DREW BAGLEY: We're already six minutes past time. I don't know if all of you read the most recent e-mail, but Laureen will be out on vacation for the next three weeks. So I'll be taking over the phone calls during that time period since I went over everything that Laureen wants to accomplish while she's out and while we were in Helsinki together. I apologize in advance. You'll hear my son in the background because at the last minute the day care announced that they were closed today. So I apologize for that background noise.

But for this month, this is our final stretch before we meet again in person in August. So we have a lot to get done building upon all the readings that we've done so far, all the safeguards that we've analyzed, and we're getting to the final stretch where we need to start turning this stuff into a written product that will eventually become a draft.

And so that's what I guess the next month is really about, is organizing that and figuring that out. And so from now on, at our meetings so that we're making sure and – real quick, can everybody still hear me or is my child being too loud?

ALICE JANSEN: We can hear you, Drew.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, great. I can barely hear myself [in here]. And Fabro can hear the [inaudible]. Alright, cool.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So to keep ourselves on track and make sure that we're getting everything done – because obviously we've all fallen behind on our own set deadlines – we're going to do status updates at each call, so that way we're all setting our own goals and keeping to them. And so Alice is going to be helping with that and keeping us on track. So Alice, would you like to maybe do a status update now or do you mind if I –

ALICE JANSEN: Sure.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay.

ALICE JANSEN: Go ahead. Go ahead. That's fine. It can wait.

DREW BAGLEY: I was just going to say, do you mind if I just speak a bit more about what else we're setting out to do?

ALICE JANSEN: Go ahead, Drew. That's fine.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. So in addition to the status updates, in this meeting we're going to go ahead and announce how the rest of our month will work with regard to even finalizing the assignments that we haven't finished so

far, such as analyzing all of our sources and what not. And then Alice from here on out will be keeping us on task with that, too, with these status updates.

And so for this first go-around, I guess what we all know the team is our update on where we are with regards to our reading sources, whether we've finished filling those out and highlighting them green for the ones that are going to be relevant for the actual report as well as where we are with the safeguards and going through and determining whether or not they've been triggered and what the outcome was. And then any other additional information for any other things that any of us may be working on with regard to setting up research projects such as for me the DNS Abuse, for others it may be setting up surveys.

So with that, I will yield to Alice.

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you, Drew. Let me pull the action items document up on the screen. Okay.

So as Drew has just explained, the sources document is being remapped to the four different groups that we have now, the first one being DNS Abuse Team. So we've set up different wiki pages for these groups where resources and the status of findings are available. So what we will be expecting here is for these four groups to finalize their finite analysis of these different resources, you can determine whether they will be useful for your discussion papers or not.

Brenda, if you could just show one of the wiki pages so everyone gets to see what it looks like, that would be great. Just one moment. Brenda is pulling the document up. Thank you, Brenda.

So here you have got the Impact of Safeguards and PICs wiki page for instance. You've got a shopping list of all the sources that are relevant to that group as well as the status of findings and analysis.

So status means whether it was highlighted as green or not, meaning is it useful or not. So that's essential as well for you as a first step, as Laureen indicated in e-mails, to determine. And you will see who your different colleagues in the groups are. So you will need to go through the sources and establish whether yes or no, we want to proceed with our sources or not.

Essentially I think the first step here is for all the groups to talk to each other, but also establish a deadline date for all these findings to be finalized. And I guess, Drew, this is something you want to touch on as well?

DREW BAGLEY: Sure. For these action items going forward, Laureen has appointed leads for all of them just so that way essentially everything will function as a team. But that way, since one person will be appointed lead, that person will be responsible for giving a status update. I have a list here of who she appointed for each one. And if anyone thinks that someone else should be the lead because they know of someone's schedule or whatnot, then definitely speak up because this could change. But the

point of the exercise is just to make sure someone is at least definitely responsible and then can ensure that we're able to meet our deadlines.

I'm going to handle DNS Abuse and be the lead for that subgroup, and so I'll be working with Calvin, Fabro, and Carlos in analyzing our findings. And then for the Impact of Safeguards and PICs Team, Fabro will be the lead on that and that's a team that we're all on. So Fabro will have to keep us on task. And then –

ALICE JANSEN: The actual [inaudible] consumer.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, [inaudible] review. Where's the consumer… Okay. That's what I was looking for. What's the consumer one called again? The Consumer Safeguards?

