
ERIC OSTERWEIL: ...the document that Geoff sent out. I don't want to run afoul of – the agenda, there it is. Okay, cool. Ah, nice. So I can slide right in there. I don't know if we have a default anybody to run the call. Should we ask?

DENISE MICHEL: I vote you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I'm more than happy to pick up the mantle in this case.

DENISE MICHEL: Unless someone else would like to do it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Going once.

DENISE MICHEL: All right.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Twice. Okay, cool. Obligated involuntary officer. Sweet.

If anybody hasn't had a chance to look at Geoff's document, please signify that now. Otherwise, it will be a lot easier, at least for me to kick off, I'd like to put myself in queue to describe some of the thoughts I had in going through the document. If I don't see any hands going up, I'll

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 assume that's a reasonable start and nobody has any starting off comments, questions, or proposals for a different direction. Cool.

I'll just go in line order of the things I came across when I read the document. The first one that comes up is kind of [inaudible] a bit. I found that the third sentence in the first paragraph seemed to me to be in contrast or in conflict with our overall scope defined in the terms of reference in that we had a number of discussions about how we only want to ultimately produce recommendations that fall within the purview of ICANN clearly, but that in order to understand some of the broader implications, especially if they were things like systemic dependencies and other issues, that we may and we actually expect we would likely need to look more broadly than that.

So the first thing that caught my attention was: "The broader consideration of the security and stability of the DNS ecosystem, its architecture," etc. "and actors is a topic that intersect with ICANN's mission in a number of areas, but the general topics are substantially larger matters and will not be considered as part of this review." To my sense, that was the first thing that caught my attention in that, that necessarily contradicts what we put in the Terms of Reference.

I'm not sure that anything other than – I want to hear if anybody has any comments or questions – but it isn't so much that I know whether we want to necessarily line item the text right now. But I want to know, was there some sense of why we readjusted the scope in this sub team. Does anyone recall? Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: I'd like to add – I guess you don't have a queue. I was chairing the first day's meeting in Johannesburg and wasn't able to join this group in its breakout session, so I don't have a sense of the discussion if there was one around this point. But I also see a bit of a disconnect between this group, why it was formed, and this statement that "the broader considerations ... will not be considered as part of this review." I also see this as contradictory to our Terms of Reference and also the responsibility or the circle that we drew around the topics for this subgroup to address.

It may just be a misunderstanding of how this is written, but one of the reasons that we have the group of topics in this arena under this subtopic area was precisely to address that "broader considerations" as they connect or impact on ICANN.

That's not to say, of course, that the subtopic group or the review team more broadly would issue a recommendation, get involved in an area that is outside of ICANN's scope. Everything we do is bounded by the mission and scope of ICANN as it's laid out in its Bylaws. But in order to understand the dependencies in the larger system in which ICANN carries out its responsibilities, I think we need to make sure that we understand a much broader landscape and also understand that ICANN

has a range of responsibilities, from being directly responsible to sharing responsibility to simply being one member of a global community and being broadly supportive or acting as a facilitator or other things like that. So I also, to wrap up my remark, find the introductory paragraph too limiting.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Thank you. Does anyone else want to make a commentary on this? I think one of the things that might be useful is if we have a note of the things that are coming up here. So we certainly ought to have discussion about them and if anyone has any perspective that they maybe recall from the sub team breakout or whatever, mentioning it now would be useful. But we might want to ask if someone can help us annotate any sort of things that need to be updated in this. I have a tracked version of a lot of my comments, so I'm happy to share that on the list perhaps after we're done with the call and we could go from there. But I do want to make sure that if there is some additional perspective that this is a good time to go through it. And I'll keep an eye on the chat room for anybody who feels more comfortable using that medium.

DENISE MICHEL:

Also, I was trying to find the initial brainstorming list of topics that was refined. I don't see that on the wiki page. Can staff point me to that? Bernie?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: There was an e-mail that Geoff had sent out immediately after the Johannesburg meeting.

