
YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the NARALO Rules of Procedures Working Committee call taking place on Monday, 16th of January, 2017 at 20:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Glenn Mcknight, Judith Hellerstein, Alan Greenberg, Louis Houle, and Seth Reiss.

We haven't received any apologies for today's call.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Evin Erdogan, and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

Finally, I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking for the transcription purposes. Over to you, Glenn. Thank you very much.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great, thank you so much. I just have to mention, I was probably saying this to the benefit of those who came on early, but I'd like to thank the Americans for joining us on their holiday today to honor the great Martin Luther King, and I'd like to appreciate your time spent with us today.

I do expect John, who is the main penholder, to be on the call as well, so we'll give it a little bit of time, but if we can maybe go over the rationale and the scope of the project first, and perhaps by then John will join in and talk about what progress he's doing on updating the document itself. So, Silvia, please join in anytime you like.

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.

Just to put this in context, we are looking at revamping our Rules of Procedures. Not to make them longer, not to make them more cryptic, not to make them less straight to the point. We agreed in our last call, if you recall there was consensus that we wanted to make these documents not sort of the be all end all as we've seen in some of the documents that have come through, but really to clean up what roles we have, where there are gaps. I believe Alan made a point about harmonization or integration with our existing MoU, and definitely has to be integrated with the ICANN Bylaws.

So, I just want to put this project in scope in terms of the other RALOs, so I'll turn to Silvia. Silvia, can you sort of give us an update on what the other RALOs are doing and where they are in terms of whether revamping or updating, or they're happy with their existing Rules of Procedures? Thank you. Over to you, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes. Hello, everyone. This is Silvia. Thank you very much, Glenn. With regards to other RALOs, APRALO was the first one to update the Rules of Procedures back in 2014, and they did after a long – actually long – debate, they did a quite extensive rewrite of the rules – is on the screen – very detailed style. That was back in 2014, and that can be a model in some aspects for other RALOs.

Then AFRALO has created a working group and has started a review back in 2014. However, because of the IANA transition, APRALO stopped the work and they haven't resumed work yet.

However, they did some progress with regard to some aspects of their regulations. They realized that in some aspects, they are obsolete, so they did quite an interesting review with regard to management, decision making and also metrics, attendance metrics.

However, they haven't resumed their work yet. LACRALO did a comparison between the English and the Spanish versions, so that's where they are. However, they haven't reviewed the substantive aspects of the Rules of Procedures yet.

On the screen, that's the version that they compared back in 2014 in London, and so at least now, the English and the Spanish versions of the rules match perfectly. However, they still need to go into details and update their rules.

And then EURALO is actually now in the process of revising the Bylaws. They also found that currently, the current rules do not address many issues, and they are considered obsolete. So therefore, they will start a review, and in the case of EURALO, they will take as an example or as a methodology the fifth law which is considered very efficient in the European context.

So, that's where we are with regards to all the Rules of Procedures in all the RALOs. Thank you. Over to you, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great, thank you so much. That was very succinct and appropriate to time set what we're doing. I'm just going to open it up to questions before we turn to John, and welcome John to the call. Anyone have any

questions for Silvia on what the other RALOs are doing and what our mandate is? Looks like no one. Okay, [let me] thank you. I think somebody was starting to speak.

JOHN MORE: Yes, this is John. Whenever you want me to speak.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, thanks, John. We were just doing the second item, just giving a scope of project, just putting it in context what we're doing, that what we're doing isn't alien to the other RALOs. It's actually in context to what other RALOs are doing as well.

So, this entire process is not a make work project for the sake of making work, or as some people have said making rules for the sake of rules. It is looking at our existing procedures and tightening them up, refinement, and as I think we had consensus last time, John, we're not going to make this the most definitive set of rules on every possible thing we possibly – just some really great guiding principles. So, John, I'm going to turn to you to provide us an update on how your perspective is on updating the rules and alterations. Back to you, John.

