
DENNIS CHANG: Hello, everyone. This is Dennis Change, ICANN staff. Welcome to the Thick WHOIS Policy Implementation Meeting with the IRT on the 4th of October, 2016.

Let me just quickly roll through and see who's here from the community. Looking down the list, I'll just read it. Berry Cobb, Chris Pelling, Francisco Arias, Joyce Lin, Marc Anderson, Marika, Ray Fassett, Roger Carney, Steve Chan, and Steve Metalitz. There are three other phone lines open. Anybody want to identify themselves?

STEVE METALITZ: This is Steve Metalitz. One of them is my line.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ: [inaudible] 355.

DENNIS CHANG: Anyone else who's just online?

RAY FASSETT: Ray Fassett.

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.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay, Ray. I see you. I see you, Ray.

All righty. Well, let's get started then. Before I get started, welcome to our new Adobe Connect room. We have some help today, and a new member of the team from ICANN staff. I want to introduce Mike Brennan. You probably know him. He is with our ICANN technical support, and he's supporting us today to make sure that, technically, this Adobe Connect room is working properly and we have a successful meeting.

Michelle has joined us, and she will be helping us with this call and administrating. As you saw her, she started the recording for us, so you'll be hearing from Michelle more.

Michelle, do you want to introduce yourself? It's okay, then. For those of you who are involved in the PDP Working Group, her name is probably very familiar to you.

MICHELLE DESMYTER:

Sorry, Dennis. I was muted. My apologies.

DENNIS CHANG:

No problem.

MICHELLE DESMYTER:

I received quite a few names in the attendance today. I'm so happy to be a part of this group. I work on [inaudible] support for a lot of policy calls and IRT. I'm really glad to be on board.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you very much, Michelle. Let's get started with our agenda today. We have pretty much the same agenda as last week. It's a continuation of efforts. We want to talk about the revised scale and the consensus policy first. We'll look at our draft documentation document for the Thick WHOIS Transition Consensus policy. We have Version 5.1 I have prepared for you. We'll look at that together. Then we'll go ahead and continue the discussion on the draft memo to GNSO, also, in privacy on issues, and then WHOIS [conflict] procedure and escrow of contract data. I think we can go through all the agenda, but we'll see.

Well, first, the CL&D consensus policy. You've all seen the revised version. It's a simple modification of removing the RDAP from the mention – let me see – of the policy. Then we wanted to provide time for the community for their review. I know the IRT has been reviewing. We have feedback from the community on this, but we want to hear from you, now that you've had a chance to look at this for a couple of weeks. Are there any more comments you have on this?

Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I'll jump in. I responded via e-mail on the discussion list, but I'll just restate what I said before. I'm supportive of the edit and this change. I think this is in line with what we discussed. We'll address the concerns that the Registry Stakeholder Group had.

So in short, I'm supportive of this revised TLD Consensus policy language. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Marc, for that support [inaudible] support. Anyone else want to voice their support? Or their any concerns, please? Let me hear from you.

Roger is typing. Krista, go ahead.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Thanks, Dennis. Hi, everybody. It's Krista Papac from ICANN staff. Thank to Roger and Marc for expressing support for the path forward. I guess one of the things we'd like to make sure is that we have support of the full IRT, not just a couple of parties, although we do appreciate it from, again, Roger and Marc.

I don't want to make the assumption that silence is consent because sometimes that's not an accurate assumption. So it would be really helpful if others could just speak up and just let us know where they're at with respect to this proposed path forward.

Certainly a discussion here or even just by responding to the mailing list and just letting us know that there are no objections or that you concur with the proposed path forward would be really helpful. We certainly want to make sure that we're not moving forward with something that the IRT is not in agreement with, and it's hard to gauge the level of agreement based on just having a couple people weigh in. So if others

could please let us know and share that with us, that would be very helpful.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Chris wants to reread. Anybody else? Just like +1 on current would be helpful to it, [inaudible] if you want to chat.

Are there any reservations from anyone? Joyce is giving us a +1. Thank you, Joyce.

Okay. We'll move on then. Let's see. Is Alan on? Alan is not here, right? Steve, are you okay with it, too? Any opinions? I'm sort of calling on the members that I see to make sure that I heard from you one way or the other.

