

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White  
March 2, 2015  
12:00 pm CT**

Becky Burr: ...decisions have been taken but this - this reflects the organization that the group talked about and thought made sense.

The first thing I'd like to mention is that for anybody who was planning to come for the - to Istanbul for the face to face meeting or for those of you who are not but are able to participate remotely, we are trying to set up a face to face meeting on Sunday afternoon before the welcome reception in an effort to make as much use of the time that we have together as possible and also reflecting the fact that we're a little slower getting off the starting block.

The next thing is that we have talked about work streams or work tasks, work items that sort of can organize our work and on Friday we came up with five. One being the sort of compact with community mission and core value statement that we had discussed briefly in Singapore as a strawman; two, would be refinements, improvements, enhancements to the ombudsman function; three would be refinements, enhancements, changes to the reconsideration request process; four would be the independent review process. And we had a category of Others which we will come to - other new mechanisms.

Over the weekend Jordan Carter and I were able to spend some time (unintelligible). Somebody is rustling papers in the background. If you could put us on mute that would be great.

The - Jordan and I compared notes on our various tasks lists and we decided that there were a couple of things in Work Party 1 that should come over to our group and that the new mechanisms should probably go to Work Party 1. So I'll show you the new mechanisms issues that have been moved formally over to Work Party 1.

But the first item here is the - what I'm calling and really it's for lack of any other description and not final in any sense - is the sort of compact with the community encompassing ICANN's - well actually let's go first up to the first part - the principle for our work.

We discussed what our principles should be as we move forward. And there was pretty strong agreement in the first call with - on Friday - that our goal should be to work on mechanisms that ensure that ICANN actions are related to issues that are within its stated mission and that require ICANN to act consistent with clearly articulated principles.

This would be ensuring that ICANN - the ICANN Board and ICANN can be held to its bylaws, ensuring that ICANN carries out its mission consistent with the binding statement of values and principles and preventing scope or mission creep through bylaws changes, policies, etcetera.

And just as an exercise in getting everybody on the same page and hopefully testing this notion about (unintelligible) this is what we're about, I'd like to begin with a discussion - any discussion that people have about these

principles for our work, what it is we're trying to accomplish and what our guiding principles will be as we move forward.

Anybody who has comments or anything like the please raise your hand. I see Kavouss' hand is raised. Please join us.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, good time, morning, afternoon, so on. If I am asked by somebody just close to me the first item, compact with community, asking me what do we mean by community? Who are the community? Are we talking the 13 ICANN communities that we have counted in ICG when we discussed? What are the communities that we have to (unintelligible) who are those communities that we need to contact? If it is defined, I have no (unintelligible) if it is not defined (unintelligible) where are these communities. Thank you.

Becky Burr: That's a very good point. We're first going to just talk about the principles for our work, which is the page ahead of that but I do think that's a very good point, Kavouss, and we should discuss it.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay, thanks. Okay.

Becky Burr: Anybody have other - any comments, questions or concerns about the principles for our work? Obviously not written in stone but I think, you know, to the extent that we fray into other areas we want to be able to ask ourselves whether that makes sense and whether, you know, it's - we need to modify our principles.

Okay, I don't see any other hands on that point so moving on to the compact with the community. I think that the issue that Kavouss raised is who is the community, is going to, you know, is something that we're all going to need to

think about and nail down collectively in the accountability process and in the IANA transition process.

One way to think about it is to contemplate that those affected by ICANN's actions in some cases it will be those who are directly affected and those who are indirectly affected. But remember, it goes back to the mission and core values - the mission which is, you know, who is dependent upon the root server system and implementing consensus policies around names that ensure that stable and secure operation.

I've seen it shorthanded and, you know, sort of SOs, ACs and other directly affected and indirectly affected stakeholders. That's sort of pretty broad. I think any thinking that we can do to articulate that a little more crisply would be quite useful but I don't know if we can do it at the outset. Kavouss, you have a comment.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, just for your information I think I have raised it before. When we did some work in ICG we have identified 13 - 13 - communities. Whether you call them directly or indirectly affected it may be difficult. But at least as a starting point we could treat them into the shopping list, (unintelligible) community that were identified in ICG for the work. So that's just a point I wanted to offer for your consideration.

