you know, no one's set to say, you know, all systems go.

But I think there's - I think there was, you know, a lot of interesting points made and anecdotes shared about why we're, you know, we're on the right track but still have a lot of work left to be done. And I think - and again, no one, I think, no one was claiming that this transition needs to stop and the status quo needs to be reinstated. I think there was all - consensus among all that we're moving right along. So I think that - I think your assessment is on - spot on.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you so much, Chris, for sharing that. Thoughts from others who were in attendance or comments or any other questions for those that were?

Ron Andruff: Elisa, this is Ron speaking.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Yeah, I just wanted to say that I took felt very much similar to the last two speakers. This was a very difficult path to cross here insomuch as you had a very large number of congressmen present. Often you see these hearings as only two or three and there was a large number of them present. So clearly this is a topic that's very at the top of their list.

And I think that our - all of our guys, whether it was our own team in the BC, Steve Metalitz, (Mei Lin), others from IPC, I think everyone did a very good job of managing that very, very dangerous path to make sure everyone knew that we're doing the best we can with this experiment.

So I think Steve Metalitz - and I noted it in my BC list the other day - Steve Metalitz comment about this is an experiment and we're doing the best we can with it, I think that really came home for a lot of people that this is not a perfect thing, there's no such thing like it in the world so for all things being equal I think we're doing a good job and I think our guys who were at the table did a fine job and I'm very proud of them so thank you very much.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Ron. Andrew.

Andrew Harris: Thanks, just want to mention from Amazon perspective we of course testified as well. And, you know, we're obviously very pleased to be able to have the opportunity to tell our unique story and we're also very pleased with the

attention that Paul got from a number of the members and chance to talk about what happened.

But also just wanted to echo what Chris and others were saying that we definitely came away with the sense that - and this, you know, mirrors as well other conversations we had is that that people aren't really standing in the way of the transition and that the accountability process in particular but also the CWG process is making good progress and think that as long as everything is accepted and put in place that it should be in good shape and that's what we're picking up from basically what we heard at the hearing and the conversations we've had so thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Andrew. Any other comments or perspective or questions? All right any other items of business or any other topics people want to take some time and discuss on the call today or things that we should be thinking about as a group or should be considering?

All right, hearing none I would like to give you 20 minutes back of your day. And we'll plan on having our call in the next two weeks and you will receive an invite from Yolanda. In the meantime if there are other items or topics or ideas that you have taken them to the list and we'll have discussion there. Otherwise I look forward to speaking with you next time. And, again, thank you all so much for joining.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks.

END