JOHN MORE: I was given the task to work on looking at the Rules of Procedure. I think the content in it is actually pretty good, but it's scattered around and it is sometimes ultra-detailed, but not necessarily linked to I think the several purposes that they should be.

The first – which I discussed with Glenn – is it seems to me that at the very beginning, basically the mission and the ways of operation, the principles of operation should be set forth at the beginning. That's a fairly normal way of doing things.

And then you describe the structure, and then you describe the means of electing people to the structure, and then you have the provisions dealing with the membership and the reference to the metrics, and an open and fair way of handling issues relating to membership so that if there is a question about membership's participation, there is a clear set of rules for indicating that to the member that has problems and providing for a way for the member to dispute or to question it.

And that's basically what's there. So, I think the Rules of Procedure have a lot of procedures in it. For example, the language use. All sorts of things are in there, but they're not in a way that is easy to get to. Glenn has sort of given me – I would say what he just said is that it will be detailed enough, but not excessively detailed.

And I think that the big thing is every concept of how we all work together. For example, there's a mention in one place – but not commonly – about consensus. That would be obviously one of the principles under which everything would be done, and then when you have votes, etc.

I've gotten – partly because of the way the current structure is, I think that rather than just marking up what is there now, what I've been doing is drafting a whole new one that people can look at. And if we wish, we could go back and change what is there now, but I think that to

really do it the right way, one needs to start with a new document that everyone can work off. And I should be finished with that. I worked a good part of the weekend, and I should be finishing it in three or four days to have something that then can be put up. As I said, rather than just trying to mark up what's there, which would be incredibly complicated to do.

And let me also say that any draft of anything I've ever done, I'm always open to having it revised.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. Great, thank you so much. Okay, so we're going to open up the floor, and the first person to ask a question is Alan Greenberg. Please, go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. A couple of points. Number one, on the issues on membership. Do recall that the membership for individuals is a NARALO issue. Membership for ALSes is an ALAC issue. So there, actually the ALAC is the one that approves members or decertifies them.

So, although the NARALO has a role to play, it's not the definitive player in that. Although I understand what you're saying of what you would normally have in sort of a membership organization, the rules are – it's a bifurcated one here in that the responsibility is split. So, we do have to take that into account.

However, I hadn't realized you're quite at the stage of drafting new ones. What I was going to suggest – and I think we may want to do that

at some point really soon now – is to go through the original rules and principles – and there are several different documents – not with an aim of trying to redraft them in situ, but to identify the problems because that will make sure that you're addressing them as you go through and draft the new ones.

It's probably better to do that. It doesn't matter what order we do it in, but we should do that not trying to fix the new ones but simply identifying the issues that need to be addressed as we go forward in the redrafting. Exactly how you want to do that now, I'm not sure, given where you already are in the process. But I think it's really important that we try to make sure we don't replicate some of the problem areas but address them. Thank you.

JOHN MORE:

I agree with both your points. I was fully aware of the distinction between what the ALSes and the individuals would obviously remain and built in, but they would be in one location. That's all. So, I fully agree.

And the second point, I think I have been seeing some of the problems, but I agree that maybe one of the first things to do next is for people to look at what is already there and do a running commentary that would help in finding the problems and hopefully addressing them.

So, I am fully onboard with both of your points.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. I don't know how many people there are who are that versed on them that they can give you the comments. Certainly, I can. Glenn may well be able to, Evan who was the Chair for a bunch of years might be in a position to do that. I think if each of us mark up some documents, then probably one hour on a call with just those of us who have any input to the process can probably identify them all.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yes. In response to that, when we started looking at this issue – and Judith, please jump in on this – we saw that we ran into the issues because whether it's a lack of process or codification process, we saw a lack in the clear way of step-by-step process of running letters, reporting and documenting for potential ALSes to go through the process of decertification.

That was one of the areas that we saw as an issue, and I believe we've done a short summary of issues that we identified that were issues which I can share with you in the group. One of the things that Seth has done – and I'll just read it, I'm not sure if he has audio.