Becky Burr: Okay, that's very helpful. Why don't we go through this but if we have time - if Alice or Brenda, if you can get the ICG list and maybe we'll have some time to discuss it as we go through.

So with respect to this compact that I'm calling it - and we can call it anything we want - it consists of a mission statement for ICANN, again this is something that is taken from the bylaws but also is reflected in the - in the

specification 1 with respect to registry and registrar agreements and also in the bylaws. So obviously it's coordination of the global Internet system of unique identifiers.

And specifically with regards to names it's implementing consensus policies that ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique name systems and that involve issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate openness, interoperability, security and/or stability of the DNS. So that's the - that's just the strawman for this one work task.

Then the notion would be in addition to, you know, an articulation of the mission statement, the - ICANN would be obligated to carry out its mission in certain ways. It would be obligated to limit its activities that to issue that are within ICANN's mission and require global coordination. It would have a commitment to preserve operational stability, security, reliability, interoperability and openness. It would be obligated to open transparency in the public interest and in accordance with the multistakeholder model.

It would be required not to get into a situation where it was advancing the interests of one or more interest groups at the expense of others. And this is just a way of talking about avoiding regulatory capture. Respecting the roles of the SOs, the ACs and external expert bodies and that includes groups like the IETF and the IAB and the numbers registries and the like.

Support the bottom-up multistakeholder model of policy development and reflecting in a manner that's consistent with the compact and that reflects the functional geographic and cultural diversity of the Internet. Rely on mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment in - apply documented policies consistently, objectively, mutually and a fairly. Remain

accountable through mechanisms defined in the bylaws. Duly consider governmental public policy recommendations and operate with excellence and in a fiscally responsible manner.

Now those are taken is centrally from ICANN's existing core values plus the nondiscriminatory principle that appears in a different part of the ICANN bylaws and also based on comments that other people have made in a public comment.

We, on Friday, asked for volunteers for this workgroup. And we will be asking for volunteers to work on this. And the task here would be to complete and refine their mission statements and the commitments or community compact or whatever it is we decide to call it.

There was one item in the WP1 scope that related to clarifying ICANN's limited technical mission which is not particularly a triggered item but that fits within this work stream neatly so we've moved it over here and eliminated it from the Work Party 1 work stream.

Anybody have comments or questions about this particular work item?  
Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Becky, I have. When you refer to the mission of ICANN do you refer to the mission which is currently understood to be bylaw or under the comment? Or some of the elements of the Affirmation of Commitment when it is included or consolidated in the bylaw also will be added to the mission to - of the ICANN. Have you considered that this is one point, please?

And I may - there is a second one. You refer ICANN technical mission. Is there any other mission than technical? Do we have a separation saying that

this mission is technical and this mission is others and what are the definition of others? Non-technical or administrative or procedural or what? Because I referred also to some of the statement of the NTIA referred to ICANN technical mission and even the two senators refer to ICANN technical mission. So what is the (unintelligible) on this technical?

That is - and the last point is that when we say (unintelligible) community we have to think in future how we contact the community. Supposed we know who are the community, how we contact would be a designated people by whom they contact the community and bring the issue back. So these are the small things that perhaps they should think it over not to be forgotten. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Right. And I think that those are all points that this worker party - this task would encompass. I can tell you that when I was coming up with the commitments in this strawman, I did go back and look at the Affirmation of Commitments so I think that I have incorporated in them but obviously that would be for the group that's working on these to explore some more.

Limited technical mission is traditionally the way ICANN and the white paper and others have referred to ICANN's mission. You know, the technical mission is coordinating the Internet system of unique identifiers. And then we have a set of tools with which - that it uses to accomplish that mission.

We use the term "technical" to essentially limit ICANN's roles to that which is necessary to achieve the coordination reasonably necessary to achieve the coordination as opposed to, you know, a variety of public policy issues that are the remit of sovereign governments as opposed to a body like ICANN.

But all of those things are questions that the group working on this particular work stream will need to talk about and grapple with. And of course the communication question goes hand in hand with the sort of like is the community that we are talking about.

