

**Adobe Connect: 23**

Alan Woods (RySG)	Kristina Rosette (RySG)
Alex Deacon (IPC)	Kurt Pritz (Chair)
Amr Elsadr (NCSG)	Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison)
Ashley Heineman (GAC)	Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG Alternate)
Ben Butler (SSAC)	Marc Anderson (RySG)
Collin Kurre (NCSG)	Margie Milam (BC)
Diane Plaut (IPC)	Mark Svancarek (BC)
Farzaneh Badii (NCSG)	Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison)
Georgios Tselentis (GAC)	Rod Rasmussen (SSAC Alternate)
Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC)	Stephanie Perrin (NCSG)
James Bladel (RrSG)	Thomas Rickert (ISPCP)
Julf Helsingius (NCSG)	

**Audio Only:**

None

**Apologies:**

Ayden Férdeline (NCSG)  
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)  
Emily Taylor (RrSG)  
Chris Disspain (ICANN Board Liaison)  
Benedict Addis (SSAC)  
Matt Serlin (RrSG)

**Audio Cast (FOR ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS)**

Peak: 16 joined

**View Only Adobe Connect:**

33 joined

**Staff:**

Berry Cobb  
Caitlin Tubergen  
Daniel Halloran (ICANN Org Liaison-Legal)  
Marika Konings  
Trang Nguyen (ICANN Org Liaison-GDD)  
Terri Agnew  
Andrea Glandon

**AC Chat:**

Andrea Glandon: (12/11/2018 07:09) Welcome to the 33rd EPDP Team Call held on Tuesday, 11 December 2018 at 14:00 UTC.

Andrea Glandon: (07:09) Wiki Agenda Page: <https://community.icann.org/x/-wrVBO>

Stephanie Perrin: (07:17) Please accept my apologies for this meeting, I will be watching the adobe chat but will be participating in another meeting, so may or may not be listening. Unfortunately, I was unable to obtain an alternate.

Terri Agnew: (07:18) Thank you for this notice Stephanie

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (07:58) hello all

Leon Sanchez (ICANN Board Liaison): (08:00) hello everyone

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:00) Hi all!

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:00) hi all! :)

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:01) It's my birthday and all I got was an EPDP call. :-(

Andrea Glandon: (08:01) Happy Birthday, Ashley!!

Marika Konings: (08:02) Congratulations!

Kurt Pritz: (08:02) 55 is a big number, Ashley

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:02) Not too far off Kurt! :-) Thanks folks.

Terri Agnew: (08:02) finding line

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:02) Happy bday Ashley!!!!

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (08:02) happy birthday Ashley :)

Margie Milam (BC): (08:03) Happy Birthday!

Terri Agnew: (08:03) Happy Birthday Ashley

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:04) happy birthday!

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:04) Happy Birthday, Ashley.

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (08:04) Happy birthday Ashley, you are supposed to take the day off when it is your birthday!

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:05) Has my idea of trying to avoid competing legal advice hired by ICANN org and our team been brought to the attention of the PCST?

Mark Svancarek: (08:06) Happy birthday!

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:07) Using same legal counsel as ICANN could make things easier for us and ICANN.

Amr Elsadr: (08:07) Happy b-day, Ashley!!

Berry Cobb: (08:08) @Thomas, not yet, but it will be as part of the PCST discussion. We'll essentially be using the same process as WS2.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:08) Aren't the lawyers on our group the least likely to present our questions in a neutral style?! ;-)

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:10) Hi Berry, thanks. WS2 did not really succeed in avoiding duplicate efforts by law firms.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:10) the idea would be for ICANN org and us to agree on one firm and use their advice

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:10) Apologies, but what is PCST?

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:10) Kurt I have a comment on the EPDP letter, if we can discuss once you get through the preliminaries.

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:10) eDPB

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:10) sigh

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (08:11) Amr - the committee managing finances for special projects such as this EPDP

Berry Cobb: (08:11) PCST = Project Cost Support Team - consists of Council and EPDP leadership, budget owner and support staff.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:11) To Kurt's point, it did seem Sisyphean

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:12) Thanks, Thomas. And thanks, Berry. You answered my next question before I even got to ask it. :-)

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:13) Hi. I've been on the call, but was having adobe issues.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:13) Happy birthday, Ashley!