STEVE METALITZ:

This is Steve Metalitz. I don't have any objections, but, like Chris, I'll take a final look and respond to the list.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Thank you. We appreciate that. Okay. Well, okay. Thank you, Ray.

"Sign me in." Sorry, Chris. You have IT issues. I hope it's not this room. It seems to be working well for us. But, yeah. If you think it has something to do with this room, please go ahead and let me know. I can forward it to our Technical Support Team. Oh, Windows 10. Whoa.

All right. So what we'll do with this is I'm going to maybe send out another reminder to the IRT. In particular, Chris and Steve, I would appreciate it if you could reply back to me or back to the IRT.

We'll move on to our next topic. Just a reminder, it is a complex roadmap, and it helps me to look at this every time. We do have two effective dates, and we're getting started on 1 February. This is when the announcement is, so we're still on target to make the announcement by next 1 February, which means that we have to get on with doing the public comment on the transition part.

The update of the – this is the roadmap, actually. I want the update of the document. You will see and I will show you that I have combined Sections 2.1 and 2.2 now that we have a confirmed request from registrar that the alternative method of bulk transfer is required, so we don't have to have conditional dates of "if" statement anymore. That made it very simple.

Next is Section 2.10. The billing contact data display has been added for Marc's request. Let me see. Chris: "Did outreach to GDD happen as per last couple of [calls]? Just I was able to reach out to..." I'm not exactly sure what Chris is asking. The outreach to GDD was not required for the alternative mechanism.

Let me bring up the document. Okay. So this is the document. I'll make it a little bigger. Nothing has changed on top, just the date, and the effective dates are the same. You will see that 2.1 has changed. Within the same paragraph, I have added an alternative bulk transfer mechanism, keeping everything the same. So that makes it clear that

2.1 does both. The EPP mechanism and the bulk transfer mechanism are both required, and registry operator will provide in on the same date, 1 August 2017. That makes it nice and clean because we don't have to deal with yet another date.

What's nice about that is that it still provides six months that Marc has requested for development, and it allows for that. Then we don't have to deal with yet another date that could be confusing.

This was a deleted part. It used to be 2.2 – this right here. Any questions on the 2.1, the alternative mechanism?

KRISTA PAPAC:

Hi, Dennis. It's Krista. I think you have a couple people with their hands up in the queue. I think it's Marc and then Chris.

DENNIS CHANG:

Right. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. As I stated on the list, I'm good with the proposed edits for 2.1 and the old 2.2. My comment was actually on 2.11. I don't know if you want me to defer that until you get to that or not.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Let's defer. Let's just finish the discussion on 2.1. Chris, did you have a comment on 2.1?

CHRIS PELLING: Hi, guys. Hi, Dennis. Thank you. I don't know if you can hear me. Can you hear me?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. We can hear you fine.

CHRIS PELLING: Cool. In the last meeting, or the previous meeting, two weeks ago, staff mentioned the outreach to GDD to find out – because obviously we don't have the reach of all registrars in the IRSG – if any of those would also be interested in the alternative method.

I'm only thinking and bringing this up so that they can obviously get in touch with Marc, as Marc requested a chat with certain or some registrars to see the best way of planning it going forward and really to give Verisign an idea of really how many people – or registrars, sorry – outside of the [IRSG] would actually wish to implement it. That was my point in the chat.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I understand. Yes. Okay. Now that I understand that, I will go ahead and reach out to our Registrars Services Team and go ahead and see if we can get some more information and let them know [that] the point of the policy here was that, even if just one registrar makes the request, the registry operator was willing to provide it. Now that you have and some of your colleagues have made the request, that cleared the

trigger, and so it's no longer an if-and-when condition. We've already satisfied it.

CHRIS PELLING: That's perfect, Dennis. I totally appreciate that. It was more to help Marc, really. That was all.

DENNIS CHANG: Right. And we intend to help Marc as much as we can by getting in touch with the people who actually use this bulk mechanism. That is part of the implementation phase that we do have time for. But we did want to get the policy cleaned up so that we can go to public comment.

Okay. Next item. Let's see. Steve is asking for the CL&D document. Okay, we'll make that available to you.

