
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: I would just like to welcome you to the RDS-WHOIS2 Rec 4 Compliance Meeting #2, on January 22, 2018 at 14:30 UTC. In agenda today is Susan and Alan, and from ICANN organization we have Alice, Jean-Baptiste, Amy, Lisa, Steve and myself, Brenda. This meeting is being recorded, please state your name for the transcription, and I'll turn it over to you, Susan. Thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks Brenda, so we've got great attendance from ICANN staff and I appreciate that. So Alan, I'm not sure we're going to get any team members this morning and maybe [inaudible], the meeting was cancelled, but then rescheduled this meeting. You know, the regular plenary call was cancelled. So just wondered if you had thoughts on any of the questions that were included on this document, and whether or not we should add other questions or requests, any input?

ALAN GREENBERG: The short answer is I didn't look at the document recently. But I'm willing to read it right now?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, what are the changes that have been made since the last version, is that obvious or not?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I don't think the track changes were on the report, let me pull up what my version shows. So of the things was that staff compiled the two working groups obviously, so the sub-groups. Some of the questions I think on the second page, or third page was -- I'm a little confused over the committee, and that's why I was hoping Chris or Erika would be on the call; on the board sub-committee that does oversee Jamie's work, and so I put in, how does this sub-committee oversee Jamie's work?

What reviews have been done, reports, do they weigh in on the yearly assessment, and I realized, Jamie's I think he's only been in the job a year. Who is on the sub-committee? Can staff provide a list of the members with SOI or CD? And then I responded to Erika's comments as Erika indicated in her comments there is not a board compliance sub-committee; we should review how impactful the WHOIS Board Committee is and whether or not we make a recommendation that this Board Committee oversees compliance in general.

So there's supposed to be some sort of WHOIS board committee, but not a compliance. And she also referenced a risk committee; I have no idea what the Risk Committee does, but I thought that would be interesting to find out.

I added some questions about the Compliance Team; a number of employees on Compliance Team. Does the Compliance Team contract with any vendors? Do you find a need after roll-out, and that was the roll-out of the new gTLDs, to implement new processes or technology? That is about all of my inputs to this.

And the other thing that we were thinking about doing is trying to schedule, and Alice is working on this, just a short meeting with Compliance next week when Chris and I, and I think Erika is going to be there too, are in L.A., just more of for setting some ground rules or finding out the easiest way to interact with Compliance and set up meetings for the whole sub-group to interact with, and do the reviews with, as a Compliance Team.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That all sounds fine. One question; are we trying to, in the work of this group, divide it into what we are doing on behalf of reviewing the last recommendation, and what we're doing in terms of the new topic? Or are we simply trying to amass all of the information gathered and weave for any -- I mean obviously in the report there's going to be two separate sections. So to what extent are you looking at it right now as if there were still two separate groups? Two separate [CROSSTALK], not groups.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Right, that's a good question, and I guess in my mind, and I mean I made that clear in the document that we should review the actual recommendation maybe first, focus on that, and then from that sort of

come up with other questions that would be that additional compliance review. So recommendation four and then what was, I don't even know what the sub-groups number, but what's the full compliance and what's going on. Does that seem feasible, or...?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, that seems reasonable. I'm trying to eat an English muffin and trying to mute as I crunch, so I'm going on and off. Yeah, that seems quite reasonable. I guess until we actually start, you know, going into some finer level of detail as to exactly what are we going to ask them, and things like that, I think it's all going to remain vague.

Maybe the next step, it would be nice if we had more people on the group, but I think at some point we have to start getting into the details of what are we going to ask, what are we trying to—especially on the second part of the project. We're looking at new things, because right now reviewing the old recommendations is moderately simple.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Right.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Deciding whether we can follow on recommendations is a next step on the process, and there may or may not be any. It's the new one that I'm a little bit concerned of trying to in a timely matter start mapping out what are we going to do, because unless we have some sort of road map and work plan of how we're going to go through this, two months from now we're going to suddenly find out we have the draft report

ready to start putting together and we haven't really identified what it is we're talking about yet.

So I guess I'm just a little nervous that we start putting together some details pretty quickly. And certainly I haven't done that, and I guess I want to see the group working together and starting to put some ideas, and we have Carlton on the line now I see.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, good morning Carlton, or afternoon for you maybe, late morning? No, I would agree and a lot of this in this document is more of to spark that thinking I think, but I can take it to the next level too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well I think it's almost one of these things that each of us have to independently, and then merge the debate whether some of this stuff really should be there or not, and then merge whatever's left into a single, cohesive plan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, can you speak?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: And Lisa has her hand up, Carlton is typing. Go ahead, Lisa. Good morning.

