ICANN
Transcription
Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) PDP Working Group call
Wednesday, 14 June 2017 at 16:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as anauthoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-14jun17-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p9kwedy8u36/**

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/k0bwAw

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms, RPMs, in all gTLD PDP Working Group call held on the 14th of June, 2017. In the interest of time there will be no roll all as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge, and Kristine Dorrain, we have you noted, could others please identify yourselves now?

    Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to our cochair, Kathy Kleiman, please begin.

Kathy Kleiman: Terri, thank you so much. Welcome, everyone. J. Scott was supposed to chair today's call but he has a conflict, hopefully he'll be joining us at some

during the call but could not be with us at the start so I'll be chairing today. But my cochair, Phil Corwin, is on the call with us.

Today is short meeting. As we try the experiment of splitting time between the full working group and our new - our third sub team kicking off on RPMs, this was an idea that J. Scott posed some time ago and so we're going to kick it off today.

Quick note that second phone bridge and phone information, dial-in information, has been circulated so that - Mary, can you confirm that to get onto the second call we will need to call back and that we can't hold on, is that right? Go ahead, Mary. Thank you.

Mary Wong: Hi, Kathy and everyone. Although we have a second line and different password, for those who are already on the working group call now, and who intend to join the sub team call that starts immediately, you do not have to call in today. What staff will do is transfer everyone over to the new line if you're already on this one. Thanks, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Perfect so we can stay on this call or re-dial in. And a note to David McAuley in the chat room, you're not late, we just started. So today's agenda is largely an administrative one.

We'll look for updates to statement of interest, we'll get a brief progress report from the current two sub teams, talk a little a bit about the scope and mandate of the new sub team being created, a little bit about our revised work plan, we're of course running a little late at this point given our detailed discussions and then I want to highlight Number 5, the cochairs are working hard to organize the three-hour face to face session in Johannesburg and we would love your input on that both on the call and in email private or public of how best do you think we might use that very precious time that we're in.

So that's an overview of our agenda. Let me pause and ask for any updates to statement of interests. Don, you can't hear me? Terri, is there any way to raise the elevation or the volume of my participation? Okay, Terri's adjusting the volume. Thank you.

Okay, no updates to statement of interest. I'd like to ask for some very brief progress reports. We know that the Sunrise Sub Team and the Trademark Claims Sub Team are rapidly finishing up their work both consolidating and clarifying charter questions for these two RPMs as well as guiding us through what data will help us best analyze and understand these questions and any solutions or resolutions that there might be to them.

So let me ask for Sunrise, is Lori on the call? Lori Schulman. She does not appear to be. Is there anyone who would like to - from that sub team that would like to give an update? Barring that, Mary, could you give a quick update of the Sunrise Sub Team? Mary, I think it goes to you.

Mary Wong: Hi, Kathy. This is Mary. Yes, actually I'm going to ask Amr if he's on the line if he can do that as he's been keeping the notes and following up on the action items.

Kathy Kleiman: Sounds good to me. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Hi, Mary and Kathy and everyone. Thank you very much. Yes, so the Sunrise Registration Sub Team has pretty much wrapped up its refinement of the charter questions and has been looking at data requirements since the call on last Friday. There's an online Google Doc that the sub team is working on and updates have been continually coming in over the course of the past couple of days.

And one other action item for the sub team was to finalize a few definitions and progress has been made on that front as well, specifically for reserve

names, premium names and premium pricing. So we're seeing some good progress on those - on both those fronts.

And there is a possibility - a strong possibility that the sub team will conclude its work following the call this next Friday, the Friday of this week. And hopefully if the sub team does conclude its work then it will be in a position to provide a comprehensive and full update to the full working group during the next working group call which will likely be the last one before the ICANN 59 meeting. If there are any specific questions or items that you'd like a more detailed update on, I would be happy to provide that. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thank you, Amr. This is Kathy. And a shout out to everybody on the Sunrise Sub Team that we're meeting - Lori will be holding the meeting on Friday and it sounds like an important one as the sub team wraps up.

Onto the Trademark Claims Sub Team with a brief update. I know there were two cochairs on that. Who would like to speak?