Let's get on with 2.10. It used to be 2.11, but now it's 2.10 because we have removed 2.2 from the policy. Marc, go ahead. Do you want to present this?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. We talked about it last week and I think this is that we didn't really intend to override or change the Registry Agreement. I think Steve Metalitz brought up the point that for .mobi I think was the example he used, the billing contact is not optional, it's required. So we proposed an edit to the language saying the billing contact is optional unless otherwise required in the registry's Registry Agreement or something to that effect.

I think we wanted to add a clarification along those lines just to account for registries like .mobi. I think Steve said there were four or five that he counted where billing isn't optional it's actually required in the Registry Agreement. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Marc. This is an important point. Go ahead, Francisco.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you. So Marc, I think I mentioned this last time but if not, assumption is that after the CL&D policy then these registries will not have the billing contact as a requirement. It would be optional.

MARC ANDERSON: Can I just respond back? I did go back and reread the CL&D document and that wasn't my takeaway. I think it doesn't really touch on it at all. I didn't see anything in the CL&D document that would make me think if I'm a registry operator and I have a contract that states the billing contact is required, I didn't see anything in the CL&D document that would make me think that it's no longer required or that that obligation has been superseded by the CL&D policy. I'd be happy to be proven wrong on that one. I just went back and reread it and I didn't have that as a takeaway.

DENNIS CHANG: Francisco, go ahead.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

To me, Marc, the way I read it is if you look at the beginning of the policy it says that the output of the – I’m paraphrasing here – that the output of all the TLDs is going to be based on the Spec 4 of the new TLD base agreement, and that does not include the billing contact as a requirement. If you look at the rest of the policy, it has a specific language about extra contact requirements for differentiated access for name [tel and cat]. That’s the only contractual requirements that are being singled out and allowed to continue in the policy. The rest of other contractual requirements in the Spec 4 are not considered, so to me that means they disappear.

But again, billing is still an optional thing. It’s just that it’s not any more required. That’s my reading of the CL&D policy.

MARC ANDERSON:

I guess I’d love to agree with you. That name is actually one of the TLDs that has billing as a required field in the language and so I’d love to not have that as an outlier. Like I said, I’d love to agree with you but I think there’s some room for interpretation there as to whether CL&D clearly overrides a Registry Agreement, a contractual obligation to provide the billing contact. I guess my read of it is that if the registries have that data then they’re required to display and they’re required to display it in the manner specified in CL&D.

I’d love to agree with you. I really would. That’s really not my takeaway from reading that document.

DENNIS CHANG: I understand, Marc. Steve, did you want to [inaudible]?

STEVE METALITZ: I really had two points here. One is the question I raised in the chat, is [it might for] Francisco to, I understand your point but what is the downside of including the language Mark suggests? That's as "unless it's otherwise required by the contract." You're saying that isn't the case but obviously that may not be crystal clear to everyone that's bound by those contracts as we've just heard. So what's the downside of saying the billing contact is optional unless otherwise required by the contract?

DENNIS CHANG: Francisco?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yeah, I have no issue with that edit, and I'm just realizing now that it's not there. I thought it was. Similarly, I was going to say that the discussion seems to be this academics because it doesn't matter what's your opinion on what CL&D says if it's required or not, it's up to the registry and if the registry wants to make it a requirement they can do it. If they don't want it, they are fine not to do it. So it doesn't really matter.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ: I think that, Francisco, if you're saying that Marc's edit is okay then maybe we can... And it just was omitted here for some reason then we can just move on from this point. I agree with what you said also, that It says registry policy may define if it is required. I assume if a registry thought the contract required it then they would define it that way. But I think Marc's edit is probably preferable.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. If there is no harm in adding it then maybe we can go ahead and edit then "unless otherwise required." Is that the phrase that you'd like to add?

STEVE METALITZ: I think it was "unless otherwise required by the registry contract or the Registry Agreement."

DENNIS CHANG: I see. Okay. Yes, just so that we're all clear the intention of the Consensus Policy is that it does supersede the contracts, so I'm glad that we're having this discussion and we need to be on the same page.

