
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, folks. Welcome to the 35th Safeguard Meeting. I'm going to try and talk as little as possible because I'm struggling with a sore throat. With that said, let's start off with recommendation 16, which I have sent around a while ago to reflect the work that Carlos and I have done after our last phone call. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, and maybe if you can give both independent scrolling authority so they can scroll up and down, and make this bigger and smaller as they see fit. I'm making mine bigger.

So, these changes, which I'm hoping folks had a chance to read, basically requested the comments after our last call about this data collection, and the main thrust of the original comments were to change this; our recommendation really focused on a study to something that would focus on data collection, and specifically, this recommendation focuses on administration restrictions.

So, since it's been sent around, and since it's already been the subject of a lot of discussion, I will hopefully assume correctly that folks have had the opportunity to read this, and I welcome folks' comments and questions on this. I'm going to figure out how I get back to my big screen -- there we go -- so I can see if anyone has hands up.

I didn't receive comments from folks, so hopefully that means it did a good job of reflecting the concerns expressed. Any questions or

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.

comments on this? I'll give a pause in case of the scrolling through.

[AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, I don't see any questions, and I don't hear any comments. So, what we'll do is present this during the plenary call tomorrow, which as an aside, I may need someone's assistance with because, technically, I'm being called for jury duty, but in my experiences, that involves a lot of waiting, I still may be able to participate in the call. But let's present this recommendation to the team during the plenary call.

Jean-Baptiste, have we circulated this to the entire review team or has it just been circulated to the safeguard folks?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: If you wish, I'm more than happy to share this version ahead of tomorrow's plenary call.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That would be great, because I'm not convinced that we've done that. Yeah, so that would be super.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, no, no; that's correct. I did not do it, just because I was waiting for the final version, [CROSSTALK].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, yeah. No, no, no criticism; that was actually an inquiry; I wanted to make sure my recollection was correct. Okay. So let's circulate this,

and we can move on to Gao, so we can focus on recommendations 13 and 15, in light of public comments. And what I also want to emphasize is this part of recommendations 13 and 15, the focus is on response to public comment, so we'll also be grappling with whether and how these can be consolidated. But the first step is to make sure we're aware of and responding to the public comments, as appropriate. So I'll turn it over to you, Gao. [AUDIO BREAK]

GAO MOSWEU: Thank you for using my microphone. Can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's a little bit echo-y, Gao. So, I'm wondering maybe if there's a way to stand a little closer to whatever your mic source is.

GAO MOSWEU: I'm sitting very, very, very close to it. Okay, let me just close the door; okay, I'm hoping that is better.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It is better.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay. Thank you. So, recommendation 13 and 15, particularly speak about [inaudible] and the trust towards new gTLDs. The recommendation 13 is about doing a study to find out which new gTLDs have benefitted the most. And the reasons that consumers gave

visitations to those [inaudible] and new gTLDs over other new gTLDs. And what particular factors were in, which website consumers actually visit. And also, the behaviors, how their behavior determines how well they trust the new gTLDs.

And so this is basically premised on the base that in 2015, when the first of the two consumer surveys were conducted, over the two years, actually, we have found that there's an emerging trend that awareness in terms of new gTLDs is lower than awareness of legacy gTLDs by a margin that goes as far 46%. And so, where we get that awareness, the visitations therefore are lower as well compared to legacy gTLDs; there's a difference of about 46%. And so, that's what this recommendation is looking at, why do we see more awareness in legacy gTLDs, and less in new gTLDs.

And the measures of success -- I cannot scroll, I'll have to open my document. Could you give me scrolling rights? Okay. [AUDIO BREAK]

So, the measures of success would be indicators that include global awareness of new gTLDs; therefore, we'd like to see the gap reducing between the awareness of legacy gTLDs and that awareness about new gTLDs. We also would like to look at the incidences of visitation of the new gTLDs as our awareness increases, and just that there should not be such a big difference or such a big margin between the legacy gTLD visitations and new gTLD visitations.