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, Kathy. This is Kristine. I'll give the recap. I know I cochaired last week. Just really quick, we thought we were going to wrap up last week. We've gotten pretty much everything done that was part of our original assignment. We also - two weeks ago during the plenary - or a week ago during the plenary session we were handed the proposals by Greg Shatan, Brian Winterfeldt and Michael Graham that related to suggestions for changes to the claims notice process. And so we are working those proposals into the charter for our sub team.

And so we will be hopefully - I've been remiss about sending around updates this week so an update will go out this afternoon to anyone who's on that sub team. Hopefully we'll finish up our deliberations on the list and then kind of put some punctuation at the end of it on Friday on our regularly scheduled call and we are hoping that this will also be our last week of meeting as well. Thank you, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific, Kristine. Thanks so much. And we know on the cochair side that we sent you a curveball from the working group that extended your work, so thank you so much for taking that on and taking on those proposals, the three variations of the proposals on trademark claims so appreciate your wrapping that into your work.

Great, well let's move on - and great thanks to everybody on these sub teams, both working on the list and working on the call. There's been a lot of work being done and that will help the working group tremendously move forward.

So let's move on to Agenda Item Number 3, which is really our third sub team that is about to kick off. So this item says, "Confirm scope of work and mandate of new sub team." And I'm going to stick with the old name until we choose a new name, so I'm just going to call it the Private Protection Sub Team. I believe it was Amr who circulated a list of variations of that name and so perhaps we'll be picking a new name soon. But until then I'll just call it Private Protections out of habit.

So this is not - this agenda item is not meant to do - is not meant to be a long discussion. But it is to confirm, you know, confirm that the draft questions of the cochairs is going onto the sub team and that a draft has been circulated with edits that has been posted on the Website. And I wanted to ask staff, when I checked the wiki, I did not see the substantive emails of Jeremy Malcolm, Greg Shatan, responding to him and others. Could we add those substantive emails because I think that was the decision of the group was that the correspondence on the list would also become part of the easily available record for the scope discussion that the subgroup - that the sub team will be holding.

So let me call on Paul and then on Mary. Paul McGrady please. Paul, you may be on mute.

Paul McGrady: Sorry about that. Paul McGrady here.

Kathy Kleiman: Oh there you are.

((Crosstalk))

Paul McGrady: You've actually got to be smarter than the mute button in order to participate in ICANN, which I'm not apparently. Thanks, Kathy. I guess I'm hoping that we can - maybe you could just step back a minute and tell us what we're, you know, what we're going to accomplish on the call in relation to this subgroup. There's obviously the naming issue, we've got the name in the agenda, we've got the name that you're reverting to. I think what you call things are important. Obviously I'm a trademark lawyer, I think that. But that's only sort of one issue.

I think the other issue really is getting to what this subgroup will be all about. There was back and forth on the list that some people were operating under the impression that this would be an information gathering exercise, I guess to help the larger group decide whether or not the current RPMs that are in place are you know, okay, if there are flaws in the current RPMs, you know, do the things that are out there that the registries are offering, do they fill in those gaps and so therefore there's no need to mess with, you know, adding additional RPMs?

Or, I guess in the alternative, some other people thought that this group would be put in place to sort of, you know, deconstruct what the registries and registrars are offering and I guess make - propose changes or those kinds of things. I'm in the first group, not the second group. But I guess are we going to decide that issue today before this other group kicks off, because if the other group kicks off without that issue being decided, I think it's going to be a waste of everybody's time. So I guess there's the name and the scope. Is that what we are going to do now? Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: No. No, that is what the sub team is going to do. And let me ask Phil Corwin to comment and then I'll comment as well. Phil, go ahead, please.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thanks, Kathy. And thanks, Paul, for your input. And this is a personal view, I don't think there's any official cochairs' view on this and when the cochairs agreed to the list of questions we put forward in the list we just kind of wanted to be broad and inclusive but leave it to the sub team to decide how to focus its work.