LISA PHIFER: Good morning. Thanks, Susan. I just wanted to maybe help point out how the information that you had previously compiled for topic 7 was merged into this combined document, so if you look at the change marked text, anything that is change marked in blue actually came from the topic 7 document which is the additional objective now to be addressed by the joint sub-group.

So for example, the questions that you'd originally identified for topic 7, they appear on page 6 I believe. So anything you see on page 6 that's redlined is actually questions that you had identified for that; what Alan referred to as the new work item, but that's previously topic 7, that objective.

And I also wanted to call your attention to, there's a link in the chat for the Risk Committee's charter, which might be one of the documents that you find useful as input.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, thank you. That is helpful. Let me look at the Risk Committee. And Carlton? Carlton is saying he didn't hear the point you made clearly, Alan. Do you have any input on this document, Carlton?

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, what I was saying was, I'm looking for the time that we start actually putting together a relatively detailed work plan on how we're going to accomplish both of these, and both to give Compliance some sort of heads up as to what kind of things we're going to be looking at, and to make sure that two months from now, or whatever the time is that we're supposed to be in our face-to-face meeting and starting to compile the draft report, are we going to have the—my concern is this is one of the few topics we're looking at which is really going to require some subsequent work and investigation. And I want to make sure we start on that sooner rather than later, is the summary I guess.

Lisa, I noticed in the Adobe Connect this is version 1, but this is version 1 presumably of the combined topics, is that correct?

LISA PHIFER: That is correct. It's the version1 of the compiled compliance document, and it's actually sort of 1+ because it has Susan's edits as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, is this one on the wiki at this point?

LISA PHIFER: Yes it is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so if I download it and read it on the plane today, I'll have some idea of where we are, and can start on my behalf doing what I just said

everyone should do. It goes along with also reading all the GDPR documents.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Good luck on that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a four hour flight, and an hour or so in the lounge ahead of time, maybe I'll get it done, we'll see.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: And Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks. So I wondered if, and I'm sure you have, but if we could spend a minute talking about what you think the objectives might be for an initial meeting with the Compliance Team when you're in Los Angeles, and any specific questions that you'd want them to be prepared to address in that initial meeting.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: You know, I think it's been awhile since I've paid very close attention to the Compliance Team, and so my thoughts, and maybe this doesn't require Maggie and Jamie both, but is to just get some basic information about the structure; like how many employees are there? How many people are in management? Do they break the work up [inaudible]?

Who is the separate little team or—I shouldn't say little—separate team is, but you know, do the people who work on the WHOIS and accuracy reports, what kind of other things too, do they see an overall picture of the compliance issues that are brought to the team's attention?

Sort of just some basic structural questions, so then that would help us sort of pinpoint who we need to talk to and the tools they use for any WHOIS issue, and then just some of those questions I've put in the document, but more of just not delving into an actual review but sort of prepping, and it would help us figure out what those detailed questions are I think while talking to Compliance.

Do you have any recommendations on that, Lisa? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, so we've got to --

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's Alan. As you were saying all that, my only thought was it's unfortunate that all of that kind of things of tell us about the compliance in terms of the organization, who does what, what tools do you use, is the kind of thing I'd like to have seen on the web as part of their normal openness, and unfortunately for ICANN, there's an organization chart at the top level, but there's not really a lot about any of the sub-groups and how they're organized.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: My own personal little bugaboo.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. Lisa, I think that your objective does grasp what I'm trying to say.

LISA PHIFER: Yeah, I copied essentially the questions you were raising into chat, just to capture them, but I think what you're looking for is something that essentially lets you see the structure of the compliance organization with respect to who works on WHOIS, right?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Correct. I guess one of the things that concerns me is, is the WHOIS -- the work is so siloed within the Compliance Team that when complaints come in and it's frequently one registrar, they just answer the WHOIS question, or deal with the WHOIS compliance matter, but they have no idea that there's also the registrars, say that the registrar is behaving badly in some other areas too, so there wouldn't be an overall compliance action.

It's not a cumulative, it's, "Oh, we took care of this compliance action with this registrar, or this registrant, but we're not looking at the bigger picture." I guess that's sort of what I'm getting at with wanting to know the structure and who does what, and really who we should interview, you know, down the road. It looks like Carlton also says the CCTRT team was originally scheduled to visit with a client but the time did not allow.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not obvious that Compliance is organized or should be organized around things like WHOIS. I mean they have an overall job to do, and WHOIS is a part of their compliance, but certainly not -- it may end up being the major part of what they do because of the WHOIS world we've gotten ourselves into, but overall they're enforcing contracts which have a lot more in them than just WHOIS.