Another measure of success is the level of trust for new gTLDs that it must at least be as favorable compared to that of legacy gTLDs. And we also want to see the correlation between the level of familiarity and the

number of visitations. I'm hypothesizing that as familiarity grows, the number of visitations will also grow. But the study will also look at the familiarity or awareness, the rates of visitation, both in legacy gTLDs and in new gTLDs.

So, the details there are -- we want to establish which particular new gTLDs have the most visitations, and any reasons that users would give to explain that choice in terms of visiting those new gTLDs more than visiting others.

And then, we also would like to look at the factors that determine the frequency and the regularity of certain gTLDs. And I guess that the question, if you look at it, is basically looking at what we [inaudible] knowledge, attitudes and behavior, and so the first three questions look at knowledge, the attitudes, and now, knowing what they know, and having the attitudes that they have towards new gTLDs, we would like to find out the behaviors which indicate the extent to which they trust new gTLDs.

One, does the fact that they are more aware and are now visiting new gTLDs -- is it a result of the fact that they trust new gTLDs because -- we have something called transferred trust, as in where for instance you would not trust a particular gTLD, but you would trust another one, in comparison. So if, for instance, there's been cases reported in terms of abuse or mistrust towards a certain new gTLD, would consumers gravitate towards a particular one because of wanting to run away from that one -- okay, I'm just putting it simply.

And then also whether there's also a reflective mistrust, where it's like, "I don't totally trust this new gTLD or website, but because I don't know it, or I'm not familiar with it; but I need to be able to trust it because my work for instance needs me to be able to visit it, or to visit it for certain instances of regularity, or to fulfill a certain need." So these are some of the questions that we're looking in terms of the behaviors.

While looking at, you know, the trust as a big component of the employment in particular, I know that one of the comments was about that they felt that we didn't look at trust in the whole system. But I'll get to that comment in the next recommendation. So, in terms of the study -- okay, I'll stop because maybe I'm speaking too fast. I'll stop and find out if there are any questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Gao, it's Laureen. I have a couple of questions. Do you have in details the premise of this recommendation? Was that in the original? It's hard for me to tell what's new and what was the original version. Was the premise of this recommendation language those two paragraphs? Was that in the original or is that new language? [AUDIO BREAK]

I'm wondering if you're on mute still because I can't hear your response.

GAO MOSWEU:

I was saying that [CROSSTALK].

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Now I can hear you.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay. I'm not able to scroll, but I want to find out if you're referring to the paragraph just after the red text.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. Do you have scrolling rights now, or is it just a technical problem? I'm assuming that everyone has scrolling rights.

GAO MOSWEU: No, I don't have scrolling rights. I don't have scrolling rights.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Maybe for the rest of this call, we can just make sure everyone has scrolling rights. It sounds like Jean-Baptiste is saying you do have scrolling rights, but maybe it's a technical problem.

GAO MOSWEU: No, I'm not able to scroll.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

GAO MOSWEU: I'm not able to scroll; maybe it's the browser I'm using, I don't know. Maybe it's my connection. But I'll type in the chat -- is the paragraph that starts with that sentence?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Exactly. So, is that new language? I don't recognize it, but I could be misremembering.

GAO MOSWEU: No, that's new language. That's what I wrote for this.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Okay. Okay, so, in general, it's helpful for I think all of us to be able to know what new language is. And I think the easiest way to do that is -- and I'm saying this for everyone because we've all struggled with this, I think -- the easiest way is to make sure your new language in a tracked changes version or in a different color font.

So here, what caused me to be confused is that you have language in red, and then you have language in black, and I thought the black language was original language, but I didn't recognize it, so I thought it was new language. So, this is new language?

So, I think what I'll ask you, for when you send around the next version, I think it's very, very, very important for everyone to know what is new because we agreed on the language that isn't new, and I want people to know what's new and what's not. Because we want to pay special attention to what's new and if there's confusion about what's new, then we won't be focusing on the right things. Okay. So this is all -- the success measures, and the details -- that's all new, no matter what color font, is that right?

