

Adobe Connect Chat_CCT-RT F2F Meeting at ICANN59

24 June 2017

Pamela Smith: (6/24/2017 08:59) Good day and welcome to CCT-RT Face to Face at ICANN59 on 24 June 2017!

Brenda Brewer: (09:03) Please stand by, we will begin momentarily. Thank you.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:09) Jordyn, you know that the December 2016 doms in your survey don't come up for renewal until Dec 2017-Mar2018?

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:10) And the Aug15-Dec16 renewal covers some of the Chinese bubble

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:11) Our renewal rate calculation is based on renewal+deletion transactions in December 2016, so those are domains registered in 2014 or 2015.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:11) (or earlier for legacy gTLDs)

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:12) Took the .COM websurvey data here back to Jan 2014, filtered the new regs and then checked their deletions. Doms without content drop at a higher rate than doms with content.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:12) Ratio spiked at around 13.1 or so for Dec 2015 doms.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:14) So, you are looking at renewal rate **within** a TLD. We looked at renewal rate **between** TLDs.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:14) I have data on other TLDs including new gTLDs and ccTLDs.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:14) Which is not to say your analysis is wrong or ours is right, just that they are different.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:14) was going to use the xyz from June 2014 survey as an example.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:15) Except that mine is based on actual data and yours is not? :)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:16) Hmm, that seems like an unconstructive point of view.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:16) I just explained the data ours is based on.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:16) The ICANN data is a summary rather than a per domain. This is based on tracking domain names and usage. You have no domain data prior to Dec 2016 from reading the paper.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:17) Right, the ICANN data is per-TLD not per-domain.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:17) TLDs with high parking rates were not statistically correlated with low (or high) renewal rates.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:18) The XYZ data from 2014 would be the classic example of how a TLD with massive parking doesn't renew well. (The Netsol zone stuffing.)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:21) Yes, I think you're right that the first big chunk of XYZ registrations did not renew basically at all. It turns out you probably shouldn't over-generalize from that data point.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:21) I've got multiple surveys

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:22) Some of XYZ 2014 doms did renew because of the nature of Netsol registrants. (Older/Bluechip/Autorenew)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:33) Is there a way to get a mic?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:33) I can type too.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:34) Seems like it's not working.

Brian Aitchison: (09:34) i hear you jordan but I'm remote

Brian Aitchison: (09:34) too

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:34) I can type:

Eleeza Agopian: (09:34) We're unable to get his audio in teh room just yet.

Eleeza Agopian: (09:34) Jordyn you can type for now.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:35) Even in the spam trendline where there's more from the new gTLDs it seems like there's not an increase in total activity, though?

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (09:35) it seems like we cannot hear you, please type.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:35) There's more spam on new gTLDs than legacy gTLDs, but that's just substitution rather than an increase in spam.

Brian Aitchison: (09:36) great point Jordyn.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:36) Would the incentive for spammers be that there is heavy discounting on new gtld reg fees?

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:42) <question>Did the team correlate known vulnerabilities in web CMSes and plugins with spikes in compromised domains?</question>

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (09:45) Hello John, thank you for your question, it will be addressed at the end of the presentation.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:45) thanks, Jean-Baptiste

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:53) Is the rate of abusive TLDs using privacy/proxy services changing at all?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:56) Sorry, SLDs.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:56) Is the rate changing.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:56) Not the total number.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:57) No, that's not quite it.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:58) Could that registrars figure be more accurately split into accredited registrars and resellers (rather than unaccredited registrars).