Okay, if there are no other questions we will go to the office of ombudsman, which is another task. There were many many suggestions in the public comment period about reforming the ombudsman function, strengthening its powers, perhaps giving it the power to set board decisions or policies aside.

I think that is, you know, whether that's appropriate or not depends a lot on a discussion about what, you know, what the role of the ombudsman is and if there are other places where that could happen.

A lot of discussion about strengthening the independence of the ombudsman function, giving the ombuds- the ability to refer a matter to an independent review, providing more transparency on how the board or staff responds to the ombudsman's intervention in particular find it a little frustrating that we know whether things are, you know, open or closed or resolved but - in the annual report but we don't really have more information about how they've been resolved, whether the board has, you know, has accepted or acted on the ombudsman's recommendation or intervention or whether the board has just said thank you, we hear you.

One suggestion, and again it's not clear to me that the next three things are appropriate for the ombudsman function but they're various review mechanisms. The two highlighted bullet points about giving the community power to select the ombudsman or allowing the NomComm to select and retain the ombudsman do go to perhaps strengthens independence but those items will be in - those are in the remit of Work Party 1.



So let everything about the ombudsman, other than the selection process itself, would be in this group. And just on the point of a sort of what the task of the group would be - and this is going to be the same in every case - is to look at the current rules under which this review mechanism is carried out and propose appropriate changes, enhancements, whatever, to those rules in order to create the kind of accountability that we think are missing.

Mathieu and Thomas had previously circulated a kind of template for what would need to be addressed when we're talking about the implementation. We would need to have an understanding from the group about, you know, who has standing to invoke the assistance of the ombudsman, what the standard of review would be for invoking that and perhaps that's different depending on the situation.

You know, who - how this process works, how it makes decisions, how accessible it is and how it would be implemented. And this is an important part of the sort of knowing that we won't get all of the accountability mechanisms stood up and operating by the time the transition needs to take place but having a clear path and the adequate tools to implement it following any transition. Any comments on this work task?

Yes, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Becky. I think the ombudsman was or is an arrangement with the current situation. I wonder whether, when we are talking about empowering community to do some sort of either oversight or (unintelligible), I don't know, (unintelligible) I see some conflict between empowering the community and giving a role with certainly endless power to the ombudsman on this ombudsman would be something more or less and the vector of the

community but not something which is in parallel to the community. There should be some sort of coordination or let us say, something that they do not (unintelligible).

So I think currently it would be difficult to have community to be empowered to this (unintelligible) then we have ombudsman. Then I don't know who will judge between the two even though the ombudsman is elected or selected by the community I see we have to look at this issue that do really we need ombudsman if the empowered community and if we have all of these mechanisms (unintelligible) or we don't need that anymore. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Right. Well is clearly a question, I think that, you know, there is quite a lot of literature about the role and use of an ombudsman. And I think at some level one of the notions is that you address issues as early as possible through an ombudsman function that doesn't require, you know, necessarily a whole community vote. So I think there is some value in talking about that.

I think with respect to, you know, the selection of the ombudsman, who selects the ombudsman, that's really a question of strengthening the independence of the ombudsman. But I know that Chris LaHatte has strong feelings about this one and I expect there's going to be a lot of discussion.

But of course, you know, your point is well taken. There's nothing sacred about any of these suggestions. And to the extent that as we, you know, come up with mechanisms that we think are important we need to not simply add new mechanisms, we need to see whether the existing mechanisms continue to make sense.

Okay, moving down to the reconsideration issue. This is something that that community and the board, frankly, has expressed some frustration with with

respect to that very narrow circumstances under which reconsideration can be invoked.

And so this work - this task - participants in this would be looking at the mechanism for reconsideration and looking at whether the standard of review could be modified, whether it, you know, covers, encompasses all of the actions and groups that it needs to have, whether there's, you know, whether it is more appropriately kind of a first step to independent review or something fairly separate as it is now a different basis. Although in - for all practical purposes, it tends to be a necessary first step. So that's what this group will be doing.

Then the independent review, I set out here the current standard for independent review and the previous standard for independent review. In this area I think that there is a lot of concern about the cost of this process, the adequacy of it, the accessibility of it, whether it should be something that only directly affected parties can implement, you know, can invoke or whether it's something that the community could invoke on the basis of certain, you know, events.