Rod Rasmussen (SSAC - alt): (08:16) I'm filling in for Benedict today - he got pulled into doing a presentation on short notice.

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:17) Another perspective Alan: There's no way our letter could make things worse.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:17) I don't know about that, James. It could be the proverbial straw (that broke the camel's back)

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:18) hahaha!

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:18) But seriously .... it could

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:19) I agree, with Alan and think that we should wait to see their response and hold our opportunity to send something once we are on better and stronger grounding

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:20) Souds like Kurt has a cold.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:20) "sounds"

Margie Milam: (08:21) Sure - I'll be happy to do that

Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:25) does someone have a link for this mind map document handy. Doesn't display well in my adobe

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:28) Thanks Marika.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:29) @Marc: You can download it directly from the AC room.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (08:29) thanks Amr, that worked for me

Marika Konings:  
(08:29) <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/97848059/EPDP%20Team%20Charter%20Charter%20Questions%20Phase%202%20-%2027%20Nov%202018.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1544104215000&api=v2>

Marika Konings: (08:35) The charter says "the threshold for establishing "answered" for the gating questions shall be the consensus of the EPDP Team and non-objection by the GNSO Council".

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:36) @Margie: This was clarified on the very first EPDP Team call.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:36) gating questions gotta be answered by consensus.they are not answered if there is no consensus....

Georgios Tselentis(GAC): (08:36) What level (as defined in the charter) of concensus are we talking about ?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:36) oh great written in the ccharter clearly

Georgios Tselentis(GAC): (08:37) Also how "sufficiently answered" is defined?

Terri Agnew: (08:37) finding the line

Marika Konings: (08:37) sorry, my line just dropped

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:39) The Charter explains that this EPDP Team will present its findings on access and other issues in a subsequent report.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:39) acting in good faith means following the process.

Marika Konings: (08:40) the charter foresees two Initial Reports and two Final Reports - one on phase 1 and one on phase 2

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (08:40) yes Marika

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (08:40) it is quite clear in the charter

Marika Konings: (08:41) consensus is a defined term in the GNSO operating Procedures - it is an assessment that the chair makes

Marika Konings: (08:42) through a set process

Alan Woods (RySG): (08:42) The charter defers it .... we aren't

Georgios Tselentis(GAC): (08:43) Yes Alan I understand that but I want to know when enough consensus is enough

Marika Konings: (08:44) The definition of consensus is "Consensus - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree."

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:44) There is never enough consensus :)

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:44) Simple majority is consensus in this case?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:45) Georgios, there are elaborate rules for that in GNSO Op procedure.

Marika Konings: (08:45) @Mark - there is no specific definition, but you need to factor in that recommendations eventually need to be adopted by the GNSO Council for which Supermajority support is needed.

Georgios Tselentis(GAC): (08:45) ok so Marika you say no full consensus is needed to consider that a question has been answered

Marika Konings: (08:45) Correct, consensus is the standard.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:46) @Georgios: Yes, in GNSO-speak, consensus and full consensus are not the same thing.

Georgios Tselentis(GAC): (08:46) Apologies Farzaneh I am new to GNSO OP language

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:47) thanks kurt.

Andrea Glandon: (08:49) Hadia, use your telephone connection

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:50) of course it does why are you re stating the wrong thing Margie said Hadia. this is frustrating. you can't just blindly follow others. Margie was wrong. charter says you should have consensus

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:51) ok andrea ill do that next time

Andrea Glandon: (08:51) Thank you, Hadia!

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:51) If we take on Phase 2 concurrent with Phase 1, then this ePDP will miss its deadline.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:52) @Margie: The charter explains that the issue of access is included as part of the third deliverable - a separate initial report than the one we've published.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:52) no. we will not have phase 2 discussion when phase 1 is not done

Julf Helsingius (NCSG): (08:52) The charter is pretty clear, and was discussed extensively by the GNSO council.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:52) Is there any room for compromise here? Perhaps initiate discussion of phase 2 once we have agreed on the draft report?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:52) @Kurt: Agree. Let's take this to the mailing list.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (08:52) In the interest of meeting any of our deadlines, I support moving this to the mailing list.