Number 1, on the name of the sub team, I think that's probably the least important issue it will deal with and one that shouldn't require much discussion. It's not that important as long as there's a common name that everyone starts using. I think the one in the - under the agenda called Additional Registry RPMs, is not the best because an addition to the registry offered RPMs, the sub team is also supposed to look at the extent in notice to rights holders provided by the Trademark Clearinghouse and it is not a registry. But other than that, I have no thoughts on that one.

On the questions, you've got the - we agreed on last week's call that the sub team would start with the original list of cochairs' questions with the amended list edited primarily by Jon Nevett where he believed that some of the questions were either out of charter scope or not relevant to our inquiry. And any email strings regarding the scope of the sub team's work, and I don't believe there have been too many of those.

So and then it's up to the sub team. I would - it's up to them how they'd want to proceed but I don't think it's a waste of time; I think on each one, you know, you can click through the - I guess the sub team can either start with the cochairs' questions and go through each one quickly and compare it to Jon's list and see if there's consensus that it's within scope and relevant or not, or they could start with Jon's list and discuss whether his suggested deletions are appropriate. I don't think there's a big difference either way.

But the point of this exercise is to inform the full working group of what is being out - of what is out there in the marketplace being offered in addition to the ICANN mandated RPMs to understand how they work, how they might enhance or interact with the mandated protections and to better inform our work on adjusting the mandated protections. That's the primary reason for the inquiry. So I don't want to go on too long. I think most of this discussion is better held in the sub team.

And again, there's - if anyone in the working group or on the sub team believes that it decides that a question from the cochairs or any other question they think is appropriate, has been excluded and they believe it should be within - looked at by the sub team, or the full working group, we're going to bring all - anywhere where there's no consensus we can look at that later on on the full working group. So but the main thing is to launch the sub team and have it proceed with working on the questions where there's good consensus that they are relevant questions and within scope. And I'll stop talking there.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you, Phil. This is Kathy again. That was very much the agreement of the cochairs was that it's time to launch the sub team. And I note it's very large sub team so, you know, a large segment, I would expect of the people currently on this call will be moving onto the sub team call. So I'm just going to make another comment and then turn over to Paul and then Greg.

That some of these questions go back - some of the questions that the cochairs have included in their draft questions go back to the original TMCH charter questions where people were really asking - it comes to us in the charter from the GNSO Council to ask questions about the TMCH so this is about contractual relationships between TMCH providers and private parties and understanding better the data the TMCH provider holds and shares and for what purposes. So those are the questions that we do start with from the charter.

Paul, go ahead please.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Kathy, and thanks, Phil. Paul McGrady here again briefly. I think if we're going to push the scope issue down to the sub team, but we do need to set some timeframe within which to resolve that issue and if we can't resolve that issue to be able to come back to this group and get it resolved. I, for one, am, you know, suffering from a one-year merry go round on the scope of the jurisdiction sub team in Work Track 2 and it's kept it from really making any forward progress on the real issue. So fine that it's pushed down but also we do need some mechanism to push it back up if we can't get across the finish line on it. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Great, Paul. And this is Kathy. Let me suggest that the sub team may want to work on the questions it wants to work on and then return to the working group to see if they agree with the scope that was chosen. But going forward is kind of the key issue at this point at least from a timeframe point of view and we're under a lot of pressure from the GNSO Council on that. Greg Shatan, go ahead, please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. Maybe this is a dumb question but I want to make sure I understand the work this sub team is supposed to do. The other two sub teams seem to exist only to review and revise or create questions which would then be taken care of by the full group, if I understand it, but this group is going to both deal with what the questions are and then get the answers as well or are all three groups doing both questions and then also coming up with the answers to those questions? Thanks, and sorry I don't know the answer myself.

Kathy Kleiman: Greg, hold on a second. Questions and coming up with the answers to the questions, the sub teams traditionally review, consolidate, revise but they don't answer. And flag data that might be gathered to assist in the answering of the question.

Greg Shatan: So the first two sub teams just basically did questions. And then their work was done. Will this group's work be done when it finishes deciding what the questions are?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, exactly like the other sub teams. Consolidate and clarify the questions, you know, if things need to be brought together because the same question's been asked three times, we can do that as well. Create an order, a logical order for the working group to go through the questions and suggest data that might be gathered to assist in answering the questions, exactly like the other sub teams in that respect, in terms of what's handed back to the working group.