ALICE JANSEN: [inaudible] behavior.

DREW BAGLEY: Consumer and User Behavior. For that one, Carlton will be the lead. And then for the Effectiveness of Safeguards, David will be the lead. And that is obviously a tiny team of David and Jamie. So Jamie and David are here, so that's the only one where the whole team is here. So that's good.

The point of that is just to make sure that we at least have one person who will be responsible for the status updates. And for that, by next week each team should at least finalize the sources. So this is now replacing what we were originally doing where we were going through each source on our phone calls and discussing which ones we thought would be relevant.

So now in its final stage, each team should be spending the next week going through the reading list seeing what actually will be relevant to each topic area, highlighting them green if they haven't been done already, summarizing them if that hasn't been done already, and then ensuring that they have a final list of sources to begin the discussion paper with.

Because how these sources will work is, it'll kind of function as a literature review so that we can begin a discussion paper with just the sources even if we're relying upon other research such as surveys or quantitative research that hasn't been done yet. And so this will at least give us a starting point that will eventually go into a chapter to say what research already existed, what things look like with regard to the impact of new gTLDs on all these different things, and then we'll be able to fill that in with whatever data we get back in the months ahead from our outstanding research projects.

Today is Tuesday, so it would be great if all of us could do our part to finalize our teams' resources by next Tuesday. And so then each lead should then go ahead and give a status update next Tuesday to me, because then I'll be able to speak up in the group meeting to give the status update for our sub-team. So just let me know by Tuesday that

you're finished finalizing the sources, and so that way we will know that nothing else on the reading list is outstanding.

Does anybody have any questions about that, or any questions about what Alice went over? I don't see any hands up. Okay.

So then in addition to that, next week we'll get more details on the discussion papers which will be the big thing we're going to accomplish before our August meeting. And so Jonathan is going to be sharing a template in our bigger group meeting about what each of the discussion papers should look like. And what that's going to help us do is ensure that no matter who's writing them, we're still fitting a similar mold and a similar style that will eventually go into the final report.

And so if you have any feedback beforehand about what you think that template should include, then definitely reach out to Jonathan beforehand. But otherwise we'll see that next week, and even before then we can all in our sub-teams begin summarizing our findings based on the little short summaries we already have from the reading list.

I apologize again for the baby in the background. That is highly distracting.

So then I guess since all of us have been a bit behind on the readings and on even the Safeguards chart, I was wondering if anyone had any feedback on something that could help that process or if anyone had any specific reasons why they thought we're falling behind, if it was just individual schedules or if there was something that could be organized a bit better. Does anybody have any feedback about that?

DAVID TAYLOR: On my part, I had a chat with Laureen at the ICANN meeting last week in Helsinki and I just said, with my reading certainly it's just a schedule thing because I'm allocating a certain amount of time to this per week. And having just moved off onto sort of RPMs and trying to get the RPM questionnaire and liaising with INTA and doing various things and calls on that, I've just kind of used up my time allocation. So hopefully I will get back onto this and meet your deadline. That's all. So it's just purely my organization and my time.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Got it. Yes, and that's probably the case with most of us. But I have seen in the past week it looks like – myself included – that we've all made a lot of progress on our Safeguards chart, which is very helpful because that's going to help us really put together our analysis. So does anybody have any questions about the Safeguards chart? Or does anybody have anything particularly interesting on there?

Alright, well I think the next phase that we're going to need to do with the Safeguards chart now that we've – I'm looking back at it again to see if there's any last minute stuff. Ah, David, speaking of you – you and Jamie need to complete yours. I'm seeing that that is the only incomplete part.

But with the next step of the Safeguards chart, now that for the most part we've highlighted what the safeguards are, what [inaudible] is, and whether or not they've been triggered, is going back through Brian's chart and seeing what we want to do as far as further research.

If you guys recall, Brian did a great job laying out what type of research would be required for each category, and then gave his own opinion on whether or not he thought it would be worth pursuing with regards to return on investment for spending money on that research project. And so for that, if everybody today could just go back through Brian's chart and then determine what we want to do next, that would be really helpful so that way over the next month we can line up the appropriate research projects if necessary, and we can determine from Jonathan whether or not we have the budget to do that.