James Bladel (RrSG): (08:53) @Ashley - there may be some time for overlap at the end of this ePDP, but if we try to load that on to our plate now, we'll lose both, IMO

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:53) @Ashley: Yes, and imo, that wouldn't be a compromise. That seems to me to be what is actually expected of us.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:53) @Ashley we don't have to start addressing access now - but we need to at least establish when this is going to happen

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:53) Was dropped off the call.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (08:54) Hadia - not sure I understand your comment. That is what I was proposing.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:54) i was dropped off too

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:54) but I am on the AC now

Andrea Glandon: (08:54) The op is calling back to Amr & Hadia

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (08:54) no Mark. there is no vote. there has to be a consensus

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:55) @Mark: We can reach consensus on the gating questions in the process leading up to the final report, not the initial report.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:55) Thanks, Andrea. Back on now.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:56) @Kurt: +1

Rafik Dammak (GNSO Council Liaison): (08:56) as it was suggested, I can bring this to GNSO council and if people having any claryifng questions

Andrea Glandon: (08:56) Great! You're welcome, Amr

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (08:56) @Ashley ok great

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:56) How about we try to reach consensus? Remember, this is only about the gating questions, not all of them.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (08:57) Thanks Amr. Sorry for saying "vote", which apparently is the incorrect term for this situation.

Alex Deacon - IPC: (08:58) +1 amr - we need to prioritize discussions - hence my request for details as to what the plan is going to be.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (08:58) +1 Alex

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (08:59) @Alex: Good request.

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:05) background noise ... Hadia.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:09) +1 James

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:09) @James: +1

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:12) @james but if registrars could be at risk and the registrants are not truly aware of their options why would registrars bother

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:13) My concern exactly Thomas, well said

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:13) @Hadia - competitive advantage, if they believe they can manage the risk effectively.

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:15) @Mark - Yep, that's fairly common, but what we have seen is that local resellers quickly move in to those regions/markets that are "underserved" by bigger players.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:15) @hadia but if "registrars could be at risk and the registrants are not truly aware of their options" are you saying therefore that you accept this is a much higher risk.... so why would you want this as a policy so, seems a rather reckless approach?

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:17) it's not just about burden of writing codes. it is also that some registrants might not be giving genuine consent . (i.e. don't know what they are consenting to)

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:17) Diane, yes. Sort of a controller to controller scenario where companies are RNHs

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:17) But that only covers a fraction of all domain registrations

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:18) @Diane: We also need to consider Article 14 in the context of collecting data from someone other than the data subject (assuming that the tech contact is another data subject). We haven't done that yet, and it wasn't mentioned in the EDPB input, if I recall correctly.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:18) +1 Amr

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:19) @Alan what I said in my intervention lets first know what "informed" means and then decide based on the feedback we get if it should be required or optional that is if there is no risk then it should be a requirement because it is needed by some of the registrants the issue now is the risk so lets reach a decision with regard to that

Farzaneh Badii (NCSG): (09:19) no sorry educational information never works. in which legal system has educational information been sufficient to illustrate informed consent. how about an educational program to educate folks that wants to use web forms to access to personal information of domain name registrants

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:20) Yeah..., we can't depend on educational resources. Not enough.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:20) Hopefully no one is advocating a reckless approach. As for tech contacts being unaware to what they are consenting, Microsoft believes that a user experience which responsibly serves the tech contact need and meets legal need is entirely within state of the art.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:21) @Alan what I said in my intervention lets first know what "informed" means and then decide based on the feedback we get if it should be required or optional that is if there is no risk then it should be a requirement because it is needed by some of the registrants the issue now becomes to learn more about the risk to make the decision