Any other comments on the policy? So that is going to be the final edit on the policy. I don't have any more edits that is coming. Just one phrase that we're going to embed and then I will present to you the version 6 of the draft after this meeting. Anything more on the Transition Policy document?

Okay, hearing none thank you very much and we will move on to our next topic. Marc, did you have a comment? Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Yes. I brought this up last week and I had suggested following up with Francisco offline but hadn't had a chance to until earlier this morning. But I had brought up the topic of escrow of the contact data so I'll just bring that up again here. I think I reached out to Francisco [here] on an e-mail as well, but what I'd like to do is suggest language for the escrow of that data based on the escrow specification that Francisco helped define. I just am not exactly sure the best way to go about that, so I reached out to Francisco for some help on that. But that's the idea in my head on that. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Okay, Francisco has his hand up. Let's give him the... You want to talk [quick], Francisco? Go ahead.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you, Dennis. So Marc, I don't know if you know but I think our bosses are talking about this so I think they are discussing what's the best way to go about this. So [I guess my side is] beyond me at this point.

MARC ANDERSON:

Fair enough. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, so there may be possibly one more addition regarding data escrow to the document and hopefully we can get that clarified quickly and finalize the draft.

Okay, let's move on to the next topic on the agenda which is draft memo on the privacy issue. There was quite a discussion online. Who wants to start this discussion for the IRT? Anybody?

Steve, go ahead.

STEVE METALITZ: Yes, thanks. I guess I'd like to get clarity on where we stand on this. Marc circulated a draft. I commented on that. He responded. I asked some further questions. That had all happened I think by September 12th and there have been no further responses to that. There was some discussion on the call last week I think.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

STEVE METALITZ: I'm not sure whether we're discussing the question of whether the IRT should send something to the GNSO Council or whether it should instead be asking for an update on the legal review that was done I guess last year or whether we're talking about should be in a

communication to the GNSO Council. So I'm just a little unclear of where we sit on this.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes. Thank you, Steve. From the staff perspective, this is an IRT call, and if the IRT wishes to notify the GNSO Council that a unforeseen or new event has happened that concerns the privacy and would like to notify the GNSO Council, it's up to the IRT to draft that memo and get an agreement, edit it, co-edit it if not and then go ahead and send it. So we are facilitating that discussion from the staff side, but I'd like to give the floor to Krista. She's got her hand up.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Thanks, Dennis. I just wanted to add to what Dennis was saying. There is, as you all know in I think it's Recommendation #3 of the Policy Recommendations say that if any privacy issues emerge from these transition discussions that were not anticipated by the working group, the IRT is expected to notify the GNSO so that appropriate action can be taken. So to Dennis' point, you guys had suggested sending something to the Council and that's I think Marc submitted a first draft, and the IRT is working together to agree on the language of the draft.

As far as the legal review that was conducted by ICANN last year, also as part of Recommendation #3 I know there's some questions around or there's some suggestions maybe is a better way to put it, from the IRT that staff should relook at that review. We're discussing internally those suggestions. I don't have a response for you yet but we are discussing

that. But that would be a separate thing from the notification to the GNSO. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Krista. Chris, did you want to speak or just chat?

CHRIS PELLING: Yes, [saves me typing] at this point.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

CHRIS PELLING: In response to your point there, it's great news that you're considering it internally. After [Alan G] mentioning putting it straight to ICANN Legal in I think it was either last meeting or the previous to last meeting. One of the things I mentioned on the list is to make sure that if it does go via ICANN Legal that you do include EU Legal advice, obviously because from our point of view that's where you're going to hit the biggest issues and need those unforeseen issues rectified or at least looked at so that going forward with the GNSO communiqué or request that Marc's put forward we then have a clearer picture to put forward.

DENNIS CHANG: Steve, or Krista, did you want to respond to that first? Go ahead, Krista.

KRISTA PAPAC: Thanks, Dennis. I just wanted to make one clarification that the memo is a memo, it's not meant to be legal advice but it's a memo that was requested under the Policy Recommendations that a review be done and provided. So I think everybody knows we're a little bit sensitive about using the term "legal advice." I just wanted to be clear about that. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Steve, go ahead.