Seth, do you want to just speak up and talk about your comment? I'll just give him a second to make sure he gets audio. What he writes in the chat box, “I agree with John that the document needs an entire redraft and it needs a better structuring and organization. I agree with Alan there are a few policy and substantial issues [fared] in the document that could be decided by the group rather than the drafter.”

My response to that: I agree. The current document bounces around. Subtitles might help, or some kind of flow that the topics are actually

related to each other so it's a logical process. When Silvia and I were going through the APRALO one, we didn't even get through maybe a third and it was 101 items already. We were going to compare ours with the other ones, and it was just so ominous in terms of getting to go in that direction. And again, I go back to this committee's marching orders to make this a readable, consumable product that is not overly complicated. Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Two things. Number one, I'll give you an example of the kind of thing I'm talking about. We have a rule that says the representative of the unaffiliated members cannot be an employee, consultant or whatever of a registrar or registry. The theory is that this should be a true, unadulterated user and not someone who is making someone off of the domain system.

Completely rational thing. You can defend it or you can say it's stupid, but it's completely rational. We don't have any such rule that the Chair and Secretariat have to have such an affiliation or not. So, the Chair can be an employee of a registry, the Secretariat can be an employee of a registrar, but the unaffiliated rep who has no real task other than to count some votes occasionally cannot be.

That kind of inconsistency, I think, doesn't make sense. And either we should use the [room] uniformly or use it for the important votes but not the unimportant votes. There is a whole bunch of inconsistencies that got added over time that I think need to be rationalized.

And there's a number of other things as well, places where we fixed a problem but didn't fix the complimentary problems somewhere else. So, it's that kind of thing that I'm suggesting we want to do an overall review for.

Back on the membership issues, John, I still have a bit of concern but I'm willing to wait to see what you draft. There really is no way that the NARALO documents can specify some of the details of how an ALS gets certified or decertified. NARALO has a role to play but cannot be the definitive source of other things which in fact are set at a different level and approved by the ICANN Board. So, just a caution on that. Thank you.

JOHN MORE:

Yes. That's the sort of thing that is useful to sensitize me to, but my understanding is that the idea is to the extent that NARALO has a role to play, that needs to be set forth in a rational way because that's an issue.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. That I support 100%

JOHN MORE:

So, it's not the decision making, it is clarifying the NARALO role.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, correct. Okay.

JOHN MORE:

And I do think – since I sort of – I did a lot of the work on redrafting or worked on redrafting Bylaws of the Internet Society and creating the Chapters Advisory Council and I do a lot of nonprofits and organizations, but the purpose is really to have the document be organic that is appropriate for the organization have a certain level of clarity. But there are details that you all have that I do think it really is useful to have those just set forth and shared around so everyone has that. But I do think that is an extremely important part of doing this.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you, John. Let me ask Alan a question on this. In terms of our efforts, do we need to go back and change our MoU first? It's a chicken and egg situation. Do we need to have our MoU currently based on the new ICANN and what our Bylaws are saying, or do we just go ahead with the Rules of Procedures and there's an MoU change afterwards and then we go back to the Rules of Procedures and then harmonize it? What do you see the pros [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The MoU is likely to have to be revised because of all sorts of things that are going on. The product of the At-Large review is likely to cause a major revamp of the MoU. The work we're doing right now on ALS criteria is likely to cause that. Plus, of course, the things that are in the MoU that just don't make sense and may never have made sense.

Remember, this was all drafted before we ever tried actually operating as a RALO, and to what extent it makes sense is questionable. So, are we technically going to be in slight violation of the MoU if we draft new

rules? Yes, probably. But we're also in violation of it now and no one seems to have cared.

So, I would not worry about the MoU at this stage of the game. The MoU could be considered as Articles of Incorporation if we were incorporated, because it is sort of the substantive document on which we are based. But we are not a legal entity, we don't have to worry about that level of nicety right now.