DENISE MICHEL: I have that.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: You have that part?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm not looking for that. I'm looking for the brainstorming list that we broke into these topic areas and then we refined. We removed the duplication, we added more details. That list should be on the wiki page for this subtopic area. It actually should be linked to every subtopic area so people can track how we got to the subtopic areas and what the initial brainstorming and the initial list of topics was. That's an important anchor for all of the subtopic teams. Anyway, I don't want to take up time on the call, but when you guys find it could you send me a list please and add it to this wiki page?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Will do.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think that's a good point to help us if we get to a point where someone feels very strongly about something, it's helpful to look back and that would be a good mechanism to do that.

I'll move forward. As I said, I'll keep my eye on the chat room and hand raising and stuff like that. The next thing I see is in the "Root Zone Management Practices" section. There's "TLD label management (what labels go in the root zone)." I think that's absolutely a reasonable – oh, sorry. I see Boban has commented: "Due to the fact that nobody is on the call from the subgroup discussion" – which is, I guess, true. I'm not sure who was there. Certainly, I wasn't and, Denise, I heard you say you weren't. Standing by for Boban. Letting you finish. "Maybe we should move this discussion to the mail list."

DENISE MICHEL: I think everything we talk about today we also should talk about on the e-mail list. I think that's a standard assumption of mine that these calls are really important and useful to move the conversation along in the surface issues, but we should always be documenting and talking about things on the e-mail list for not only transparency but also to ensure that people who can't make the calls can continue to participate.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Denise and Boban, I agree with. For the record, I completely agree. Like I said, I want to put my comments out on the list. I'll probably put them out as a tracked changes version of the document. I think one of the things that might be useful here is, one, speaking more as a co-Chair so Denise will keep me honest on this, but speaking as a co-Chair, we really

want the sub teams to start moving forward rapidly. So inasmuch as there were notable absences from this sub team meeting, we really wanted to have the meeting anyway.

One of the reasons, for example, is unless people feel like it's not the best use of our time, which I'll be receptive to, I can go over the comments and concerns I have and we can actually evolve a shared understanding and then absolutely take it to the list. I suspect with utter certainty that when I send the document to the list it will spark some conversation.

This way, hopefully people can understand – the people on the call here and anyone who might listen to the recording can understand – the perspective that maybe informs some of the comments. So it's just supposed to be a higher fidelity way to start off the conversation and also us getting used to the fact that the sub teams need to meet more corporeal than on e-mail. Is that a fair comment?

DENISE MICHEL: It makes sense to me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Let's watch in the chat room for a second and get Boban's comment. Cool. All right, great. It's not that I want to beat this horse to death or anything like that. I just want to go over it.

So the "TLD label management" section, to me it seems like this is a good section to have and I'm not sure if the intent was to be exhaustive, but just to make it clear, obviously I think the four bullets that were

there were not an exhaustive list of things. It might just be a starting point. To underscore that, one of the ones I would have added, for example, is – so the ones that are there are – I say this mostly for Boban because he is, or I guess you can read the chat so I'll say it for Denise.

What's there is: "What guidelines and constraints govern the labels that are placed into the root zone of the DNS?" "How are these constraints managed by ICANN?" "How is change control exercised?" and "If a proposed TLD contains non-ASCII Unicode characters (IDN) what procedures are followed to ensure that the label meets these criteria?"

One of the things that I think is important add is, for example, what extent impacts and behavior relate to labels that will be or are in the root zone and how can this longitudinally be considered. For example, name collisions. There has been a lot of work done about name collisions in the last several years. It's easily argued that name collisions aren't related to the fact that there's a string that's in the DNS root but it's more about the consumption of a string and the result of that.

I think this is one of those cases where the [inaudible] statement at the beginning of the document wouldn't allow us to look at something that has already provenly been within the scope of concern. I guess I mostly would add that because it's a good instance, but I think even when we get briefings from SSAC or whomever else, there will be opportunities for us to see or understand that there are broader issues and how they relate to the work that we're doing.