Phil, go ahead, please.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Phil, quickly. Yes, we want the sub team to agree on what are the important questions for the full working group to focus on. This is a somewhat different exercise. The other sub teams are working off original charter questions. There were no particular charter questions on the private RPMs but it was the collective view of the cochairs that the full working group needs to understand what's being offered because at least it seems at least in regard to sunrise registrations that the availability of some of the private RPMs affects the use of sunrise and can inform decisions in that area.

But basically it's - we want the sub team to fairly quickly come back to the full working group with an agreed upon list of questions they believe are relevant to informing our work on the mandatory RPMs and are within the scope of our charter and identifying what data is currently available or may be available regarding the operations and efficacy of those private RPMs. And that's pretty much it. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks, Phil. And are there any other comments? And if not, let me - Mary, I'm on a different page looking at something else, can you tell me if there's

anyone in the queue, please? No, seeing none, great, then we will wrap up Number 4 and look forward to the new sub team meeting to come. And thanks ahead of time to everyone for thoughts on that.

Is there someone on the call who would like to speak? Okay, so now we move on to the updated work plan. And I'd like to ask staff to brief us on that and the edits that they put into it because this will guide and direct our work for the next few months and over the summer and into the fall. Mary, go ahead, please.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Kathy. Hi, everyone. This is Mary from staff. So what you're seeing on the screen dated 6 June is essentially - well, it actually is the same document that was circulated last week. What we want to note here, as we noted last week as well, is that obviously this still subject to change depending on the progress of the group overall and specifically at this stage depending on the final recommendations from the two sub teams that are currently working on refining charter questions for sunrise and claims.

So the main point is that we have, as usual, marked as milestones the various ICANN meetings. What we've also assumed is that at each of the ICANN public meetings, we will continue to request and hold a so-called face to face meeting of this working group which of course will include remote participation. And as everyone knows, we are planning for a three-hour face to face meeting in Johannesburg in about two weeks' time.

So it's possible that for the future ICANN meetings, we could also continue to have three hour face to face meetings but if need be, we could request the GNSO Council to allocate us a longer period of time to allow us to catch up with our work plan, as I said, if need be. So that was the assumption that underlies a lot of these timelines and milestones that we have in here. And ultimately you'll see that we are looking at finishing Phase 1 sometime in early 2018.

One of the things that we will need to do probably following Johannesburg where the other PDP working groups also have face to face meetings, is to get back with the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP group either through our community liaisons, that's Susan Payne and Robin Gross, as well as through the cochairs of our group speaking to the cochairs of that group because as you will recall, our work in terms of Phase 1, which are the RPMs developed for the 2012 round, does relate very directly to the work that they are doing for the Subsequent Procedures.

So that is, I guess, the other thing to watch out for. And so, Kathy, that's where we are. And hopefully we will complete Phase 1 in the timeframe that we have here. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific. Thank you, Mary. This is Kathy. In looking at the timeframe, one of the things that really strikes me is that we are now going to be spending, through the summer and into the fall, on the RPMs, on the sunrise period, on trademark claims and on private protections or whatever you'd like to call it, which means we're really not commencing our work on the URS, the Uniform Rapid Suspension until ICANN 60 which is think is Abu Dhabi.

So that's the kind of new milestones, new dates to put into the calendar but the cochairs really felt that the discussion that's been taking place over the last few months was an important one and so we've extended our schedule to accommodate that and appreciate staff's help in updating the work plan. Does anyone have any questions or - and of course partially it is a crystal ball; we're hoping to stay on the schedule. Anyone have any questions or comments?

Thank you. Then let's move onto agenda Item 5 which is discussing how to best use our time at ICANN 59 in Johannesburg. Could I have a show of hands among participants for who is going to be - who's currently planning to be in Johannesburg? You can raise your hand or hit Agree, but who's going to be there? Pause a moment. Terrific.