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:21) it seems to me that educational resources are part of the solution - not the only solution.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:22) @Alex: That sounds like a more reasonable approach to me.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:22) Yes, education part of the solution

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:22) Alex is correct. The user experience should be designed in an appropriate and defensible way. It can't just be a single checkbox, for example.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:22) useful insight, thanks Rod.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:22) +1 Rod

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:23) The thing is, ed resources might work for some, but is impossible to be sure that it'll work for everybody.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:23) Amr, that is probably not a reasonable bar for any user experience.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:24) But we can conduct uer testing and find the weak spots and the common confusions.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:24) user testing

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:24) THere are going to be several issues like the one Margie raises. Including legacy data held by Registrars, Registries, and third party data aggregators.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:25) @Alan for sure no one is advocating for "a reckless approach" this will be bad not only for the regsitrars but for the users as well - we need to learn about the risks if they do exist

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:26) @Mark: Agree, and not suggesting that it should be a standard. Just reinforcing the rationale that it is not a sufficient measure on its own.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:26) Kurt - not necessarily legal. Only legal if it passes the GDPR test today

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:26) regarding legacy data - we have discussed in the past that a pragmatic phased approach should be considered.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:27) Alex - I am all for pragmatic solutions. All those dealing with the issue of legacy data should consider putting that as a separate process into their record of processing activities.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:27) ...so at least it is seen to be tackled.

Rod Rasmussen (SSAC - alt): (09:28) @Kurt - my point was that making things optional for a registrar to collect doesn't solve "the problem" and really just complicates things more from an operational point. The value of the informatinn itself is a separate debate.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:29) I'm glad we all agree that there is no point in taking the reckless approach. So to bring it back to our actual goal, does the Temp Spec support compliance by the publication of the Tech Contact. Do we have clarity on how this will be achieved in a Compliant manner NO - Therefore should we make it consensus policy that it is Mandatory that all regsitrars and registries to process the data of a 3rd party, without clarity as to how consent will be achieved - NO.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:29) Marc you say the technology exists, wonderful. Please provide us the details of that solution so we may consider it?

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:30) @mark not marc! sorry

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:30) Happy to work with you on it.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (09:34) This is exactly why this should not be contractual.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (09:34) well put James

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:35) @Mark - some registrars are challenging the legality of the Temp spec.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:35) can't hear

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:35) ICANN has tried (unsuccessfully) to compel them to collect in the interim, but those efforts have been rejected by the court(s)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:36) @James: Agree, so long as "not playing in the same box" is a business decision on the part of the contracted parties involved. In other contexts, we shouldn't require CPs to not play in the same box (such as geo-distinction).

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:38) I guess it would be helpful for those wanting the optional requirement to write up a storyboard of how the registration process could work and be compliant with Art 7 and 14 so we can all look at that.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:38) a very large +1 to james

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:39) I can only guarantee that there is customer demand for this

Margie Milam (BC): (09:40) +1 Ashley

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:40) Ashley - that's the job of Registrar/TLD marketing. But not ICANN policy development.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (09:40) Agreed James - if there is customer demand and we haven't seen that yet. It may well change. The other issue is to ensure that the technical contact has given their consent to provide their name to the registrar.

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:42) James and Alan - has it been your experience and is it from an operational standpoint, that having the tech contact provides a necessary and important outlet from a service and safety standpoint for maintenance for consumers? So to Ashley's point that the balancing of interests under a legal standpoint even in line with GDPR that the need for this information is balanced in favor of providing it?

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:42) There are also responsibilities on the part of the controller in the scenario of collecting tech contact info in GDPR.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:43) @Kurt: There is also an optional field regarding purpose N/7 - validating RNH eligibility to register a domain name under certain TLDs.

Rod Rasmussen (SSAC - alt): (09:43) @Kurt - regardless of whether there is "GDPR risk" or not, the legal questions still need answering to offer even an "option" to the registrars in order to allow registrars to "opt in".

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:43) @Diane - I don't think the benefits of the Tech Contact is universal to all customers. Only a subset. Which is why we favor the idea that this is optional.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:43) Kurt, for the organization field, the mandatory publication is the bigger issue. s

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:44) @Thomas: +1

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:44) Happy to answer Purpose N questions.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:44) Redaction of the org field should be mandatory.