DENISE MICHEL:

Makes sense.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Then moving on, there's another section below that: "NS and DS record management in the root zone." This one was kind of surprising to me. The first two of three bullets there look to me like, just wondered, do these belong more in the ICANN SSR Team's purview? Though they are appropriate. Honestly, I'm wondering. I'm not sure that I know that they don't belong here.

The first one is: "Are appropriate security practices used to ensure that changes are duly authorized by the correct party prior to inclusion onto the root zone?" The second one is: "Are the NS and DS records validated by ICANN (or PTI) prior to inclusion in the root zone? What steps are taken if validation fails?"

I certainly could imagine us having a lot of conversation about this, but I also thought this feels more like the ICANN or as it says maybe PTI internal processes and are they protecting the integrity and the validity of data in the zone. Is this something that belongs in this subgroup, or does it belong more in perhaps the other one? Does anyone have any thoughts on that?

DENISE MICHEL: I'd like to get in the queue. I'm sorry. I simply cannot into Adobe Connect.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: My understanding of how the broader team decided to split up these teams was where ICANN had sole or primary explicit responsibility for the activity that would go in the ICANN SSR group. Under that, I would see the label management as going under that group instead of this group.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. All right, cool. I see Ram Krishna said he agrees as well, and we'll take this to the list, obviously. I'm happy to hear everyone's perspective on this, but don't feel like you have to decide right now. Obviously, the list is probably going to be our primary mechanism for working through these things until the calls, not the other way around. But that's good. I'm glad it wasn't just me getting loopy.

The next thing that I saw – and, Boban, I'm seeing your typing, so I'll grab your comment when you have it – was under the “Respective roles of RSSAC and ICANN.” This one surprised me. Again, I'm going to just suggesting I think the initial scoping statement above is probably something that needs some work. But the “Respective roles of RSSAC and ICANN” really surprised me, mostly just because I didn't know why we were calling out RSSAC in particular. But nevertheless, when there's this subsection that talks about the root servers.

Sorry, I'll go back to Boban's comment: “Should be in the scope, no matter in which group.” Oh, yeah, Boban, it absolutely should be in someone's scope. Totally agree. It's just a question of which scope. I personally don't have a strong feeling if the two groups want to fence

over where it goes. It should just go somewhere. So I'm totally with you on that.

Anyway, so the root server operators, there's a bunch of discussion in the paragraph. I won't bother to read it to everyone. It says blah, blah, blah, "while the content of the root zone is the same across all root servers... is served in terms of finer level of granularity of the technical aspects of the service." So basically, the [priming] paragraph talks about the actual serving of data from the root server system. Then it jumps to a sub bullet about "Is it appropriate that such variation exists across the root servers?" without actually describing if there is a variation.

I put in three suggested [priming] bullets. "How consistent are the contents across all root servers [inaudible]?" "How much lag is there in attaining consistency after a change to the root zone?" "Are there any instances of substantial inconsistency or variation, and how would this be detected?"

There is a comment in there that says, is this RSSAC's [role] or the SSR teams? That really surprised me because I guess I feel like if we find an SSR issue, it shouldn't limit us that RSSAC should care about that too. If anything, it should underscore the fact that if there's an SSR issue that RSSAC should pay attention to, that we should really raise it to them. I guess my meta question right now on the call is, is there any reason why we should treat issues that are relevant to RSSAC as well with kid gloves or is really is it really if it's an SSR issue it's under our remit to address it and to outline it?

DENISE MICHEL: I'd like to get in the queue.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: An issue being within RSSAC's purview does not take it out of the SSR review team's purview. In fact, if that was our operating standard, there would be very little that the review team would actually be doing because of the activities of RSSAC, SSAC, and actually other elements of ICANN. Our responsibility is to look broadly across ICANN advisory committees and stakeholder groups and ICANN departments and even broader than ICANN where ICANN's responsibilities involve it in other entities. So I also would not agree to taking any RSSAC issue off the table.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Okay. And I hope I'm not misreading it. Since I wasn't there, I'm personally just telling everyone my perspective on having read it. So if I misread it, then I wouldn't want to impute to Geoff anything he hasn't said. But yeah, okay, I'm glad to hear that we're on the same page with that.