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:58) just a terms thing.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:58) What is the fraction of domains used for abuse that happen to use privacy/proxy services?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:58) And is that rate changing?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:59) So, on date X say 50% of domains used for abuse used privacy5 services.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:59) On date X+1 is the same fraction of domains used for abuse also using privacy services, or is it more or less?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:00) We see the total number of domains using privacy+proxy services from new gTLDs increasing, but is that purely a result of registrations?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:00) (So roughly what Jonathan is asking, but specific for privacy+proxy.)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:08) I'm going to guess all of the TLDs for the Gibraltar registrar are from the registry affiliated with that same registrar.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:09) Yes, Alpnames and Famous Four are affiliated.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:11) https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_domainincite.com_20169-2Dfamous-2Dfour-2Dconfirms-2Dlink-2Dto-2Dalpnames-2Dmass-2Dnew-2Dgtld-2Ddevelopment-

[2Dproject&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=cRsv9RaEt-1XfnLIeH0hUOdUXhWnTBm4Ur6up80DoRQ&s=vMLyHlcFDbkGHDC7LANaLdmFnva9vEo7Hvg-uMjZVbY&e=](https://www.whois.com/whois/2Dproject&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=cRsv9RaEt-1XfnLIeH0hUOdUXhWnTBm4Ur6up80DoRQ&s=vMLyHlcFDbkGHDC7LANaLdmFnva9vEo7Hvg-uMjZVbY&e=)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:12) Nanjing Impreious has been deaccredited.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:15) The interesting thing about this graph is that it seems to imply that mostly new domains are used for domains (at least from this registrar) since the abuse drops off once the accreditation was terminated even though the domains would continue to exist. (Maybe ICANN staff can tell us if/when the domains were actually transferred to another registrar?)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:16) Er, mostly new domains are used for abuse

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:17) Right, I mean new registrations.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:17) Not new gTLDs.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:21) Thanks, I noticed in web surveys that there is a correlation.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:23) The web usage surveys detect link injection hacks and these are what spike on the vulnerabilities. It is a class of webspam in that they link to the attacker's website and may not be traditional e-mail spam type abuse.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:26) Is there any documentation of the relationship between pricing and abuse in the report?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:26) That would be very interesting to document.

Jonathan Zuck: (10:26) I guess that's coming

Brian Aitchison: (10:26) no Jordyn there isn't although it's alluded to in places

Jonathan Zuck: (10:26) "inferential" study

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:28) To the extent that it's possible to document findings on this it would be helpful, I think.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:28) Probably a good paper on the economics of spamming ready to be written?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:28) It matches people's intuition, but some data (even point data on specific events) would be good to document.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:29) Some of the parking would be automatic rather than intentional.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:30) A spam dom may be auto parked.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:30) Hmm. Remote audio died?

Eleeza Agopian: (10:30) On break.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:30) (At least for me.)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:30) Oh, okay.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:30) It wasn't clear that was happening.

Eleeza Agopian: (10:31) Sorry Jordyn.

Eleeza Agopian: (10:31) We'll do a better job of cluing you in. :)

Eleeza Agopian: (10:31) Glad you're able to join the discussion remotely.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:31) I wish I was remote but on the right time zone. :-)

Eleeza Agopian: (10:31) Ha! I bet.

Brenda Brewer: (10:32) Break Time - we will resume in 15 minutes, 10:45 local time. Thank you!

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:34) @Jordyn, these are the nocontent/content deletions ratios I mentioned: (Jan 2015) 2.85 2.07 2.81 10.87 3.03 4.22 3.11 3.50 3.73
4.05 4.41 13.12 (Dec 2015)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:34) Hmm, that doesn't format very well here.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:36) c/p from Excel. Basically there were two big domainer type buys in Apr15 and Dec15 that subsequently had most of them deleted. That's where the noco/co ratio gets higher than normal.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:37) Most of those doms when straight on to PPC or had no content on the websites. That's for .COM, btw.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:40) Yes, the notion of looking at per-SLD correlations is interesting. I suspect we're not going to have time to dig much more into this particular topic, but if you have survey data and underlying methodologies that you can share with the RT, we can potentially at least mention it as a reference for future examinations of the topic.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:40) The renewal rates in .COM have been declining since 2004. Calculated them by dom back to then. Probably will publish some of it anyway.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:41) Have been publishing web usage surveys for years and even published the first large ones (>1M) on .EU and .MOBI in 2008.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:43) The databases here also cover about 530 million doms. What you could look at in the future is one hit wonder domains in the ngts. (Doms regged for one year and never reregistered.)