There's also some questions about whether the current system ensures that all necessary parties are participants in an independent review process. And so looking at the independent review, in particular those issues, is going to be an important - an important and a very (unintelligible) piece of work. To me this is the heart of our work.

There have been a lot of suggestions about creating a permanent standing independent review panel so that you can develop expertise and ensure consistency across the decisions that the independent review panels make and,

you know, resolve some of the sort of cross cutting policy or implementation issues that we've experienced in the new gTLDs for example.

What the scope of review would be, how we can make sure that it is accessible, there is a fairly strong view about making the independent reviews decision binding. I think that that is not universally agreed on but I certainly have heard a lot of views for that.

And then one of the issues that comes up is using this as an independent appeals process for contested delegations, transfers (unintelligible), etcetera, related to IANA. I just want to make sure that everybody here notes that at least with some of these IANA operational issues the directly affected parties, meaning registries and both Gs and Cs, and I know I can tell you from personal experience that the ccNSOs want to be designing the process - any process for review.

They may be able to sort of use the independent review panel as a tool but we shouldn't presume that this group would be writing the rules for revocation and transfers and redelegations particularly of Cs but also of Gs. Any questions? Kavouss, you still have your hand up. Is that a new one?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Becky, I'm very sorry. This is (unintelligible) previous issue of ombudsman. I had a point if you allow me...

Becky Burr: Sure, I'm sorry.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...just raise it and put it in record. I believe that is would be tasked to add on a defined or predetermined activities either triggered or non-triggered by the community, that would be more or less a representative or an agent of the community to act on a regular basis on something as the non-triggered and on

the triggered so it would be connected strongly with the community when it is empowered. This is test of the issue of the ombudsman.

On the issue of discussing, may I ask that is it really necessary to have Point 3 and 4 as two different point? Because I see no major difference between reconsideration and a review. Couldn't we or would it be possible that you combine Item 3 and 4 together and you have (unintelligible) to the visions of many people talking about standing independent review panel.

And I remember two or three weeks ago there was another good exchange of discussion and views and people they have communicated many good ideas. Perhaps those people would further take up this matter if you and other colleagues agree that you combine Point 3 and 4 together because reconsideration and review, in my view, are very very close if they are not identical; they are very similar.

I am not talking about binding and nonbinding that is another issue of the decision of the - that is another issue (unintelligible). Would it be possible you combine 3 and 4 together as one single item? Thank you.

Becky Burr: So I'd like to invite other comment on this issue. To me, reconsideration and independent review are quite different in the following way. In the reconsideration decision - situation, you are asking that deciding body, the board or the staff, who's made a decision or taken an action, to reconsider what they have done and change their mind.

In the Independent review context you're asking, you know, a different party, not the decision maker, but an objective party that can apply rules, to look at the decision that, you know, the board or the staff has - or somebody else has taken and assessed whether it, you know, whether it is consistent with the

mission statement and the core values. So to me they feel like different - quite different things. But I would welcome other comments from participants in this conversation on that point. Or, Kavouss, if you have more to say.

Kavouss Arasteh: If you allow me, I could say that yes, I agree with you but I see reconsideration as a redress but not as something else because that issue go after the review, you review, once you review and you find something to be looked at again and then you ask reconsideration or redress, this is the way (unintelligible). I may be wrong but I think I agree with you. Now there are two different things but one should go after the other, first review and then reconsideration or redress. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Okay. David Post.

David Post: Yeah, I just wanted to add that one could think of this system as sort of a two-step process in a sense. I mean, if an affected party think that the board has acted outside of the mission statement or not in conformity with the stated rules and procedures, it could be - it could be a process just well first you have to bring that to the attention of the decision maker through a reconsideration type process and allow it, the decision maker that is, to consider your arguments and to reconsider what it has done inserted a meter way to solve the problem if there is indeed a problem, if they decline to do that or they disagree with your reasoning or they refused to reconsider then you can go to give this third party to come in and evaluate it.

Becky Burr: Right, so you could put it either way. Now to Kavouss' point, it surely will be that an independent review could say to the board what you've done is not consistent with the bylaws or whatever; now, go back and reconsider it again. So there's potentially come into play in different ways.