This next one may not be something that we get a lot of on our call here because I basically had a question at this next point. Right before Section 2, there's a subsection of one called "Respective roles of ICANN, PTI, and Verisign over the root zone contents."

There's a sub bullet: "Is this separation of roles appropriate?" I just wondered if there could be some background or some intuition behind that question. It seems very odd that in the SSR2 Review Team we would be questioning the separation of roles unless maybe we could outline that there was some reason to call that into question.

It sounds like nobody that was at this subteam meeting is on the call now that could answer that, right? Okay, I'll put it to the list. I'm just curious what the frame for that is. I think if there's a question we need answered, then we should absolutely take a look at it.

Moving on to Section 2, "Change Management." Down in sort of the weeds, there was just something I didn't quite understand. The third bullet, In coordination with ISO 3166 or both introduction and retirement of ccTLDs, what is the nature of the interaction between ISO 3166 and the root zone? Are all two-letter TLDs reserved? What about exceptionally reserved, traditionally reserved and indeterminately reserved names? Does ISO 3166 provide for cc name retirement in an acceptable manner?

Is that an SSR issue that we should be talking about? Because if it is, that's cool, I just don't completely understand it. It might just need more – maybe I don't get it, maybe I need to get hit with [inaudible] or maybe it just needs a little more framing text. Does anyone have any perspective on that? And basically, feels like that's just saying what TLDs are – okay, so I see Bernie and Steve both have their hands up. So, Bernie, why don't you go first? Unless I missed you before, in which case I'm really sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll let Steve go, and then I'll complete.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, cool. Steve?

STEVE CONTE: I was [dealing] with Bernie. I was actually in the subgroup that Denise and Boban and everybody else was, so I was not part of this one, but looking at this point that you just brought up and also the respective roles – the way I'm reading this is if I look at the stability of the SSR of unique identifiers within ICANN's whatever, these two points might be talking about looking at or evaluating stability. If we look at multi-role process for PTI, ICANN, and VeriSign to look at this third bullet that you just brought up – and I'm thinking of .su versus .ru, and .gb versus .uk, and there could be a stability question in there somewhere. So, I'm not making a suggestion either way, I'm just bringing up that there are two Ses in SSR, and maybe we should consider from all the different versions of [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Bernie, did you want to follow it up at all?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I do. Firstly, the retirement of ccTLDs is I would say almost purely the purview of the ccNSO. They've been working up to starting a group

to make policy recommendations on that, and that, if you will, got underway a few months ago, and they're working on getting everything together to actually start the work of developing a policy for that, because there is a bit of a policy vacuum when it comes to ICANN ccTLDs and their retirement versus the standard rules of ISO 3166 for the generation of ccTLDs. And I won't talk too long about this, but I spent three years working on this, so I can talk of this until the cows come home.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Pardon me. Denise, did you have a comment?

DENISE MICHEL: No, go ahead. I'll just get in the queue.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: The other point I wanted to make is there has been some discomfort between the ccNSO and the SSAC on the introduction of two-letter ccTLDs using other alphabets, and so there is the potential for visual confusion in some of those, and that may play into the stability part you we referring to. So, I hope this is helpful. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, that was helpful. Thanks, Bernie. Denise, did you want to go?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Thank you. Just briefly that Steve and Bernie, that's useful to have that background. Of course, the fact that the ccNSO is addressing this doesn't take it outside of our purview, but I would like to understand and perhaps [the] person who added this text on the list, we can ask that they provide some more background as to how the coordination with 3166 is in and the ccTLDs issues is stability issue that warrants the team's review. I'm absolutely not saying that it isn't, I don't have the depth of history in this area to understand the issue that the SSR Team should be addressing. I need a little background on that as well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yes, that's great. Thanks a lot, Denise and Bernie, and [inaudible]. So it sounds like that one may sort of be something that gets resolved through e-mail discussion. But yes, certainly the homoglyph, homomorphic issues that I don't read in the text but I absolutely heard from you, Bernie, those are interesting. And we'll see what comes back when we sort of have a more collected discussion, but yes, it's good to raise.