GAO MOSWEU: Yes. It doesn't matter if it's black or red. Most of it is new.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, I think my first question is on the success measure. When I'm reading the success measures, although I think that those are great goals and would be beneficial, I don't think the study itself would achieve those goals, and I don't know that, even if the studies were conducted in the best way, that would be the measure of success. Because I think what you get when you conduct a study is you get information. And the measure of success is going to be getting sufficient information to provide to perhaps the policy-making process.

In other words, I think we're skipping a step, so to speak. That's just my sort of general observation here; that this success measure really has to be tied to what we're recommending. And what we're recommending is not a change in policy; what we're recommending is to gather this data.

But that's sort of my general reflection. I don't disagree with the success measures that we would want to drive to these things, but I don't think that's the success measure of the recommendation. And I think if you look at some of the other study recommendations that have been made, they talk about gathering sufficient information to drive policy-making. They've put it in terms of that focus; because just collecting information is not going to achieve these goals. Does that make sense? [AUDIO BREAK]

GAO MOSWEU: I can hear you in bits and pieces. I last heard the line that says the measures of success or the indicators of success must be inline with what we are recommending. And that you don't feel as though these success measures would be achieved by the study that we are recommending. Is that the general gist of the rest of your comment was?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, that's the comment, that we wouldn't -- just by getting this information doesn't mean that these results would be achieved. So I just think, in terms of the way we think through the success measures, it has to be tied to the recommendation. And here, we're just talking about gathering information. So I think the success measures need to be tied to providing information that could drive a policy-making process.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And I'll type something in the chat also, because it sounds like it's difficult to hear me.

GAO MOSWEU: All right. Thank you, Laureen. Are there any other questions or comments? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Did you want to talk more about the public comments, Gao?

GAO MOSWEU: Yes, you took the words right out of my mouth. I was just about to say that, in the absence of any further comments on this first recommendation, I want [inaudible] to the public comment. Yes?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay. So, the public comment that we received, we see there are 22. And three were in favor; three were against the recommendation; and one comment was neutral, while 14 were not indicating their stance with regard to the recommendation. So, I'll just summarize the public comment in that table, and the ALAC supported this recommendation. The Registry Stakeholder Group supported the recommendation itself, but not the priority level, and they questioned why it should be [inaudible] level or prerequisite.

And then, we have [inaudible], supported the recommendation, but not the priority level; they had suggested that over and above the suggested

items, there should be questions that are specific to brand gTLDs. I just wrote that -- and they include that while we work on the suggestion, and I agreed that it'd be interesting to look at the effect for a specific brand gTLD. We believe that the general study that we are proposing, not offer insights to brand gTLDs as well, and if they send out afterwards [inaudible] -- I'm not sure if at this point in time we could justify or add questions that are specific to brand gTLDs. I would need the team to [inaudible]. Okay?

And then, in terms of [inaudible] .com, they had in general comments which actually they gave for a couple of recommendations, because they kept -- recommendations 1 to 16. They give it in the documents about recommendations 1 to 16 that they should all be at prerequisite level, and that the information must be made public. So, they also express that they did not understand the definition of about the confidence of what we deem as consumer trust.

The NCSG commented that they didn't think that this was a prerequisite, and that there must be a specification for what [inaudible] to be taken at the expense of ICANN's organizations. ICANN.org just gave details as to the estimated resources that would be needed for the recommendation. And they also suggested that there be a convergence of other ICANN efforts, such as the gTLD Marketplace Index.

And I [inaudible] I don't think we have any other disagreements with the suggestions. It's just our idea is that our recommendation is up there, information is gathered; as to how it's done, we don't really have a problem with that. And if there are any commented that they didn't think it was -- they questioned the principality of the recommendation,

and whether the benefits would justify the cost, and they didn't agree with the level of priority that we state on the recommendation.

And some [inaudible] from the public comments was for us to review the level of priority of the recommendation, from it being a prerequisite. And then also that the cost, the perceived cost may really benefit, and that any cost that is spent on implementing the recommendation might outweigh the benefit. And then, that's the implementation of the recommendation must be in collaboration with other efforts in the gTLD Marketplace Index.