For me, for example, I've been working very closely with Brian to finalize a DNS Abuse study, and Brian met last week even with the Procurement people and so I should be able to hopefully circulate a draft to everybody this week. And that's another thing where, if any of you think that in addition to whatever the feedback is for finding out more about DNS Abuse which will help us inform our analysis on consumer trust, if any of you think of anything else that could be added to this study based on the data sets we're getting that might inform some of these other categories and these other safeguards, then let me know because that would be really helpful as well.

But yes, has anybody thought any more about some of these surveys we've talked about for any of the safeguards? Okay.

I think right now then what we should do is go ahead and walk through our safeguards, because that will help us share what we've found with each other and then see if anyone has any feedback on how we should go about doing further research. I'm trying to see who's here from my

subgroups. So Geo's on the line, I'm on the line. Alright, so we can go over what we found out for our safeguards.

We had a lot to look at for DNS Abuse and the technical safeguards, and for some of them there's going to be further research required. And so a couple weeks ago I reached out to ICANN staff, to Registry Services as well as Compliance, and then since then I believe Laureen has put in a formal request to ICANN Compliance for a lot of the questions that a lot of us have had. And so hopefully we'll have more data soon.

But for vetting registry operators, when I was looking into that I saw that it had definitely been triggered of course – criminal background checks had been conducted – but what I don't know in the data that I'm seeking is whether or not there were any suspicious actors who tried to become registrars or control registries, and that this actually prevented them from doing that, and that therefore the safeguard was successful – or rather, just registries for this one. This is registry operators. So that's something where, from a data perspective, I'm thinking that ICANN holds that data or would hold the best data. So I don't know if anyone has any other feedback about that.

And then DNSSEC deployment we've talked about many times and there's already data out there on that. And that's something where DNSSEC deployment appears to have been wildly successful. On the other hand, I would love to hear anyone's feedback on how we might want to measure the impact on whether or not DNSSEC deployment being successful has actually made the DNS more secure.

EN

JAMIE HEDLUND:	Something bad has happened to my laptop so I can't get into the Adobe room. DNSSEC deployment has been wildly successful at the top level, but as the data show it has been woefully underwhelming at the second level. So if you have a signed top level that brings a chain farther down. But without signing at the second level, you don't get the benefits of [authentication] that you do with DNSSEC.

So you can say that the program's been wildly successful in requiring the signing of the TLDs, but there is, I think, it's worth us trying to understand better – and I know that's already been researched about this with .com and the CCs – but why it's not picking up at the second level… where it is picking up at the second level, what benefit or impact that may have but what obstacles there may be for people, [is it] just registrars don't want to offer it? Is it too much overhead? What protections are being lost as a result? |
DREW BAGLEY:	Yes, that's a great point. Because it's only in the single digits at the second level or something?
JAMIE HEDLUND:	Yes. Like 2.5% or something like that. And even lower depending on how you look at it.
DREW BAGLEY:	But then the safeguard is only requiring it at the top level.

EN

JAMIE HEDLUND: Correct.

DREW BAGLEY: So what should we do data-wise, or even if it's citing some other reports to kind of demonstrate the positive or negative implications of that. So if we have a registry that is fully compliant, DNSSEC signed, but in their zone there isn't anything signed at the second level, do you know a good way – because this would be something where even if we just did a sample – that could be helpful for informing [inaudible].

JAMIE HEDLUND: Right. My sense is that there is general literature about the slow uptake of DNSSEC – and again, I think it mostly focuses on legacy registries – and so there may… but I don't know. And there may be findings on that about as to why registrars in .com, for example, are not signing people up that would be equally – I mean there would be the same obstacles with the new Gs that there might be with legacy. So it would seem to make sense to suss that out, see what's already there, and then figure out what are the right questions to ask specifically related to new Gs. Or whether you can just assume it's the same dynamic that's going on with new Gs as it is with legacy. And that there's nothing unique in the new Gs for DNSSEC signings at second levels, that it's just part of the broader phenomenon of low uptake.