Okay other comments? Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. It seems to make sense to me, and maybe I'm missing something, but to look at how this currently takes place under the ICANN bylaws. The request for reconsideration is a request that's made essentially back to the board itself although it's given to the board governance committee rather than the board as a whole. So there's no third party involved. It's a relatively lightweight process. And the board basically, you know, gives its own reconsideration request.

The independent review, you know, as it's name suggests, is a more heavyweight type of process involving an arbitral - and outside arbitration authority that is going to take on the matter which, you know, is both more time-consuming, more resource consuming. So I really see these as rather different types of recourse mechanisms. I don't see how we would collapse them together.

And I think, you know, parties that have gone through the independent review have found it to be may be too heavyweight and it may need some solutions. But it may be that it's necessary especially if we're going to go into the binding area that it remain a robust, and unfortunately therefore, resource time and money consuming process.

But the request back to the board to reconsider its own decision, you know, if, you know, backed up with, you know, proper reasoning, you know, doesn't require anything other than, you know, basically a letter to the board and not entering into a whole arbitration process. So again, these seem to me to be two quite different tracks. And clearly - and it seems to me that the reconsideration process is probably the first step on the road. You could go to the independent

review afterwards, but I don't think you'd necessarily need to be required to do so. Thanks.

Becky Burr: Okay, anybody else? David, do you - is your hand still up or is it a new hand?

David Post: No that's - I must be still up. I apologies.

Becky Burr: No problem. Okay then the final thing that we talked about on Friday was a bunch of proposals for new mechanism from bylaws changes, eight permanent cross community working group, a recall mechanism and a community veto.

And as I mentioned, Jordan and I had the opportunity to spend some time reconciling our list and we decided it made sense for those things to be part of the Work Party 1. Now obviously anybody who is dying to work on these new mechanisms would be most welcome to work on them in Work Party 1 as well. So this does not preclude your ability to work on those issues.

If I could I mean although you will certainly have an opportunity to do this, this won't be the final opportunity, if I could ask for people who are interested in these different work streams to raise their hands to indicate they are interested in working on this then we will be able to sort of set up the real work that needs to get done.

So to the extent somebody, anybody wants to work on the mission statement and commitments to the community or the compact as I'm calling it, could you raise your hands? And if you're not in the Adobe room you could just let us know. So this is a call for volunteers for the standards and comments. I see David Post, (unintelligible), David Maher added. Okay.



Going down to the ombudsman program, volunteers to work on that issue. Edward, that's great. Anybody else? Okay, the reconsideration request, Edward, that's good. You know, this seems - might seem - I think this is one of the clear frustrations with the community has experienced so I think this is going to be an important piece of work for the group. And then the Independent review, got Greg, David Post, David Maher. Anybody else? Okay. All right, that's great.

We will add you guys to this. We will also circulate this list to the entire group and ask for additional volunteers. But you should be looking for us to get - reaching out to those of you who volunteered to get some work done. Obviously in order to make the transition timing work we're going to have to work pretty hard for a bit of time here so I really appreciate all of the volunteers here.

We will be circulating times for regular weekly calls of the full group. We will try to make those very much sort of quick check-in calls for reports on progress because I think the substance of the work is going to be done in the various work streams that we set up here. Are there any comments or questions about the structure? Anything that I've missed? Anything that I've got wrong? Taking silence as assent.

Oh, I see Greg. Greg.

Greg Shatan: I'm not sure if this fits into any of those buckets that you just asked for but...

Becky Burr: It's anything else.

Greg Shatan: Okay well then it definitely fits into that bucket. And there may be some confusion in between the CWG and the CCWG in terms of a particular issue

which is independent review or independent appeals from delegation and redelegation decisions, at least those made by the board: ccTLD delegation and redelegation decisions, at least as far as I understand it don't go through the board so would not be germane here so maybe we are only talking about gTLDs decisions.

Becky Burr: So this is a real issue and one that we need to be clear on. The CWG did ask the CCWG whether we would have independent appeals mechanisms for the purpose of challenging delegations, relocations, root zone changes and the like.