And then, there was also a suggestion in the public comment that the perceived indicators with a lack of trust not be included. And [inaudible] from GNSO, and recommend questions that are specific to brand gTLDs. I think, in general, we may concede to reducing the priority level to high-priority rather than prerequisite, in response to the comments. Do we have any questions? [AUDIO BREAK]

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So, Gao, I just want to get a clearer sense of what your recommendations are, in light of the public comments. [AUDIO BREAK]

GAO MOSWEU:

My recommendation, one is that we reduce the priority level, and two, that we consider posting this [inaudible] for web posting -- I forget her words, to the gTLD Marketplace Index; as such, it can also be -- its information can be collected there. Then, the [inaudible]; yeah, those are the two, basically. [AUDIO BREAK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think the priority level will be something that folks need a chance to think about. And what I'm going to recommend, actually, is we give the subteam more time to look at this, since it was got it shortly before the call, and not everyone's on the call. But is there a place where you've revised your recommendations to reference the consumer marketplace index?

Because I see that in your commentary, but I don't see if reflected in the revised recommendation itself. If that's how you want to change things, I guess my question is, have you actually incorporated that somewhere in the text here, whether it's in details or -- I guess it would really be in details or a change to the recommendation?

GAO MOSWEU: No, there isn't. I just wanted to present to the team and hear what your thoughts were before I can then sum it up and put in a revised recommendation. However, I can recirculate with the revised recommendations; put the wording up there of those recommendations.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. I think what would be useful is come up with a redline version that clearly shows all your changes, and then, if you have recommendations based on the public comments, make sure your version reflects that. Because then what you'll get is -- then you'll give the team a chance to react to what you're recommendations are, cause

we're going to react to what you recommend, rather than tell you what to recommend. Does that make sense?

GAO MOSWEU: Yes, that makes sense. Thank you, Lauren. [AUDIO BREAK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Does anyone have questions or reactions to what Gao has presented for recommendation 13? [AUDIO BREAK]

GAO MOSWEU: I don't know what to [inaudible], but I have to warn you that the issues that you raised with recommendation 13 will probably still come up in recommendation 15, since 15 actually follows the same comments. So, in light of that, would you still want me to present that now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, maybe we should give you a chance to look at these again and make sure that it's clear to us what the new language is, and that also that you've incorporated what you recommend to be changes in light of the public comments. Would that be helpful?

GAO MOSWEU: That would be helpful, yeah. But if we need to use that time, and there's nobody else who [inaudible] I could over the public comments, just so that we are all aware that public comments came out for recommendation 13.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. Let me take a pause for one minute. I think that might be what we'll end up doing, but I want to check-in with Calvin, just to get a sense of -- Calvin, where are we with your revised recommendation? It's just that I'm a little unclear about what's on the table from you. We had tried to slate you for today, but I'm not sure that those emails were received. So, do you want to just briefly respond, so we can figure out what scheduling is?

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. Yeah. I must apologize; my diary didn't reflect this meeting for some strange reason. In terms of the two main ones, there's recommendations 17 and 18. And I've submitted a two-fold approach to that, and that is combining the two, and I think that when you combine the two, it actually makes a little bit more sense, the two recommendations; as well as adding in some changes in there, for instance, that address ICANN.org's comments on those recommendations.

And so, that's where I am with 17 and 18, in terms of that. I don't know if we can get the stuff that I've done and put that up, so we can have a look at that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, when did you last recirculate those, and did that version look like the public comment?

CALVIN BROWNE: That was on the 15th of last month. It was the last time I sent it through. Nothing's changed since then, and it reflects some input from the public comments -- yeah. There was one thing that, I think, since the Non-commercial Stakeholders Group advised against, you know, striking these things out, but we went through the mandates and, you know, I'll have to disagree with them say that this is clearly within our mandate.