DREW BAGLEY: So are you thinking that's something we would be able to do on our own without a vendor then?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I don't know that. I know there are a number of people within ICANN who keep track of these things and it would probably be worth talking to them to see what's available and then from then hone in on what additional research might need to be done.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Great. [Dev], you don't mind maybe after this then if you could send me an e-mail with names and then I'll get my sub-team reaching out to them?

JAMIE HEDLUND: The first person to reach out to would be David Conrad, and then it's his team that's dealing the most with DNSSEC. You know David, right?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. I think this particular safeguard is kind of the perfect example of what can happen with WHOIS accuracy and a bunch of other things where the safeguards can be successful in its deployment, everyone could meet the standard, and yet it didn't solve the problem [it purported] to solve.

JAMIE HEDLUND: It's a little different in that there is a key ingredient deployed, which is signing at the root and signing at the TLD. And so that allows for DNSSEC deployment at the second level, but it doesn't require it. So it's enabled

but it's not implemented. So in this instance, I mean with WHOIS, people argue over what information should be required and what information should be verified or validated, etc. With this, it's like everyone agrees on what needs to happen, but for some reason it's not happening.

DREW BAGLEY: And DNNSEC is one of the most well-respected standards.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Correct. And so yes, I think like we have with other stuff I think it makes sense to start with finding out what we have, and then going from there to figure out what else we might need. One thing for example that just springs to mind is asking registrants if they were even offered it. Do they know what it is? Do they have awareness of the –

DREW BAGLEY: So then that could fit into one of our other surveys that we're already going to do, or interviews, one of those.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes. I don't know what ICANN staff thinks about this [inaudible] this that may be on the phone, but it would make sense to get some data on what awareness there is, whether they were offered it, surveys of some of the registrars to see whether they're offering it. We may not even have to ask we may just be able to go to their web page to see if it's offered.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. And I think so then for those particular questions for this topic, I think that we should be doing that with all these other topics, too. Anything that would fit into one of these surveys we've already decided we'll likely do, that would be great to think of questions like that. I'll jot that down [inaudible]. Oh, yes. Sorry?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I was just going to say, do you want me to try to set up a call with the two of us and Conrad?

DREW BAGLEY: yes, that would be terrific. I'd really appreciate that.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I have no idea, he may be out now. I don't know but I'll find out.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, great. So for everyone, if you think of anything that would fit into one of these surveys where we really want to ask registry applicants, successful registry operators, or registrars, any questions that might fit into some of this research that would be great because then we can just append that to something else we've already talked about creating to get data about another topic.

So then the other safeguards we looked at are here where we still, once again, still needed more data. So the Prohibition of Wildcarding, I'm

waiting for more on ICANN Compliance to find out whether or not behind the scenes that was something that actually was an issue where wildcarding was being allowed, and so therefor there was a risk that users could actually be directed to a site that was not the site that they intended to go to, or whether that was implemented perfectly and nobody allowed wildcarding from the get-go. So if anyone has any other thoughts on where I could get more statistics on that, let me know.

Removal of Orphan Glue Records. Oh, yes –

JAMIE HEDLUND: On wildcarding, isn't it sort of proving a negative? Or I don't know what the opposite of… You're speculating as to what would have happened had their not been a prohibition, or do you think we should be looking at whether or not it's that prohibition's been honored?

DREW BAGLEY: Whether or not the prohibition's been honored. I don't think we should waste our energy proving the negative. I kind of think that was already proven a decade ago –

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yeah, exactly.

DREW BAGLEY: With data out there highlighting the risks of wildcarding. So I'm just interested if it was just everybody complied from the get-go or whether

anyone was trying anything behind the scenes, or just failing to comply with all the best intentions but failing to implement it correctly.

And so that's something else that I think ICANN Compliance would have the best data on. Jamie, do you have any other ideas on where else there might be data about that – on purely just whether or not it was honored?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes, I would think the Contract Compliance would be the best. I don't know if there's any organizations equivalent to Spamhouse or whatever that would be looking for that. Contractual Compliance is going to know if somebody complained, but it's possible I guess that if no one's complaining, even though it's one of the TLDs that's using it.