And, Mary, I know it's in the chat room, but could you come on again and tell everyone - our meeting is towards the end of the main meeting now - or large face to face session, could you tell everyone when that is local time, what day and what time? Thanks. Go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Kathy. And this is Mary from staff again. Yes, we have a three-hour meeting scheduled for the last day of the Johannesburg meeting which is Thursday the 29th of June. And in local time that will begin at 9:00 am and go until 12 noon. We do recognize that that's not a great time for folks who may be joining us remotely especially from North America, but you know, ICANN meetings are such that the scheduling does have to take into account a lot of other things and typically for ICANN public meetings, no matter where we hold it, working group meetings of the GNSO do tend to take place in the mornings on most of those days. So there we have it and we're sorry that for some folks that's not going to be a convenient time.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Yes, we are - this is Kathy. We are sorry that it won't be a convenient time. George, I feel your pain; I've been up in the middle of the night to participate remotely at ICANN meetings before, but we hope you'll do it for Johannesburg as you did it for Copenhagen. Jon Nevett, is that a hand? Go ahead.

Denise Michel: Hey, this is Denise Michel from Facebook. Sorry to interrupt. I just wanted to note that I'm on the phone. I don't know if I'm the only person on the phone and not in Adobe chat, but I'll be in Johannesburg and if you are trying to get an actual headcount, perhaps I could suggest that the staff ask this question on the email list. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific, Denise, good to know that you're on audio and that we will see you at the face to face in Johannesburg. Thank you for letting us know. It looks like Jon Nevett's hand is down so he may have just been indicating he was in Johannesburg.

Okay, guys, how best to use this meeting, believe it or not we don't have it planned because so much of the RPM work and sub team work has been in, you know, has been in progress and we weren't quite sure where the ball was going to be but we're getting a much clearer vision so let me share a few things, see if anyone has anything they want to add on the call.

One is that we'll have survey - we should have survey results by the time we get to Johannesburg so discussing the survey results of design marks and some of the other questions before us will be something that perhaps we should budget time for discussing the results and their implications. There are a number of questions in the data gathering - and I don't have them in front of us but those on the sub teams know with sunrise and trademark claims we have a number of questions for the registries and I believe some for the registrars as well.

Would it be useful to put a panel together of some of the new gTLD registries and registrars and maybe have that discussion, get them the questions ahead of time but have a kind of face to face discussion as we did with Deloitte. There's certainly not as much time to prepare but it might be nice to have that interaction if the registries can make the time to do that with us.

And then the sub teams will just be beginning their work so it's a little early for any conclusions or - I mean, the sub teams will just have reported back so we'll just be doing our work together so we could continue and just hold the regular meeting and talk about, you know, the sunrise period, which is, according to the schedule, the RPM that we'll be starting on. So let me throw it out, does anyone have anything that strikes me as very pressing and very timely to include in the face to face?

Okay, I see in chat that sending the questions to the registries and registrars would be helpful. Maybe that's something the sub teams - Sunrise and Trademark Claims, can highlight at - on Friday is questions that might go out

earlier rather than later to the registries. I see a number of people, that's a good suggestion. Susan, go ahead, please.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. It's Susan Payne. Just a quick suggestion, I'm not really answering the question that you posed when you finished speaking, Kathy, but I do think that it would be - that there's a tendency or it seems to me there's a tendency when we have these ICANN meetings to actually lose quite a lot of ground and a lot of time because we sort of, you know, the regular meetings pause, you know, then we have a meeting where we quite often don't really make substantive progress, then we have a kind of miss a week because everyone's traveling back and so on.

And I would really like it if that didn't happen. I mean, I think it would be really beneficial to just use the face to face as a time to conduct our substantive discussions and continue our work. I think it would be very beneficial if people who attend, if they're not members of the working group have informed themselves of what we're discussing in advance so that we don't have to spend time educating people and covering old ground. So that would be my recommendation.

Kathy Kleiman: That sounds like a good recommendation. Thank you very much. And I'd like to ask staff to note what Susan has just said in the notes so that we can review that. And just kind of moving forward with where we are in the discussion, that's a very reasonable position to take so that we move forward and not backwards. That sounds great. Any other comments? Mary, go ahead, please.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Kathy. From the staff perspective, we just wanted to go back to the suggestion of having a discussion or responses from registries and registrars, we're not clear whether the - that is something that was suggested to occur in Johannesburg especially bearing in mind Susan's suggestion immediately following that.