And we responded that we would have independent review mechanisms that might be usable by the affected community but noted that at least some part of the community, and in particular, the ccNSO community, I can tell you, feels quite strongly that they - it is their job to design any independent appeal mechanism. So we might be providing a tool that they can use but, you know, obviously the standards would refer out to RFC 1591 and the standards that - the policies that apply to delegation and revocation and transfers of ccTLDs.

I can tell you that I know where the registries are in - the Gs are on this particular issue. But our task is to come up with an independent review mechanism to create standards for sort of the ordinary, you know, policy and implementation kinds of issues but keeping in mind that we will almost surely receive input and design from the directly-affected parties with respect to those particular issues.

And I'm not sure that that's been - that we've succeeded in communicating that clearly enough to the CWG but it was something that came up just today on the ccNSO list.

Greg Shatan: Yeah and that's still very much I think an issue in progress. And I think there are some Cs who very much want to deal with it in one of these groups and some that don't want to deal with it in either of these groups. And...

Becky Burr: Okay well that sounds like an issue the Cs have to get together on and get their act...

Greg Shatan: Yes and - and as a matter of fact, we - with my CWG hat I will say that we tasked the Cs with coming up with a position on that if they can come up with one.

Becky Burr: Okay great. That's helpful to know. Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you. Please correct me if I'm mistaken. Standing independent review panel is something that we are working on.

Becky Burr: Correct. Absolutely.

Kavouss Arasteh: Independent appeal mechanism it is a process that CWG currently engaged for delegation redelegation and revocations. Do we also have any element of the independent appeal mechanism in our work or not? If yes, where it is.

((Crosstalk))

Becky Burr: No so...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...part of the independent review panel or is a separate one. Thank you.

Becky Burr: It could be part of the independent review. So in other words, the - a registry could - and the ccNSO and the G registries could say our - we are going to use

the independent review panel for our independent appeals process but the standards on which the independent appeal question will be raised with respect to delegation, revocation and the like, are not within our work and I gather from Greg that there's some - at least a question about whether the ccNSOs are on the same page.

I can tell you that the leadership of the ccNSO has a pretty strong feeling about it. But so in other words I think the specific standards to be applied and the policy to against which a delegation or redelegation would be applied is outside of our remit. And that is a matter of policy either gTLD policy and contracts or RFC 1591 and the GAC principles, etcetera. So that is - those - the policy to be applied is not within our remit; that's my understanding.

Kavouss Arasteh: If you allow me I wish to mention that appeal is entirely different from the review. Appeal that a decision is made with respect to somebody or something and somebody appeal or that decision to be modified or corrected whereas the independent review panel is entirely two different things. I see some inconsistency to put independent appeal mechanism as part of the independent review panel.

Becky Burr: Okay...

Kavouss Arasteh: Is Number 1.

Becky Burr: That's an interesting point although I think that there have been several uses of the independent review process to appeal a specific decision. So we just have to, I mean, it could be words that we need to be clearer on. Greg, I see your hand up.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan for the record. It's my understanding that there really isn't a difference between the independent review, which, you know, currently exists, and the independent appeals panel that is proposed by the CWG except that the independent appeals panel was designed to be only related to IANA related matters and would not have anything to do with any other board decisions but that - so in the sense it could be a subset of the type of matters that the independent review currently takes on.

The other potential differences that it may deal with matters below the board level, for instance, an appeal from an action taken by the IANA and not by the board. But in terms of the ability of an affected party to seek a review or appeal from a decision of the board, they're identical except for, you know, possible narrower subject matter again, as the CWG is only dealing with IANA matters. Thanks.

Becky Burr: Okay thank you, Greg. That makes sense to me. Other comments or questions? Okay, it is exactly the top of the hour here. So I will be quickly circulating a revised chart to reflect the discussions that we've had and the various volunteers. Anyone who just wants to be on one of the work party lists even if you don't want to volunteer I'm sure we can figure out a way to make that happen so that you're aware of what's going on.

And we do have a call with the full CCWG tomorrow so we'll report on our work then. And I really appreciate everybody getting on the call. Any last words or comments? Okay and, Alice, and Berry and Brenda, I hope you guys took careful notes on the volunteers. I'm assuming (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, Becky we took notes.

Becky Burr: Okay, great. All right thank you, everybody. Look forward talking to you tomorrow and then we'll be talking soon again.

END