But that's not my world so I don't know if something like [MOG] or Spamhouse, or if there's an equivalent organization that looks for issues like wildcarding. Otherwise, Contractual Compliance [inaudible] the most obvious place.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Great. Thank you.

And then the same thing with these final topics on Removal of Orphan Glue Records, and that's something, too, that I'm guessing Compliance might have data on. And then for most of the remaining ones, it's either something that Compliance could have data on or some other internal ICANN group – even use of the centralized zone file access – and I think,

Jamie, you may have even told me before where I could get more data on that

JAMIE HEDLUND: I'm sorry, more data?

DREW BAGLEY: On how many people have actually used the centralized zone file access, if there's been any problems reported. Just to make sure it's actually working as intended.

JAMIE HEDLUND: What I reported on earlier were these monthly reports of number of [inaudible].

DREW BAGLEY: [inaudible].

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes, and the credentialed access there is for each TLD. And in terms of whether or not it works. I don't know if that would be Contractual Compliance or the Customer Service portal – that would track complaints about that. We would, I think, have to follow up with somebody in GDD Ops to find out the best way of seeing if there have been any issues with the service.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Got it. Great. I took note of that. This has all been really helpful for our sub-team. Does anybody else have any other feedback for us on the remaining findings as to research-wise what we might want to do to get answers on these safeguards and whether or not this might be something incorporated into a survey or hiring a vendor for, or a better secondary source? [inaudible] and Fabro, because you guys filled out this chart too, of course, do you guys have any other thoughts or anything else for the group on this? Alright, take it away.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If I can quickly jump in. I was just going to say that in terms of any data you might want to get from the GDD Operations Team, I'm happy to help put you in touch with one central contact there. I'm kind of keeping track of all the different data requests, so I could if you want to funnel those with me or copy me, I can tell you who to get in touch with.

DREW BAGLEY: That would be terrific. Okay. I will reach out to your [inaudible]

Alright, so Fabro's typing right now, and then [inaudible], did you have anything else to add?

Alright so we'll move on to the – Fabro is saying we're good. So we can move on to GAC advice. I see a Carlton or Carlos on the call? No. Alright. Does anybody – just looking at this chart for the GAC advice – have any feedback? Theirs is filled out really well, but if there's anything where anyone thinks that, once again, we might need to add some questions

to our survey or hire a vendor or something now would be the time just because we are running out of time before our draft is due. If anyone has any feedback for the GAC section, then please speak up. Okay.

For the Highly Regulated Sectors, which this is all under the same GAC advice, but anybody have any feedback there or on the special safeguards or general? And then, David and Jamie, did you guys – even though your chart's not filled in – did you guys want to speak at all on the Rights Protection Mechanisms, particularly as to whether or not that's something that will need an outside vendor for or whether we will be able to answer these questions and to have enough data for the report just based on what's already out there?

DAVID TAYLOR: We haven't managed to hook up and discuss this, Jamie and I, as yet. Probably because of ICANN meeting and other things going on. But the thing here I suppose I've got is how much this links into the questionnaire for the RPMs and Trademark holders, which we're looking at. Because at the moment we're trying to figure out how to get a questionnaire out and get answers back by September so we can have it for kind of a preliminary report on the one hand, and then on the other hand more people wanting more detailed questions and a wider subset of people to send it to. And obviously what we don't want to do is be hitting up applicants and brand owners with multiple questionnaires. So that's something we need to figure out which to be honest we're figuring and there's a lot of input from a lot of people. So on this one I'm not entirely sure and that's something I need to address on this as to

what questions we would need to ask and whether we'd bring it into that questionnaire or how to tie that all together basically.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. I think to your point, I think that's what we all need to remember is that nobody's going to want to be receiving multiple questionnaires asking similar questions or even asking different questions. So that's why, during these group meetings, the more we can discuss what we're working on and try and consolidate these things the better for everyone.

Does anybody have any general thoughts on what other research we want to make sure we're getting done and what sort of vendors we're looking for the next month? As I mentioned, for me, hopefully I'll have that DNS Abuse Report statement of work for you guys in the next day or so and then we can get that out pretty soon after the full group's looked at it and everyone's given input on that. So that's a big one that I think will inform a lot of the DNS Abuse stuff.