So, I certainly would not worry about the MoU at this stage, but we should be annotating it to what extent we believe it is wrong and how we believe it should be fixed for the parts that are purely under our control.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you, Alan. Okay, I have a very quick follow-up question to that. if we had binoculars into the future, is the request for a new MoU – would that come from us, or would ICANN speak up in the next year or two years? I guess, how much of a window do we have with this new revamped RoP?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think anyone in ICANN outside of us is going to initiate that process. I've got another year left as Chair, maybe two years. I would like to see as my legacy before I leave that we either have those documents cleaned up or that we know how they're going to be cleaned up. So, I think we have a relatively narrow window, but not as narrow as

the timeline we're looking for for revamping our Rules of Procedures.
Does that help any?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think ICANN Legal is going to suddenly wake up and say, "My God, the MoUs are out of date." I think it's going to be us that does that. Perhaps prompted by the At-Large review, if they're paying attention to that, which so far, they haven't.

JOHN MORE: It seems to me that working through the Rules of Procedures could assist in knowing what parts of the MoU need to be addressed, and they can all be made subject to – with the understanding that we're creating a draft that can be used, and then the final implementation can be determined by what ICANN Legal staff should be done or what the MoU status is. I think it's useful to do what you're proposing to do as part of the process.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's conceivable we might have a rule which only kicks in when the MoU is rewritten or something like that, but I honestly don't think we're going to find a lot of stuff that intersects to that level. I might be wrong.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I hate to split hairs, Alan, but do we need to have something in there as well when ICANN changes its Bylaws as much as it changes the MoU?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not following.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. In terms of the ICANN Bylaws, they [stipulated] clearly who they write MoUs with, which is us and others, so I think – would there not be a process there that there is some kind of relationship with the ICANN Bylaws that our Rules and Procedures are updated, or MoU? I'm looking at the logistics of how one triggers something else.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I would guess that at the same time that we do new MoUs, we will request new wording in the Bylaws. Because again, like the MoUs, the Bylaws are not necessarily fully consistent with what we do, or perhaps ever were fully consistent with what we do.

But I think that's an ALAC issue. I don't think it comes down to the details of NARALO as opposed to the specifications from the ALAC of what RALOs should do. Remember, we have never really put in writing anywhere other than some vague things in the MoU and the Bylaws what RALOs should do.

You would have thought that since RALOs are the embodiment of the At-Large community in the regions, we would have done that a long time ago. But to be honest, it's not that we avoided doing it. No one has

ever really suggested that we do. But I think it's probably time, and that's one of the reasons when we're looking at the ALS Criteria and Expectations Group, there was also a section in that of what we expect of RALOs.

One of the reasons RALOs can be criticized in the current review is because in some cases, RALOs are not doing much to facilitate the communication path that we want between the ALAC and ALSes. But we've never actually asked them to, either.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

On that issue, Alan, where do we stand with the ALS criteria and metrics? Is that [inaudible] yet or that expectation has been set, or it's still going through the works?

ALAN GREENBERG:

We chose to focus on the ALS expectations as the first part, which is the real substantive part and the part that will involve RALOs the most. That was approved in Hyderabad in principle, and we're supposed to have a small group – we haven't actually done anything yet – that is to redraft that to enshrine it permanently.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. Yes, because I recall you were mentioning about the simple thing, and it's not a lot to expect, but the simple thing on our ALSes mentioning on their Facebook or their website how they're involved with ICANN. So, that's just the basic issue, never mind other stuff.

ALAN GREENBERG: The whole principle of ALSes was they have members. That's why it's a group, not an individual. But we've never used the members, and that means they have to know they're an ALS, they have to have a way of getting information from us and a way of feeding information back, none of which exists in today's structure in 99% of the cases, or 90.

JOHN MORE: It does seem to me that as far as the Rules of Principle, what we need to do is refer to whatever the metrics are that are created for the ALSes and that would be what they [inaudible]. We would not be writing down ourselves, other than doing the general principles of what I think is a general agreement on what RALOs are supposed to do. But the specifics on the criteria would not be incorporated in the Rules of Procedure, just a means of triggering them from the NARALO side.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless NARALO sets things over and above, NARALO can't remove a criteria, but NARALO could add a criteria as long as it's harmonious with what we're doing.