So it's at all clear that the organization is going to map to WHOIS. But still, we need to understand how the various WHOIS related things are done within the organization.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Exactly, exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think one of our challenges is going to be not to wander into the non WHOIS areas for two reasons; number 1 it's a diversion from what we're doing, and number 2 it's the one thing which will start raising red flags, and cause what [inaudible] that is problematic; we don't want to get into an SSR2 situation, being accused of doing things that we're not supposed to be doing. Nor do we want to waste our time. I think [CROSSTALK] that might be.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, but I do think that any compliance action taken on a WHOIS should be -- and you're right, we're not going to get into, "Are they compliant with their contracts, and how does that whole process work

within ICANN aside.” It would be interesting to find out how the WHOIS is handled, you know? Carlton, you have your hand up?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Hi Susan, thank you, Carlton for the record. I just wanted to endorse having a substantive face-to-face meeting with compliance; I tell you that we were very keen to have such a meeting from the CCT review team. Marie came to see us a couple of times, and just dropped in on the meetings and she was very informative about what was happening there, but I think we need to delve into greater detail.

We see some early signs that some things are changing in compliance in terms of reporting, in terms of data, harvesting of data from the registry, and the registrars, but what we are not certain of is they keep on saying there is more to come. But we don't have a very good sense of all the work is going to be arranged to keep the progress going, and I certainly believe that [inaudible] definitely want to know how that is going to progress.

So I personally think that we should try to get more substantive information about how the team is organized, what are the sources of data they are capturing, how the data is curated and so on. I really would endorse that, thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Thanks, Carlton, and that is a question, one of the ones you've brought up was, we've seen some changes, but there's more to come. So I'm

wondering if we add a question on; do they have a road map for future changes already that affect the WHOIS compliance?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Absolutely. Can I just say the other thing that I'm quite intrigued by is the several strains of work that's happening in ICANN, or the constituencies about the impact of GDPR on WHOIS. That I believe is part of the decision, but also the message from compliance is that registrars, the constructive parties would be waived for compliance with until such time.

And what they want is some reasonable -- they want to get the contacted parties to offer to suggestions on how they're going to proceed and they are to evaluate those, and make a determination as to what was followed. That will have significant impact on the work inside compliance, and I think it will probably be well of us to have some kind of signal as to what their thinking is, how you handle all of that internally. That to me is very important. Thank you

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, it's quite clear that their world of compliance, enforcing WHOIS is going to change as the GDPR story evolves. But on the long term, it's reasonably certain I think that we are going to have some level of WHOIS, and whatever is there we will stabilize on what is going to be required for the various registrars in different locations and for different classes of registrant and there will be a level of enforcement, even though we don't know what the details are right now.

So the infrastructure is not going to change, it's just going to be a lot more -- you know, have to determine whether this rule applies to this particular registrar/registrant or not. But there is still going to be some level of enforcement in the long term, we just don't know exactly what the details are at this point.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I would agree. Go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Sorry Susan, I just wanted to follow up on Alan. I would agree that we don't know long-term, but the work flows definitely. Infrastructure, maybe I call it work flow's infrastructure as well and I think the work flows are going to change significantly.

To my mind, if you have to deal with several levels of WHOIS and don't come to a common agreement that is global in nature, that develops several multiple work streams, so at the team and so on, that is going to be quite a hell of a task, so I would say that I'm more interested to hear how they will organize themselves to be in place, but I do believe some level of WHOIS is going to be available still, but getting to that is going to be the deal that we would want to at least hear how they manage that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't worry about that nearly as much, because whatever WHOIS environment we're going to be in, it's going to have to be well enough

to lineate it that all the registrars and registries can follow the same -- be working from the same hymn book so to speak.

And compliance will have to work from it as well, but it's going to have to be all well determined and we can recognize from a given WHOIS record which set of rules applies, but yes, it will imply slightly different work flows, but I think a large part of that it's going to have to be, you know, automated, you can't have to have a person looking at the record to decide which set of rules to use. Before we go on, I [CROSSTALK].