But does anybody else have anything else they're working on in terms of trying to craft a research project for which we will actually have to work with ICANN Procurement. Create a statement of work, select a vendor and what not, just because we are running out of time. Or does anybody remember anyone else mentioning any research project like that who may not be on the call?

Alright. Then for maybe a lot of these remaining research [that will] fit into what the group as a whole is doing perhaps in terms of upcoming surveys.

Alright, does anybody have any feedback about the tasks before us with regard to the discussion papers? As I mentioned, we'll get more information about that really soon.

Oh, and Jonathan just added to the group that the final deadline for research requests is the Monday after next, so that's coming up really soon for us to get research requests in. So if anyone thinks there's anything that should be done with regards to that, then it's really important to speak up now or send an e-mail to the group in the next week so we can definitely get that drafted and circulate it.

And then as far as the reading sources, does anybody have any questions about that, especially those of you who still have some work to do with summarizing the reading sources and highlighting the relevant ones? And then is everyone okay with the discussion paper teams? Does anybody want to say anything? For the Americans out there, did you have a good Fourth of July?

JAMIE HEDLUND: It rained.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, I experienced the same thing. Still saw some fireworks, though, in the distance, in the fog.

Okay, well… Sorry? Who is that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It was Jonathan. A couple of things – it rained here in D.C. That's where Jamie and I are. Perhaps not across the entire country. The celebration [inaudible].

DREW BAGLEY: You mean there's different weather elsewhere?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think with D.C. is deserving of having its parades on at the moment. I think we've been asking to have our parade rained on.

But what I was going to say is that – the plenary call is actually tomorrow, not next week, Drew. Just to remind folks. And then I think that when we were in Helsinki, we determined that really sort of final research requests in sort of formal form is we set a deadline for the 18th of July. That doesn't mean that [we] have to have ideas by then, that means those are formal requests so that we can really build our budget around them. So that's the two things that I wanted to bring up.

DREW BAGLEY: Right. Yes, so if everyone can come up with whatever they would want the next week, then that would hopefully still be enough time to rush it through whatever process we need to do to get it looking like an actual statement of work. Ideally, if, I guess, by the end of this week if people had anything else that they thought we should do research-wise, then we need to get that drafted right away.

Okay, well then since this call, I guess nobody wants to speak anymore. You guys are tired of hearing my voice. And just to kind of go over things, we are by a week from today please make sure that your team has finalized its analysis of all the sources that you're going to use for the discussion papers and make sure that the relevant sources – meaning those that would actually be helpful in the report – are highlighted in green on that chart, so that way we all know which sources are going to be included for your sub-team in the discussion papers. And definitely everyone should be working with each other to share their analysis on that and figure out how to proceed going forward.

We'll have our group call tomorrow, as Jonathan mentioned not next week, and then we'll learn more about the discussion paper template that we can start shaping our analysis around. And then if everyone, too, could please finish up the Safeguards chart and immediately highlight whether or not there is something for which we actually need to hire a vendor or maybe even append questions onto another survey, and make sure you definitely share that there. Or if it's something as simple as just trying to conduct interviews with ICANN staff on various topics, then we need to definitely get that started.

And then lastly, please everyone look at Brian's chart because that's what's going to inform a lot of this, and look at what Brian's already suggested as far as different ways to get data on these topic areas so we can determine if we want to pursue any of those, and therefore try to make a request for budget money allocation for some of these and whatnot.

And then, let's see, in the group chat Karen wants to know if we have a list of all the [different] research requests. And that is something I guess Jonathan will look into that would be really important for us to know that and remember what we already have as far as research requests.

So with all that said, does anybody have any other questions, feedback, comments, concerns, ways we can improve?

Alright. I guess with that said then, we can end a few minutes early. And for the Americans again, happy Fourth of July. And for those of you I saw in Helsinki last week, it's great seeing you. And for everyone else, have a fantastic week, and please definitely e-mail the group if you have any thoughts or questions or comments from this week. And otherwise, we'll all be working hard to meet our deadlines, get our stuff done, and ensure we have some really good discussion papers by our August meeting that will help us form our draft.

Have a good one, everyone. Take care.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Alright, Drew. Thanks a lot.

ALICE JANSEN: Drew, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Drew.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]