JOHN MORE: And consistent. Okay, well I think – so that would be the sort of suggestion then that one could have out there for discussion. I hadn't thought of that, but I think that's a good example that could be part of the discussion in coming up with a final draft that people can work on. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, guys. I'm trying to encourage Seth to speak up. He's been doing some great comments, in part anticipating what you guys are saying, or agreeing and additional comments. Seth was one of the [signatories] [inaudible] roughly ten years ago in San Juan when NARALO was formulated. His long term participation in NARALO is very valuable, so I'm just going to put him on the spot. Seth, can you please speak up?

SETH REISS: Alright, can you hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Go ahead, Seth.

SETH REISS: I write my comments to help you organize my thoughts. I don't think I'm disagreeing with anything anybody said, I'm just trying to be helpful. I think the document needs to be structured and organized. I think John did that.

There are some interesting substantive points, Alan probably knows more about these most certainly than I, and I think this gives us the opportunity to rethink some of those substantive points as Alan explained. Why should unaffiliated members not be able to be members of groups but the ALSes can be?

So, we should work out all the substantive points as well, but that can be I think a second stage for the organization [inaudible] and see inconsistencies with the governing documents [inaudible] precedence, which is probably technically illegal [inaudible] include a clause which gives us some flexibility so that – and I guess I suggested one in my written comments.

I guess nobody can hear me. That works too.

ALAN GREENBERG: We could hear you, but you were cutting out periodically.

SETH REISS: I'm sure that's –

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: That's not him, that's Adobe.

SETH REISS: Thanks, Judith. Anyway, I think my written comments said it all. [inaudible]

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great, thank you so much, Seth. Yes, you were dying out, and as Judith said, it's an Adobe issue. It's not your lack of energy, Seth, which is good to hear. I just want to turn to Judith and Louis who are part of our community and on this call as well.

You've been listening to the conversation for the last half hour. Can either of you chip in and say anything? Do you like what you're hearing? Do you feel that we're ignoring some things? And I saw Judith made a comment correcting Seth on something on working group participation, so Judith, do you want to go first?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. I like what I'm hearing. I think the idea was originally that staff thought that only the reps would go on the working groups and meetings, but that has changed a couple of years ago as we're encouraging everyone to get involved, not just the reps of the ALSes.

So anyone— if they want to get involved in the working group – can ask for a confluence account and will be given a confluence account and they can get active and involved and be anything.

So, I think it's just a misnomer that may not have been known that this could happen, but Glenn and I have been encouraging the reps to say when they talk to the ALS that we encourage everyone to go on and we will help anyone get a confluence account so that they can be as active as possible.

Yes, you do not need a confluence account to go into the meeting, but as all the information is on the wiki, sometimes you do and the post you do. So, that's why we ask them. But I think John is doing a great job on there keeping everyone aligned.

I do not know that requirement that unaffiliated had specific criteria, but that's nice to know. And I think otherwise, Glenn and I have been

working really hard to get this down, and each of us has been meeting with John giving us all input and history about NARALO and what we're trying to do, what we hope to do and what is the vision so that he can get a better, clear idea when we're writing the Rules of Procedure what we are looking for.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Any other comments in terms of observations? I know we did a document before we started this process, and we'll share with the group. Any other observations about the old rules that stick in your craw or have an issue that you want to bring up to the committee?

ALAN GREENBERG: Glenn, my hand is up.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, Alan, one sec. Is this a response to Judith, or [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a response to Judith.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Judith, I don't quite understand what you were saying about there was never an intent for members of ALSes to participate. There's

always the intent. The issue of confluence accounts is a slightly different thing than that. Originally, anybody could comment on pages on the wiki, so you didn't need an account to be able to participate in working groups and things like that. Because of a spam problem, we changed the rules that said only signed-on people can comment.