Pamela Smith 2: (10:44) We are on a break and will be back in a few moments.

Pamela Smith 2: (10:48) Welcome back, everyone!

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:52) The new gTLDs seem more attractive for spam in particular.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:52) Not other types of abuse.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:53) I think that there is actually a contractual difference in spam vs. other types of abuse. I need to check the contract.

Jonathan Zuck: (10:53) Interesting

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:54) Here's the contractual language:

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:54) Registry Operator will include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domainname

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:55) Note that spam is not included.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:57) All of the abuse references in the contract are in Spec 11.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:57) They talk about malware and phishing but not spam.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:58) non accredited = resellers

Jordyn A Buchanan: (11:01) My high level reaction to this data is on the one hand to agree with Drew that it seems the safeguards are not working that well (with the caveat that it's interesting to see that the one abuse vector not mentioned in the contract is the one that seems to have substantially migrated to new gTLDs), BUT that since the total amount of abuse does not seem to have increased (in fact, I think most of the trendlines are slightly down over time) we're not seeing the new gTLDs result in NEW abuse, just the same bad hombres deciding to use a new

gTLD versus a legacy gTLD for abuse that would be occurring one way or the other regardless of the program.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:01) Andy Brier on namestat.org had been including pricing (retail) data on each TLD page. Not sure if he has historical pricing data.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:23) Ultimately, there will have to be a recommendation to deaccredit registries if this isn't solved at registrar level..

Jordyn A Buchanan: (11:33) I'm not sure that quite answered Jonathan's question: is there a difference in ICANN's enforcement of spam vs. malware and phishing? No one is trying to judge ICANN on this point, but if there were a difference due to the contractual language that might help us understand why the behavior is different across the different types of abuse.

Jonathan Zuck: (11:34) right

David Taylor: (11:35) and also, if there is a difference in the contractual language covering malware/phishing and spam then why is there that difference?

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:42) question: Do registries have to notify ICANN of discounting promotions?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (11:42) No

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:42) Would have been an easy way for ICANN to collect pricing data.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:09) I can't participate verbally.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:09) I have another suggestion, though.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:10) Rather than going through the recommendations this way, we should go through the high level topics that Laureen suggested via e-mail.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:10) And just work the individual recommendations in the subteams.

Jonathan Zuck: (12:11) do we have subteam discussions this weekend?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:11) No.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:11) But, e.g., the competition and consumer choice discussion is probably going to be more useful with Stan and me present in any case so this weekend may not be optimal for it.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:16) Here's what I previously suggested in terms of methodology:

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:16) I'd suggest the following approach: COSTS: For each recommendation, identify whether the cost is high/medium/low, using the following

definitions:Low: Requires little (new) effort from either ICANN or contracted parties, or can be completed at a moderate cost by a third party.Medium: Requires substantial effort from either ICANN or contracted parties (but not both); or can be completed at a substantial cost by a third party.High: Requires substantial effort from both ICANN or contracted parties; or may be infeasible to complete without substantial changes in operational practices by either ICANN or a third party; generally not possible to be completed by a third party, or prohibitively expensive to do so.BENEFITS: For each recommendation, clearly document the expected benefit from the expected completion of the recommendation.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:17) (That formatted very badly. Let me try again.)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:17) I'd suggest the following approach:

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:17) COSTS: For each recommendation, identify whether the cost is high/medium/low, using the following definitions:

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:17) + Low: Requires little (new) effort from either ICANN or contracted parties, or can be completed at a moderate cost by a third party.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:18) + Medium: Requires substantial effort from either ICANN or contracted parties (but not both); or can be completed at a substantial cost by a third party.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:18) + High: Requires substantial effort from both ICANN or contracted parties; or may be infeasible to complete without substantial changes in operational practices by either ICANN or a third party; generally not possible to be completed by a third party, or prohibitively expensive to do so.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:18) BENEFITS: For each recommendation, clearly document the expected benefit from the expected completion of the recommendation.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:22) On pricing in particular, I think this is a very good discussion to have with the registries in our more detailed discussion now scheduled for Tuesday.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:28) Some of our suggestions definitely require contractual changes.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:29) More to the point, I don't think we made much of an effort to figure out what the implementation costs might look like.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:29) And now we have feedback from both ICANN and registries about potential costs.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:30) Two points: 1) The word "prohibitive" is only used to describe the cost to have a third party (e.g., contractor like Analysis Group) do it versus ICANN.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:31) 2) It may be that we look at this and realize that it's a lot more expensive than we thought, in which case we may want to revise or remove the recommendation.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:31) That's the whole point of the analysis.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:36) So to reiterate what I said on e-mail, if we don't make any effort to think about costs now, there's two big problems:

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:37) 1) We lose control of cost-adjusted prioritization. Anything that looks like it's expensive just won't be implemented even if we would have thought that was the most important thing to do even if you couldn't do anything else.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:37) 2) We lose the chance to adjust our recommendations to reduce cost and still achieve our goals.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:45) Megan's last statement is exactly the point.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:45) We should be confident that the cost is sufficiently low that the benefit is worth it.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:49) Jonathan's latest statement makes sense.

Brenda Brewer: (12:50) LUNCH BREAK: meeting will resume at 13:15. thank you!!

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:54) I am going to get a bit more sleep. I'll try to rejoin in a while. To the extent you guys want to talk about Lauren's suggested topics 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 while I'm gone those are the ones I'm least interested in (but also don't presume to dictate the overall agenda of the review.)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (12:55) Anyway, I'll be back.

Pamela Smith 2: (13:25) We will be starting momentarily.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (13:36) @Jordyn Just did that No content/Content calculation on a larger .COM survey (random sample of 4.4% of all new .COM doms) of new regs for Jan 2015: No content doms deleted 2.3 times as much as doms with content.

Approx 59.46% to 2

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (13:36) 25.57%

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (13:54) <comment>Some NGT registries seem to have found that their initial plan for the content on their gTLD was not viable and they have effectively committed genericide by making their gTLD more generic less focused on their initial content type. Was there any recommendation that registries could not change focus?</comment>

Jonathan Zuck: (13:55) There's a subtle distinction between a restriction being placed on registries and incentives for those registries to create restrictions

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (13:56) The registries might object to any such term in a new registry agreement and the genericide has already been done in some gTLDs. It is probably too late now.

Jonathan Zuck: (13:59) you're right, of course but as a go forward policy it might make sense to incent registries to restrict

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (13:59) Managed registries = fewer registrations. Some gTLDs are struggling to survive and they are really going to push back on this.

Eleeza Agopian: (14:10) FYI, here's the RFC on defining "must" "should" etc.: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_tools.ietf.org_html_rfc6919&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=cRsv9RaEt-1XfnLleH0hUOdUXhWnTBm4Ur6up80DoRQ&s=T8xx0veHjMT6YrrKByu3e7UZ7XnPw0pmCAZfTujQ0Kc&e=

Eleeza Agopian: (14:11) woops. Please disregard that URL: It was an April Fool's joke!

Eleeza Agopian: (14:11) Here's the relevant RFC: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.ietf.org_rfc_rfc2119.txt&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=cRsv9RaEt-1XfnLleH0hUOdUXhWnTBm4Ur6up80DoRQ&s=eDcCl6z8BnsE6qCs4w8yIDWP_dKkkJPMv00dsElrbXk&e=

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:40) I am awake again!