And so the Eric component of this diatribe I think is almost done. I just wanted to sort of go to two more things that were sort of in rapid succession in the bottom of section two: evolution of the root service, and consistency of identifiers. So, in the evolution of the root service, it felt to me like – I wasn't sure if this subparagraph – I'll go ahead and just read it real quickly in my standard sort of like scribble.

Does the future security of the DNS root service rely solely on current root server operators and the infrastructure they operate? Should the model of distribution of the root zone data evolve to include consideration of the opportunities offered by DNSSEC such as local root, secondary servers and recursive resolvers DNSSEC NSEC caching? How can ICANN assist in these measures to assist in scaling the root and making it more resilient to known attack vectors?

This, basically having spent more than a decade doing this sort of stuff really surprised me a little bit, but it's mostly because I wasn't really sure, is this a suggestion to investigate something? Because it really seemed to presume that there's a problem, perhaps a scaling problem that I'm not really aware of, but open to hearing about.

It sort of felt like this text was proposing a solution to a problem that was left to be inferred. So, local roots – I think Steve Crocker calls them hyper local roots, whatever you want to call them, that's a pretty radical change, and I feel like we probably should outline what the concern is. Unless anybody can sort of illuminate that for me, I don't understand it.

And then the consistency of identifiers, this one surprised me as well. The DNS resolution protocol is not the only protocol that performs a mapping from a domain name to a IP address or other "attached" attribute. To what extent should the ICANN community take steps to ensure that a domain name has a consistent meaning irrespective of the method of name resolution? I.e., is ICANN's remit solely concerned with domain names as resolved by the DNS protocol, or does it extent to domain names as resolved by any protocol in the context of the public

Internet? Or domain names irrespective of the name's manner and context of use?

My concern about this, again, is it feels to me like it tried to impute a problem through describing what's wanted. So, for example the name collisions issue to try and beat that horse a little bit more. The name collision issue is one example where there is an interaction that is unintended between potentially – and in some cases very specifically – disparate namespaces, whereby I resolve a name in what ultimately is “the wrong namespace,” but that resolution dictates the reaction I have to it.

This is why I think we have the framing text in the team's terms of reference scope of we may look broadly, but we will focus our recommendations appropriately. Because, yes, if there's a namespace that isn't managed by ICANN, ICANN can't control that namespace. But if there's an effect in the ICANN-managed DNS infrastructure because of an external namespace, it's important to be cognizant of it.

So, I just did a huge word vomit, so hopefully that was not completely incoherent. But does anybody have any perspective on that, something that they recall from conversations or anything, or any perspective at all? Fair response.

So yes, so these are the sorts of things that I saw when I read through the work topics draft, and I'm hopeful that we can have a good conversation about this on the e-mail list, and that that might lead us to sort of a healthy discussion the next time the team meets. So, looking at the size of and the number of people who didn't make the call, it feels

like it might be somewhat inappropriate to try to choose a sort of a recurring timeslot right here, right now.

DENISE MICHEL: Can I get in the queue? [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, so I agree. I've seen so many Doodle polls come across. Can staff remind us? We've just done one Doodle poll for this group, and it was related to this specific call. Is that correct? Or have we done a Doodle poll for a timeslot for a reoccurring call for this group?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi, Denise. We did this meeting as a one-time timeslot meeting.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. So, Geoff [inaudible].

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Geoff was the rapporteur, right. Exactly. You can make Monday–

DENISE MICHEL: Several people were at the IETF, I think. It was part of our challenge, and so we were thinking that we could grab a time that might be friendly to the people who were in Prague for IETF and have a call this week. And then we didn't do a Doodle poll for a standing call though, right?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: No. Currently, Geoff could make Monday 17:00 UTC, but that didn't work for some other folks. So, we can put out an additional Doodle poll if you want with some more creative time zones, or we can heck and see if the 17:00 UTC works for everybody else, because that did work for Geoff, and that would be Monday. Monday, 17:00 UTC.