But there's certainly never been an intent to restrict participation in our working groups or any working groups to just ALS representatives or things like that. That's certainly not the case. There may be some technical issues that came up along the way as I just mentioned, but that was certainly not a philosophy or anything like that.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, Alan. [inaudible] go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I guess there wasn't, but when people were trying to come on and participate, they were not able to see the pages, so that's why we were told they had to get a confluence account to comment on them. So, that's when we came up with that issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, that's because of the spam problem we had that we turned off unauthorized comments.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And then people were saying [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: They should still be able to have seen – they should always have been able to see the pages. The pages can be seen – unless they're restricted – by anybody, but you cannot comment on them or edit them without an appropriate authorization right now.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right, but then we will also told when we were trying to get some confluence accounts that we couldn't get confluence accounts. And then we discussed and we were able to resolve that issue a while ago. But we originally were told that we could not get confluence accounts [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: That was a misdirected staff answer is all I can say, with some resentment in my voice.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Anything else, Judith, before I turn to Louis?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, so we're going to have Louis and then we're going to have to set a date into our next call. Louis, go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE:

Thank you, Glenn. I like what I hear today. It's very instructive, and I think that we're following the right path and I'm looking forward to see the result of John's work in a couple of days. And I just want to add one comment to Alan who was saying that, of course, guys like you know everything about the situation. You're in a position to come in and work on John's work.

I like to think that when I read that document, if there's anything that I don't really understand clearly, I think that my comments would be more than welcome and might help to what we are trying to achieve now with [inaudible]. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you, Louis, I appreciate it. Okay, so we need to set the date. We should give it at least a month roughly so that the skeleton can actually start to populate. So, what part of February is good for everybody?

Is this time of the day okay with everyone? And perhaps the third or the fourth week of February – is that good for everyone?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I hope we'll be talking at least on the problems with the current ones before then, but yes. Probably.

JOHN MORE: Glenn, I would suggest a call on the second week. I don't see reason – I think we should be in a position to have another call sooner than the third or fourth week. I think the second week, if that's possible for folks, would be appropriate.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Are we talking the week of the 6th to the 10th? I just want to make sure the calendar everybody... Because the week starts mid-week for February. The 1st is on a Wednesday, and the second week starts on the 6th. So, are you suggesting anytime between the 6th and the 10th?

JOHN MORE: Or the 15th. I just suggest first half of the month.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest earlier rather than later as long as John is happy with it and those of us who want to make comments can have our notes ready by then.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. I guess we'll send a Doodle out for any of the dates, 8th, 9th and 10th. Is that okay with everyone?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

JOHN MORE: Yes.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, everybody. As an action item, we'll get the items that we observed. It's probably buried within the document. John, I'll probably have a chat with you on stuff that needs to be in there. So, feel free, folks, to... Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand's not up.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Somebody was speaking. Is that you, John?

JOHN MORE: No, [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: All I heard was you, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I heard somebody speak up, and I know John is on Adigo. John, were you trying to say something?

JOHN MORE: No, I wasn't.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Any final comments from anybody? Does that look okay for everyone so we can organize the next call? And in the interim, feel free to share your thoughts and ideas to John, and he's still trying to put it in some semblance of order. Anyone else?

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, sounds pretty good. Thank you all for joining us. Just one last thing to Alan. Alan, I need to add a motion that Ariel sent out. She's on holidays today and I'm not getting her, and I sent you a quick e-mail on that earlier today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I was at a doctor's appointment. I saw the message. I've got to look at what Ariel said. I don't know what motion she's talking about, but I'm sure we can draft one quick enough. I haven't had a chance. I just got back just before this call, so I haven't had a chance to look yet.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great, thanks. I just want to make sure that's taken care of this week. Okay, well. Thanks, everybody, and I appreciate everyone joining us today. Thanks again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you everyone, bye.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned, so you will now be disconnected. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]