CARLTON SAMUELS:

That's a wonderful example. That's exactly one good example.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Question for staff; we've been told that to organize a face-to-face plenary meeting, we have to allow several months. Can I assume that if we want to organize a meeting in L.A. with this work group, or two days or whatever it's going to take, that we can do that on a much shorter time scale than for a whole plenary? I guess that's to Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Hi Alan, yes it's Jean-Baptiste. So you mean like with the full review team or just those who are present in L.A.?

ALAN GREENBERG:

This subgroup.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Because at this stage what we are trying to do is to have the root numbers that are present in L.A. to physically meet with the compliance members in Los Angeles.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but that's not going to be two days of meetings, they're going to try to squeeze an hour out of an already tight schedule. I'm talking about sometime between now and the time that we're supposed to meet in a plenary meeting, wherever it is, to actually [CROSSTALK] or not of work.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I mean as I mentioned already, if we wanted to organize a face-to-face meeting that would be 90 days.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was [CROSSTALK] for the plenary; we're talking about a face-to-face with four of us or something like that. Are you saying you also need that same level of time?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: It can't be 90 days. So that's just for the sub-team, you mean?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, if we want a meeting in L.A. with compliance with just the sub-team, that is four or five people, what kind of lead time do you think we will need to do that?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thanks for clarifying, Alan. This I wanted to ask, so for [inaudible], but for a sub-team I've never had a case so far, so I'll be asking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa, if I could just add; so the factors that go into determining lead time are things like, do you need separate meeting space, do you need additional travel support, and so on, so in the case of your upcoming time in L.A., you don't need additional travel support, it'll already be there.

You're looking for something brief, you probably don't need separate meeting space, just a time to meet for an hour or two that obviously doesn't require nearly as much lead time as something that requires booking of space and booking of travel.

But we can provide you with an answer, concrete answer, for in the case where you have a sub-group that wants to have space allocated and travel booked, how much lead time is actually needed for that kind of meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I mean in terms of working space we would need one of the small conference rooms that we would book for the day or so, holding five

people. That shouldn't be a challenge in the ICANN offices. The only challenge is hotel and airfare and making sure the compliance team are available at that point.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah. Alan, I thought I heard [inaudible] a couple of hours. I'm not thinking that this kind of conversation is going to be a couple of hours, you know.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, what I'm talking about, Carlton, is a few days.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay, I get you, yes, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are some people in this sub-group who will be in Los Angeles next week, and they hope to take out of those hours to talk to compliance, you know, squeeze it in between lunch or whatever like that.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, this is going to take days.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, compliance --

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: It's two meetings.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, there will be a few people in Los Angeles next week and they will try to find an hour or two to talk to compliance; that's not the meeting I'm talking about.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Got you, got you, got you. Sorry about that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So yes, I am in L.A. next week, Chris, [inaudible] and Erika, so I thought we could take advantage and just have a very introductory meeting for some of these structural questions, which would help guide how we plan out, like a two-day meeting with compliance.

CARLTON SAMUELS: You're talking about a few days, okay. Thank you, Susan, thank you for that explanation.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, just taking advantage of the fact that I have to be there anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Housekeeping; this is a meeting scheduled for 90 minutes but I'm going to have to leave at the very latest after 60.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Oh okay, well I don't see this going that long anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I just wanted to let you know though.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I appreciate that. And Lisa, you have your hand up.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks. I just wanted to call your attention to, as Jean-Baptiste has been trying to capture those questions for your initial, very short meeting with the compliance team in L.A., they're on screen now; are those the kinds of questions that you want the compliance team to prepare to answer, and maybe if you want time to review and finalize this list, can we set a time frame for doing that so that you give the compliance team enough heads up to be prepared?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right. Yes, so let's say Wednesday? Because I would like to go over -- you've extended some of these questions and I would like to go over them again and I'm sure others on this sub-group would too, so would Wednesday be adequate enough time to send to the compliance team the questions?

LISA PHIFER: When are you actually hoping to meet with the Compliance Team?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Alice had some tentative...let me go back to that e-mail. It's either a Wednesday, Thursday or Friday; let's see...February 1st, there's a couple of choices. Friday the 2nd, I think that's just with Chris though. Or yeah, it looks like Thursday or Friday, Thursday probably is when we would need those questions, we would be discussing those questions, so that would give them a week lead time, do you think that's adequate?

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa, I think that the kinds of questions that you've identified so far, a week to prepare sounds reasonable. If you were asking for more in-depth briefings I think they would need more time to prepare, but the impression is these kinds of questions that you've asked in this call, a week's lead time is reasonable, but of course I'm not the Compliance Team; they'll have to answer that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right, and this is really more to sort of start the discussion, not to do an in-depth review, so if they didn't have the answer to these questions at that meeting, that would be fine too. It's always just good to talk to people face-to-face [inaudible] and sort of start the conversation with them.