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:46) I kind of disagree we need another public comment period, but we did agree that we were going to have one.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:47) I was just suggesting we try to consolidate public comment periods so we don't do a standalone one for the new studies. So the next public comment would include any comments on those.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:48) I think the survey was fine.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:48) Better than the INTA public comment. :-)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:50) The INTA survey said that the affect was proportionate to trademark activity as opposed to size of company. That's not contradictory to our findings, which just said there were some *brands* that had a lot of defensive registrations, not that the companies that owned those brands were necessarily large.

Gaongalelwe Mosweu (PC): (14:51) @Jordyn: I agree that the standalone comment periods for the studies might create some level of confusion...It will affect the timing Yes, but it has to be done, so the studies can be viewed in context of our report.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:51) David--we agreed to consolidate the public comment on the follow-on studies at the same time as a revised report from us.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:51) So we need to do one more public comment period before our FINAL report.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:51) But not more.

Carlton Samuels: (14:51) @Jordyn: Given the iNTA survey vs commnet distance, maybe the public comment period would be shorter, no?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:53) My take is that we'd do another release of the report (Second Draft Report) that says "we also included the following two new studies, which you can also comment on now".

Gaongalelwe Mosweu (PC): (14:53) Yes Jordyn.

Carlton Samuels: (14:54) @Jordyn: Ok, limited exposure

Jordyn A Buchanan: (14:58) +1 what Lauren just said

Jordyn A Buchanan: (15:04) I think it is going to be hard to create useful success factors for some of these.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (15:05) (i.e., when we say "some PDP should look at this issue" the only possible success factor is going to be "yes they looked at it", but that's not very interesting or compelling as a rationale)

Jonathan Zuck: (15:05) agree. we need to do where we can

Jordyn A Buchanan: (15:06) Mostly just pointing out that the benefit and the success factors may be disconnected.

Brenda Brewer: (15:14) Break Time: will resume in 15 minutes at 15:30

Pamela Smith: (15:39) We're back!

Jordyn A Buchanan: (15:43) We're meeting with the NCSG this week, no?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (15:43) These are the sorts of issue that we should tee up for those F2F interactions.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (15:44) (Sorry, that's a bit of an aside but a way to think about how to use time later in the week.)

Jonathan Zuck: (15:52) Yes

Jordyn A Buchanan: (15:57) .feedback is probably particularly interesting to mention given the PDDRP and breach notice involved

Jordyn A Buchanan: (15:57) Oh yeah, PICDRP not PDDRP

Eleeza Agopian: (16:32) The draft framework Calvin and Lauren were discussing is now open for public comment: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_public-2Dcomments_draft-2Dframework-2Dregistry-2Drespond-2Dsecurity-2Dthreats-2D2017-2D06-2D14-2Den&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=cRsv9RaEt-1XfnLIeH0hUOdUXhWnTBm4Ur6up80DoRQ&s=9qmEHs4kyufr08CTLCy72nqYQqZ42BmRFAZbdzWybC8&e=

Jordyn A Buchanan: (16:36) Didn't we just get the results of the operability study?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (16:38) That may inform this discussion significantly.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (16:40) Oh, that's just "did the e-mail go through?"

Jordyn A Buchanan: (16:57) I'll be on the phone and able to talk tomorrow.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (17:02) Audio is gone. :-(

Jordyn A Buchanan: (17:03) Does that mean we're done?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (17:03) Oh, it's back!

Jordyn A Buchanan: (17:04) And gone again.

Eleeza Agopian: (17:05) and now we're done

Eleeza Agopian: (17:05) Safe travels, Jordyn!

Jordyn A Buchanan: (17:05) Okay.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (17:05) Thanks!

Jordyn A Buchanan: (17:05) More tomorrow!

Eleeza Agopian: (17:05) good luck. :)

Brenda Brewer: (17:06) Meeting is over. Thank you for joining. Day 2 is tomorrow @ 9:00 AM/Johannesburg local time.