I think what we would like to note is that if there is support for a discussion of registries and registrars in Johannesburg, then our suggestion would be no only should we get the questions to the registries and registrars ahead of time, but that we really need to get invitations and confirmations out as to what that session is supposed to do and who is going to be at that session in order for us to make it productive, as soon as possible. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thanks, Mary. As you'll remember, the registry session came up during the cochairs' meeting last Friday and we - this conversation is leading into the next cochairs' call this Friday where we're going to try to really nail down what we're doing in Johannesburg. So Mary's suggestion is a good one. I should note, I found Copenhagen and talking to Deloitte face to face very useful because we hadn't gotten the answers to the questions we were looking for and we were able to get them face to face and then they finally followed up with written questions.

But I found that interaction with members of the working group as well as members of the public with Deloitte, very, very interesting and so - but I would agree that for the registries, if we had a discussion with the registries that should probably be a shorter time than we had with Deloitte, maybe something like half an hour. But something we'll be confirming on Friday but again, looking for input today. But you're right, Mary, we would have to get out questions and invitations as quickly as possible. And it might be a first meeting with the registries rather than a last because we're just kind of beginning the process for these new RPMs.

Anyone else want to comment? In which case, I am happy to say we are running not only on time, but a little early as we close this meeting. If no one has any comments. Mary, did we decide that we're going to have a meeting next week or did we not or are we looking for public input? I forgot where we stand on that because normally we don't hold the meeting as we head out the week that we head out to an ICANN meeting but in this case we were thinking - oh, I know, I think we want to survey but I'll let Mary - I think we

want to survey who's already going to be on route versus who can attend a meeting next week. But let me turn it over to Mary first.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Kathy. And yes, we had brought this question up last week. And my recollection is that most members were on the call last week had no objection to having a call next Wednesday. And primarily I think the idea there is to do a couple of things, one is to get the final report hopefully from the two sub teams that are already working, that is Sunrise and Claims, so that will put us in good stead for Johannesburg. And secondly, to agree and finalize the agenda for the Johannesburg face to face. So that's kind of the staff assumption between last week and now. But of course if something changes we can decide that as well. But that's sort of what we've been working on.

Kathy Kleiman: All right so let me ask, is there - are there people who absolutely can't make the meeting next week because you're already on route next Wednesday when we'd be calling our call? You can raise your hand, you can put it in the chat, you can put it in, you know, in one of the bars somewhere. I'm waiting - Steve Levy is typing. But right now it doesn't look - okay. Steve can't make the meeting next week.

Are there others who can't - I mean, does anyone have a strong objection to our holding the meeting next week for the purposes that Mary said, really to have the sub teams present and to finalize the agenda for Johannesburg? I'm waiting to read the chat. Paul, go ahead, please.

Paul McGrady: So I just wanted to lodge my non-objection. I think as long as we don't take substantive decisions next week but we really are using it as a prep time to gather everybody's thoughts and finalize the agenda so that our time in Johannesburg is efficient, I think that's a good call and absent outcry in large numbers I think we should go ahead. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific. Thank you, Paul. And Lillian says she's fine with us going forward. David says no objection. Susan, George - George says it looks like most

people can make it. I agree. So we will not make any substantive decisions next week but we will review sub team material and the agenda, which brings us to the end of this call. Mary, what time - Mary or Terri, what time is the meeting next week?

Terri Agnew: Hi, Kathy, it's Terri.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: …1700 UTC, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Sorry, two people speaking at once. Could you repeat the information please?

Terri Agnew: Hi, Kathy, it's Terri. We'll have the meeting the Wednesday 21st of June at 1700 UTC.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific, 1700 UTC. Thank you, Terri. Thank you, Mary. And that would conclude this meeting unless anyone has any other comments? Thank you for going through all the administrative things with us. We now go on to Private Protection Sub Team…

END