Okay, what else should we be focusing on here?

LISA PHIFER: So if I could suggest, maybe you want to set a target for when members of your sub-group, including those not on today's call, would have looked at the documents and provided some feedback?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So let's say Tuesday evening maybe? Does that make sense? So if we can add the questions to the—so just a more procedural question; do you feel that all of these questions, all of our discussions should be reflected in this template at all times? Or is the template more of a high level, and then refer to other documents we've created?

LISA PHIFER: The template that you have in front of you is your work planning template. As the sub-group actually works and moves into the next phase, you'll start capturing the specifics of your research, and I think that's where you'll end up putting for example the results of your discussion, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought this document was frozen at this point and now we'll start creating whatever the documents are that we're going to use to track and [CROSSTALK] reporting.

LISA PHIFER: Right, right.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Right, I would go with Alan on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I mean it doesn't really matter; we can incorporate it all into the same document as it evolves, but the sections were set up sort of as an initial planning document, not as a tracking document for doing our actual work.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Alright, that makes sense to me.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. So maybe we create another document of questions for the compliance team and then reference that in this document.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, alright, do you think we have enough to brainstorm and then I'll send out an -- continue to brainstorm offline and then I can send out an update with a new document questions for Compliance Team to the rest of the sub-group and hopefully get some input before tomorrow night, Tuesday night, and then finalize it and send it to the compliance group on Wednesday. Lisa, your hand is up.

LISA PHIFER: I have one question with regard to scheduling the initial kick-off session with the Compliance Team and that is, are you expecting to have remote participation for that, since there will be a few of you in L.A. but not all of the sub-group?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That's a really good question, and that was on my list but I had forgotten to ask. That would be great if we could do that. Also the remote participation, what we can't do is -- the times that Jamie or Maggie are available are very limited so we can't change those, but would it be difficult to provide a dial-in so that the other sub-group members; Karen, Chris, [inaudible]?

LISA PHIFER: It certainly seems we could have a remote conference bridge for the call, but we'll get back to you on that. We just need to know that that was a request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, we're only talking about dialing in to two people, so one of the little conference rooms with a speaker phone on the table probably should be sufficient.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah, I would not make that a stumbling block if you are in a conference room with a speaker phone and I can dial into it, I'll dial directly into it and be done with it. Or somebody call me.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a bonus; otherwise we delegate to whoever is there.

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa, I understand you're picturing a conference just using a speakerphone; because this is a review team we do have some transparency requirements that may involve recording and so forth, so that's why I want us to actually think through the request and how it'll be supported.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Ah. I never thought of that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So we may need to record the call and those kind of things too.

LISA PHIFER: I don't know the answer. But knowing this is what you want tells us that we have to look into it.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, I appreciate that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Having been participating in review teams before, there are surely going to be conversations and interviews, a good number of them, that are

not necessarily going to be formally recorded. We're obliged to report on them, but I can't imagine that any time we talk to somebody there's going to be a formal transcript of that discussion. Maybe I'm living in an old world and the rules have changed, but that seems a little bit unreasonable to expect.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah me to, but let's not sweat it. We're guided by Lisa, we just see what we can do.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, so at this point I have nothing else to cover. I think we've got a good start on questions for next week's meeting, and then we just need others to help flush out this document or flush out the questions, or details of them. So is there any other input or concerns anybody has? Lisa, you have your hand up.

LISA PHIFER: Can I just call your attention to, Steve Conte put a LinkedIn chat to the work chart that would show you something about compliance, but he knows that just knowing who is on the compliance team doesn't really tell you what they do, and you may want to consider that as you're building out your question list.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. And thank you, Steve, for doing that. Yeah, there's several links that you've provided here concerning the Risk Committee charter, Lisa

provided that one, and then the other few that Steve could be interested in.

Alright, so I'll review those, and actually there's quite a few people in the compliance staff; right there it shows a difference in the WHOIS review team recommendation four. It's grown quite a bit since those days when we reviewed compliance. It's a good thing. Alright, so is there anything else? If not, let's call the meeting done and I'll send out a couple of e-mails today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Susan, for doing this.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay, thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thank you for your participation, I really appreciate it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll sign off now, thanks a lot.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, thanks Alan. Have a good flight. And Brenda, so the meeting is officially over.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]