DENISE MICHEL: As a standing time?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I would have to confirm that with him. That I would have to confirm with him. I know this Monday did. I would have to confirm revolving and standing orders with him.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. So, obviously we need the whole team – we need a time that's good for a majority of team members. Well, for people on this call, if they had a reoccurring time of 10:00 on Monday, is that – I'm sorry, I'm talking in Pacific Time. 17:00 UTC on Mondays, do we know if that works at least for the people on this call?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The 17:00 UTC would be noon Pacific Time, right? Or am I wrong?

DENISE MICHEL: I think it's 1:00 PM Pacific. I mean 1:00 PM Eastern. 10:00 a.m. It's 10:00 a.m. Pacific.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I think that works for me. So, I just signified agree, but yes, that works for me.

DENISE MICHEL: How about others on the call?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I see Boban says it works for him, and Ram Krishna says it works for him.

DENISE MICHEL: Awesome. So, with that, hopefully we can short circuit this. Could you just send an e-mail out to this subgroup and ask people to shout out if 17:00 UTC on Mondays does not work for anyone for a standing call time? And then we can decide later how frequently we need to meet, but if we can hold the 17:00 UTC on Mondays for this particular subgroup and avoid another Doodle poll, that would be awesome.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Thank you, I will go ahead and do that.

DENISE MICHEL: And then just if I can then kind of get back to the substance, I think it was really useful to surface initial issues for this subgroup. It strikes me that it might be useful as we go through these issues to articulate the challenge of the SSR challenge as well as you noted a couple of times, Eric, that the initial drafting to jump into solutions. And I think some of us had questions about why different topics were viewed potentially as an SSR challenge, like ccTLD activities in the root.

So, I have a question. Would it make sense in our next draft to articulate just a couple of sentences on what members see as the SSR challenge? And then if they have additional contributions on activities that the team should look at, or what they view as the path that the team needs to explore at that as well. Just as a kind of working protocol, I'm wondering if that makes sense.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That makes sense to me. Do you think that people should sort of proactively write that up or annotated the document, or if we should sort of have a freeform discussion? Any thoughts on that?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I was thinking that if people could – that perhaps a useful next step would be just to start sharing redline edits and comments on this document, and just start building it out. And if people could in that context add what they view as the SSR challenge in the different areas, I

think that would be useful. And then separately – and it’s just so helpful to have something concrete to use as a stepping off point, so I really appreciate the fact that Geoff took time to give us a first sort of strawman draft to start working from. It’s really helpful.

And one of the reasons I want to make sure I look at the initial list of topics that the full review team put under the subtopic area is that I think we need to flesh out the topics that the subtopic team addresses. I know they’re sort of a placeholder without any specifics under DNS abuse, for example, but I think there are other issues that the full team expected this subtopic team to address that don’t appear on this list. So, I just wanted to flag that for people. I’ll be as part of my redline edit suggesting bringing in some of those topics from the list as well. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yes, I think that’s really great. I think this is probably going to be one of the better sort of attended and more energetic subgroups, so I’m looking forward to it as well.

So, if there’s anything else that we ought to talk about, Any Other Business, I think now would be a good time to raise it. And Boban gives you props, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL:

Why thank you, Boban.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Otherwise, we might all wind up with 12 or 13 minutes of time back on our calendars. Going once, going twice for Any Other Business. Okay, cool. So, our friends in [inaudible] will help send a note out about potentially scheduling for this coming Monday – or for Mondays in general, sorry – and my math skill is proven wrong by Denise. I accept that. But yes, and I'll set out my redlines, and like Denise suggested, if others have redlines as well, please send them to the list and we'll look forward to Monday.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you. Thank you, Eric, for jumping in and chairing the call as well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Totally my pleasure.

DENISE MICHEL: I appreciate it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: I look forward to continuing this discussion online.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Alright. Talk to you all later.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]