Marika Konings: (09:44) The question is whether the definition of optional needs to be considered separately for the tech contact related data elements and the other data elements that have been marked as optional.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:44) Redaction of teh org field should not be mandatory

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:45) And you cannot view those points separately. If you collect on an optional basis, you need consent for both the collection and the publication

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:45) @Kristina: Correct.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (09:45) Agreed Amr. It concerns me a registrant would inadvertently put their name in there. Education is all well and good but . . . . .

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:45) regarding the org field we should consider a pragmatic phased approach - as mentioned above.

Hadia Elminiawi - ALAC: (09:45) @Thomas so what if the publication is not mandatory

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (09:45) Collection would make sense though - just not necessarily publication.

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (09:46) OK. Got it.

Thomas Rickert (ISPCP): (09:46) Hadia, both collection and publication require consent afaiK

Rod Rasmussen (SSAC - alt): (09:46) @Kurt - I reiterate my prior point that making collection of the tech contact optional for some registrars makes it a requirement for all registries and that you run into a massive rats nest of complications for the registrants and registries in dealing with transfers and data consistency. This needs a lot more baking.

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:47) I support Hadia's proposal: Registrars are required to offer it, but it is redacted (unless consent is obtained to publish)

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:47) The NCSG has argued that redaction of the org field should be mandatory.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (09:47) I think consent is risky.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (09:47) Risky even

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:47) @Kurt: Good summary of the issues on the org field.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:47) well not necessarily. the registry does not have to publish it either, the registrar can display as the see fit on their outputs (assuming WHOIS publication is what we are talking about)

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:48) BC has argued that redaction of the org field should not be mandatory

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (09:50) Agreed Hadia - it should be optional for disclosure or publication.

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:51) +1 Lyndsay, Hadia, James

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:52) But strongly prefer if published

Margie Milam (BC): (09:52) +1 Ashley

Mark Svancarek (BC): (09:52) Ashley makes a good point that it may be moot based on local law

Alex Deacon - IPC: (09:56) @james - see previous comment on a pragmatic phased approach that can be applied to address the issue of legacy data.

Ashley Heineman (GAC): (09:56) +1 Alex

Margie Milam (BC): (09:57) We can deal with the legacy registrations through a phased approach

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:57) If we could get everyone holding archived WHOIS data from prior to May 25 to purge their data, then that would work.

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:57) sorry guys just got kicked at the 2 hour mark .. these calls should really stay on for longer

Margie Milam (BC): (09:57) ie policy that the registrants who have that in their ORG field confirm that they are a legal person -- or are given the opportunity to correct

Margie Milam (BC): (09:58) at the time of renewal

Alan Woods (RySG): (09:58) Ahhh a phased unbreaking of the law .....

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:59) right, Mark. If it becomes mandatory our first step will be to purge Registrant Org from all records. And then force the Registrant to ask us to put it back

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:59) Are we not going to get to agenda item 4b today?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (09:59) Agreed James

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (09:59) Thought not. Thanks.

James Bladel (RrSG): (09:59) That's the only way to manage the risks associated with publication

Diane Plaut (IPC): (09:59) That seems like a reasonable solution Mark

Stephanie Perrin (NCSG): (10:00) I am going to reiterate my proposal that bona fide orgs who are corporate entities authenticate themselves and provide that voluntary data set.....and leave the small bus entities alone.

Marc Anderson (RySG): (10:00) Kurt - for agenda item 5 - can we confirm what the holiday meeting schedule will be?



James Bladel (RrSG): (10:00) Apologies but I need to drop for another call. Thanks Kurt, Staff and everyone!

Kristina Rosette (RySG): (10:00) Have to drop for another call. Thanks, everyone.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:01) What should opposers of the accuracy proposals put forward? :-)

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid (RrSG - Alt): (10:02) I also need to drop.

Amr Elsadr (NCSG): (10:03) Thanks all. Bye.