Yeah, so, you know, I'm pretty keen to get 17 and 18 combined and, you know, the feedback on that, both positive and negative, but my recommendations -- I personally think that it's, you know, it's a stage where we can either accept or people must tell me what they're not happy about.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And it looks like you have the new version up. Is there [CROSSTALK] -- yeah. Is there a redline, because I'm really wanting people to understand what the changes are, so that they can focus on what the changes are, although this version clearly changed cause you've combined them. Is there a redline version?

CALVIN BROWNE: I did send through a redline version; I'm not sure if Jean-Baptiste can put that up, or if it's not coming through in the redline version.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Well, let's see if we can get that up. Okay.

CALVIN BROWNE: Let me just increase the zoom for -- okay. Yeah, that almost looks like -- have here. That works, except that there's -- that one paragraph should be paragraph space; spacing should be removed there, but yes, that's mostly clear.

Oh no, all the stuff that I struck out of recommendation 18 -- cause I moved the stuff in recommendation 18 up to the beginning of 17. The rest reflected fine. Very strange, the redline is slightly different on my machine for some strange reason, but it gives you an idea.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Well, why don't you walk us through this, and maybe what'll ask you to do after the call is to recirculate your redlines to the team, and apologies that we're a little confused. But if you recirculate the redlines to the team afterwards, then I will be assured that everyone is looking at the version which reflects all the changes. But if you can walk us through this now, that'll at least give us your overview, which I know would be helpful.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sure. So, what I do is -- unfortunately, it's not on this redline version, but let's see if I can just get the original one. Recommendation 18 follows on from recommendation 17, and it basically says, "Once gathered, this data regarding WHOIS accuracy should be considered by the upcoming review team to determine whether additional steps are needed to improve WHOIS accuracy, particularly whether to proceed with the identity part of the accuracy-reporting system project."

Now, as a follow on from recommendation -- now what I've done, is I've gone and moved that into the beginning and put it in recommendation 17. And so, in order for the upcoming review team to determine whether additional steps are needed to improve WHOIS accuracy and whether to proceed with the identity part of accuracy-reporting systems, and then I lead into, "ICANN should gather data to assess whether there's significant percentage of WHOIS-related complaints applicable to the new gTLDs-related accuracy."

So basically, it's saying exactly the same thing, but it makes a little bit more sense when you put that first and you give the rationale for why you're doing 17 before instead of in a separate recommendation, 18. I'm not sure if that's making sense to anyone.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So Calvin, what I'm hearing you say is that it makes sense to combine these because that way you'll have the justification for recommendation 18, which focuses on how we're going to use the information and whether that's going to drive a decision to move on to, perhaps, an additional phase of WHOIS testing; that by combining them to have the rationale, basically, laying the foundation for the recommendation, as opposed to separating them. Is that the gist?

CALVIN BROWNE:

There you go. Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay.

CALVIN BROWNE:

Okay. And then, there's also, if you look right near the end, there's basically in response to ICANN.org's input, "ICANN should attempt to," so we soften this up, and we say, "Attempt to identify potential data sources beyond those that are contractually required, including but not limited to complaints received directly by registrars."

So basically, just making that softer, and I think that was actually based on some wording that I think Bryan might have sent through. So, it's really just to soften up that requirement on them, and make it a little bit less explicit so that they don't have to -- it's not an absolute requirement because this is data that's coming from third-parties; they may or may not be able to do it, so we really don't want to tie them into a corner and force them to actually try and get this data at all kinds of costs or methods.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay. Thanks, Calvin. The other question I have, and this is for everyone. We're also trying to put details as needed and success measures in our recommendations for the final version. So, what I would ask is that when this gets sent around again in the redline, if you could take the opportunity to make sure those are included, since that's what we're asking everyone to do for the final version; have those details as needed and success measures.

So you'll see that's what the emails said [inaudible] sending out have focused on to assess our format for the final version. So, does that make sense as something that you can add?

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. So, by success measures, we're talking about how we're going to measure the success of this recommendation, is that right?

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's right. That's exactly right. If this recommendation is successful, what will it look like?