STEVE METALITZ: Yes, thank you. And Krista, thanks for that clarification and I'm glad that you're looking at that question. I understand it's separate from this letter, but I think there's a relationship, because as I understand the basis of this letter, it is – well, we had this legal review and it covered certain things, and then some things have happened since the legal review, and in effect, I think what Marc is driving at is that the legal review is outdated. It's been overtaken by events. I don't necessarily agree with that, but I think that's what this letter is saying. So it seems to me that if there is a way to expand or reopen the legal review, we might want to consider that. That may respond to the concerns that Marc raised. It [distressed] me that... I understand they're separate, but I think they're kind of interrelated, and the legal review issue sort of comes before the letter issue in my mind. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Krista, go ahead.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Thanks, Dennis, and thanks, Steve. So I understand your point, Steve. I fully understand and appreciate your point about them being related or intertwined to some extent. Kind of to your point, that's one of the things that we're looking at in the consideration because there's a policy recommendation about us conducting a legal review and publishing that, sharing that information, which is what happened. There is additional recommendation, or language in that recommendation that if the IRT has its own concerns, they can write to the GNSO.

Certainly, our legal review doesn't technically impact the IRT's ability to write to the GNSO, but what we're trying to figure out is we want to make sure we're following the policy recommendations, and they said for us to do a legal review. We did that. If dynamics have changed, is that] contemplated, if so, how do we address that? So some of the concerns you're expressing are the things that we're actually considering too as we try to figure out what action we should be taking with respect to the memo we did publish last year, if any. And that's the part we're trying to sort out though.

DENNIS CHANG:

Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ:

Okay, thank you. Thanks, Krista. And I understand you're still looking at that, and I agree that this recommendation is not limited to things that are raised in the legal review, but I was just raising the point – which I

think Chris agreed with – that the thrust of this letter seems to be that the legal review is outdated, so one option, which I'm glad you were considering, is whether to update the legal review. So I don't know what others think about that, but Alan I think raised that on the call last time, and I'm glad you're considering it. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Any other comments on this? Okay, so ICANN staff were considerate, but does the IRT want to go ahead and see if they can build a memo that they would agree on in the meanwhile? Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I haven't had a lot to say so far on this, mostly because I just agreed with what everybody else has said. I'm kind of sitting here nodding my head. To the point you just made, I proposed a starting point for that memo, and I think the starting point would be to review, and for people to propose edits if need be, so we can get to the point where it's something we're comfortable sending to the GNSO Council. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes, I agree with Marc that by now, we have an initial draft from Marc's perspective, but I know there's not an agreement, so I would hate to have our legal team be looking at something that may not represent the IRT view on this. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ:

I'm getting a little confused here. I'm happy to propose edits to this draft letter, but I thought that Krista was saying that the question of legal review was on a separate track, so I don't know that it necessarily depends on what goes into this letter as to whether the staff has the authority to update or refresh, if you will, the legal review. But I'm happy to – to state what probably is obvious, I don't support sending this letter to the GNSO council, and I could propose edits to it, but I think I'm not sure at the end that the last part would be, "And we're sending this to the GNSO Council." But as long as that's understood, I'm happy to mark this up, and as I said, I've raised a couple of questions already with references in here to the safe harbor.

Registries generally did not rely on the safe harbor when it was in force, so that seems irrelevant to me. There's a reference to the new general data protection regulation, it's creating uncertainty. I think the opposite is true, the general data protection regulation increases the level of certainty because there will only be one law rather than 28 laws that will apply. So I'm happy to kind of put these comments in a written form, but I think the bottom line from my perspective is that it's not necessary to send this letter. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Steve, for making that clear. Krista, go ahead.

KRISTA PAPAC:

I sometimes play the role of Steve. I'm just kidding. Yes, Steve, your understanding of what I said is correct. I think there are two separate efforts, and again, if the IRT wants to write a memo, that's certainly up

to them, and you guys can work out – we’re here to help facilitate, but it’s up to the IRT to write whatever letter they feel like writing and agree to send to the GNSO, and on a separate track, we’re going to just take another look at what the policy recommendations say, what the legal review memo – just refresh our mind on what we wrote in that legal review memo and make a determination if it’s even warranted, to reopen that legal review memo. I hope that’s clear. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, Krista. Okay, Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I think we brought up the topic of – when I say we, we VeriSign. It was actually Joe Waldron, who’s not on this call, who actually proposed it. Obviously, we have a different view than Steve. We have concerns about recent developments and how it may impact us, so we do want to raise it, but I want to make sure that we’re encompassing everybody’s views. So I certainly appreciate and respect that Steve has a different view, and I want to make sure that it’s not just one voice, but we’re including everybody’s input in the IRT in this memo.

And I do think it’s something that we need to send to the GNSO Council, and I think Steve and I have had some back-and-forth on what the purpose of sending it to the GNSO Council is, and I think at the end of the day, I think that’s up to the GNSO Council to decide. Maybe the GNSO Council asks for an updated legal review, and that may be something that’s out of sight to everybody in this one, but I think as the IRT, we have an obligation to inform them, and it’s really up to the

GNSO Council to decide what, if anything, is the appropriate action to take. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Marc. Chris, did you want to speak? Go ahead.

CHRIS PELLING:

Yes, I apologize, it was just to agree with Marc, really. It's not for us to decide. This is far away above us in the sense of what needs to be looked at [inaudible], and I think I totally aligned my thoughts with Marc.

DENNIS CHANG:

Understood, and I think this is why the IRT has to continue the discussion, and maybe use the memo as a vehicle to decide and agree upon what exactly will go to the council, if anything. So from the staff perspective, we are facilitating that discussion here online, but I would encourage you to go ahead and continue your discussions. I mean via e-mail, that's what I meant.

Any other discussion here? Is there anything more I can do or we can do to facilitate this conversation more? If not, I'm going to move on and see if we can cover some other ground on our next [is the] WHOIS conflict procedure. This was brought up by Theo. Unfortunately, he's not here, and I'm not quite sure what to do about this. Anybody have any opinion on this? Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Sorry, I can't resist an opportunity to share yes opinion.

DENNIS CHANG: Of course, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: I appreciate and understand Theo's concerns about the WHOIS conflict procedure. I agree with his concerns there, but I think this is out of scope of the IRT. I think there's an existing procedure, I think we can reference that procedure, and we do, and that, I think, is as far as we can go within the scope of this IRT. I agree with Theo, but anything else is really, I think, beyond the scope.

DENNIS CHANG: I agree. That's my understanding. Marika has typed, "No decision has been taken yet on the GNSO Council on the WHOIS [inaudible]" Yes. Basically, Marika agrees, Steve agrees, let's move on. The escrow contact data, I think you brought this up. We already discussed this, so let's continue.

\ The next steps. We will go ahead and provide to you version six, and hopefully that will be the final, and everybody can support that going to the public comment. We do need to put it out for public comment this month so that we can effectively get it announced on 1 February.

And we have three more IRT meetings set up, should be on your calendar. This room seems to be working fine now, so thanks to Mike, who facilitated getting it up in the morning, and thank you, Michelle, for

recording it. And the ICANN 57 sessions, we will have a session, have not yet determined the date and time yet. But we will indeed have a session, and we will have a chance to discuss this implementation face to face. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ: Yes, thank you. Just to clarify on the public comment, on that document, the transition document, we don't have any open questions at this point, right? You're just going to circulate the document as it's come out of this call, and hopefully, we can prove that, and then you can go to public comment. Is that kind of where that stands?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, that's mine certainly [out of 10]. I think Francisco wanted to speak. Go ahead, Francisco.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes, so the only open item is the escrow, that still needs to be [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So that could either result in another clause being added, or not. It could be handled outside of the policy document, and that is a decision that needs to be made before we go to public comment, certainly, but as far as the wordsmithing and all [agreed word] that we have reviewed together for months, I think we're there, so it's certainly our hope to proceed with a public comment and not lose our

implementation calendar date, because if we miss 1 February, then it becomes 1 August, and I don't think anybody on this IRT or the Implementation Team wants that.

Any other comment? Questions? Then I will say thank you very much for your support, both on the call and online. It's great to see everybody participating. We're getting close to finish here, so let's get it done. Michelle, you can stop the recording, and we'll say goodbye now. And I'll see you next week and online. Bye now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]