CALVIN BROWNE: What will the results of it look like?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. How would we measure it?

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. Yeah, I can do something there. I don't know that will be too -- I don't think there's too much of a measurement here, I guess. No, I can do that. I can look at that, and put something in there.

The next one that I want to get into to is, of course, 24. And this one's pretty interesting. Let me just get that up in front of me, so I've got my stuff. Okay, I don't have anything --

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do we have that, Calvin?

CALVIN BROWNE:

I don't have any changes written in it on this. I mean, what I want to go through is I just want to go through this quickly, and just ask a question to the group. So, if you just me a sec, I'll get that up here.

Right. So, recommendation 24 is about the -- it's really based on the GAC advice, where they say that registrants that handle sensitive health and financial data, they have to take appropriate security measures, you know, inline with those services as defined by applicable law. And we go and we do a recommendation that we should initiate discussions with relevant stakeholders to determine what constitutes reasonable and appropriate security measures, and -- okay, we don't say anything about applicable law there; however, such a discussion could identify what falls within -- can we use the sensitive health and financial information and what matrix could be used to measure compliance with the safeguard.

Okay, so I think my issue is the language that made it into the contracts, actually says that it's "as per applicable law." And what I'm concerned about here is our recommendation seems to try and trump applicable law. So, I find myself in a bit of situation here in -- I don't really feel comfortable that we should get involved in determining what happens in these various jurisdictions where these contracts are done, and try and get involved in this conversation about what is appropriate and applicable law. I mean, you know, there's courts and so forth to sort that kind of thing out.

So, I really had an issue trying to reconcile this recommendation with the actual language that entered into the registry contracts. And I wanted to raise that for discussion.

LAUREEN KAPIN: You know what would be helpful, Calvin, since you're raising the actual contract language, is to see that actual contract language, because I see the point you're raising, but it's difficult for me to assess without seeing the actual contract language, too.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. What I've got is I've got something where I follow it through from the GAC recommendations through to what actually gets put in there. So, I'll send that through to people, and then we can take a look at that, and you know, I'll try and just add in my actual reservation there, as well.

And then, people can have a look at that and let me know what they think, because I think we may be stepping into something there that we shouldn't.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. And that's something we should discuss. So it would be great for you to be able to frame the discussion for us via email, so we have a chance to consider that. Okay. So, I see we are out of time. Gao and Calvin, thank you for your presentations today.

In terms of our action items for recommendations pending forward, action item is going to be with Calvin to recirculate this recommendation in light of your concern about a possible tension between the recommendation and the actual contract language. So, if

you can also include the actual contract language, that'll be helpful for us to assess it.

CALVIN BROWNE:

Yeah. I've actually pulled it out, so I can send it through.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Perfect. If you can send that to the subteam and ask for comments -- what would be great is if both can look at these items, we're going to getting information from Gao on recommendations 13 and 14, and from Calvin, on his; and Jean-Baptiste, you got the action item, I suppose, to recirculate his recommendation, and what I would say is including his concern that the recommendation and the contract language may be inconsistent -- might be inconsistent. So, it's either might not be consistent, or might be inconsistent. [AUDIO BREAK]

I'm sorry; I'm not being clear. So, including his concerns that the recommendation and the contract language might not be consistent; let's put it that way. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, great. Okay. So those are our action items, and we'll chat again next week, and in the meanwhile, I just want to emphasize for everyone, as you go into your recommendations, please make sure they have success measures in detail, and reflect any adjustments in light of the public comment.

But here's the big picture, we're not throwing out the baby with the bathwater. We've already done a lot of work and thought this through and gotten consensus, so these are tweaks. These are tweaks and

refinements in light of the public comments, and in light of including necessary details and success measures. But please don't think you need to go and redo these; these are just tweaks in light of the public comments process.

If anyone has questions and wants to speak to me offline, please just reach out to me. I'm happy to chat on this point. Other than that, I'll thank everyone for their extra time today, and we'll chat again next week. Thanks, everyone.

GAO MOSWEU: Thank you.

CALVIN BROWNE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]