

WP1 Meeting #17 (8 July)

Attendees:

Sub-Group Members: Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, Finn Petersen, Gary Hunt, Greg Shatan, Jordan Carter, Keith Drazek, Par Brumark, Robin Gross, Samantha Eisner, Steve DelBianco (11)

Staff: Adam Peake, Alice Jansen, Bernie Turcotte, Berry Cobb, Brenda Brewer, Kim Carlson,

Apologies: Jonathan Zuck, Roelof Meijer, Suzanne Radell, Matthew Shears

Please let Brenda know if your name has been left off the list (attendees or apologies).

Transcript

- [Transcript WP1 Meeting #17 - 8 July 2015.doc](#)
- [Transcript WP1 Meeting #17 - 8 July 2015.pdf](#)

Recording

- The Adobe Connection recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p3bv5z65c11/>
- The audio recording is available here: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-wp1-08jul15-en.mp3>

Proposed Agenda

Draft Agenda - Work Party 1 CCWG - 8 July 2015 18h-20h:

1. Agenda review
2. Community Mechanism - text to discuss as circulated by Alan (and re-attached here)
3. Community Powers - Budget/Strat Plan - **Jonathan Zuck** to circulate material
4. Community Powers - Removal of Individual Directors - **Alan Greenberg** to circulate material
5. Affirmation of Commitments - Review of updated document circulated by Steve (and re-attached here).
6. Confirming/Amending agenda items for 10 July and 13 July meetings - proposal follows

Friday 10 July @ 19h UTC

- Community Powers - recall of whole ICANN Board (Drazek)
- further discussion of matters not resolved on 6 or 8 July

Monday 13 July @ 20h UTC

- community powers - bylaws (both items)
- any other outstanding items
- 7. Any Other Business

Notes

Action for Alan: To translate the discussion into the public comment report of May 4 and redline it ready for Paris. And will redraft the paper.

Notes

Updates on Community Mechanism, AoC document and.

Robin to join the group on budget and strategic plan

Members: Greg Shatan, Alan Greenberg, Robin Gross. Matt Shears comments not reflected as he couldn't join the call

6 issues:

Who should participate in the council.

Vote weighting from the May 4th proposal

Should votes be divided, potential fractional voting allowed?

Opt out or opt in on issues

Mechanism or formal group?

If the GAC participates in the community mechanism should the bylaws be amended?

Who participates? Close unanimity. All SO and AC be included. If some as a result of next PC say they don't want to participate then can review their decision then. And need to define what participate means.

Q. RSAC and SSAC said they didn't want to participate. Did you consider that?

A. The first proposal largely focused on membership and there was confusion of what membership means. Felt, that subject to the next comment, unfair to drop groups off, they said they wanted to stay as advisors. And they can opt out and not participate.

Avri: tend to agree not to exclude now. One has just become a charter org. If they asked to be removed, then fine. And if they opt out now, they can opt back in without having to have a bylaws change. Unless they request to be named as excluded.

NTIA stress test, sufficiently open? And this approach addresses that. Leave the voting option open for any SO/AC recognized in ICANN's bylaws. So give the opportunity to vote in the future, an open invitation. Need another look at the super majority thresholds depending on voting participation.

The SSAC, RSAC and GAC, might participate in an advisory capacity. Keeping them out because they don't want to vote may not be necessary. They can advise the community council.

Second item looked at comments referring to the voting weight. Some supportive. Some questioned why the RSAC and SSAC had less and suggested equal votes. Some that the GSNO should have more. Or the votes may shift depending on issues, e.g. gTLD or ccTLD. No closure.

Most in favor of the mechanism, but this was only a small number of the total comments. But recognition on proportionality, etc. Dealt with 2 and 3 together by considering fractional voting and issues of seating of people.

Jordan. The question was also not clearly set out in the comment. SSAC, a board appointed group. And RSAC a very small specialist group. Votes by issue, this not about policy so answer is no to differential votes. Need to be clear on questions in the coming round.

About differential votes, the issue might pertain to one of the SO/AC rather than to the others.

SSAC picked by the Board: yes it approves the nominations, but it comes from its own nominating process. And if you consider their issue as a primary issue of ICANN then there are good reasons for parity.

Normalized votes, can work. But they do make the situation much more complicated.

Greg. General comment. Some justification for less weight to SSAC and RSAC. They don't represent stakeholder communities in the same way. They are fundamentally different.

Alan. Don't agree with differential votes. SSAC represents a large group and interest. The RSAC loss easier to justify. Suggest leave open and ask a very clear question next time

Fractional voting. Should a group choose to divide its vote in fraction below one, then should allow.

Jordan. Should allow. All dependent on this being a group of people.

But we should set some limit on the number who can represent a group.

Stress test issue - is there a need for a member's avatar to cast the vote, and what does this mean for the potential rogue voter. And the stress test will remain. Other officers of SO/AC need to communicate that a problem occurred and request to hold a re-vote.

Going rogue: for removal of the Board, there were directed votes. But silent on other issues. Could apply that to directed vote to all the powers, or ensure that the votes cast represent the views of the SO/AC

There seems support for the votes to be traceable back to the SO/AC

How to handle a SO/AC or individual which abstains. Don't count abstention or opt outs, but there should be a minimum number of yes votes, but need the answer to 2 above before we can finally decide.

Can there be votes through email or through a formal group. If a group it will grow to justify its own existence. But these issues are important and may require a degree of socializing to gain community support, perhaps even public comment. Suggest there should be a group. There may be need to meet face to face, which raises issues of travel support. Create a construct to allow it to meet. Staff support to help understand an issue.

Even if the people are together on a phone or together physically, or just an email, then the vote should be recorded. That the votes be transparent and accountable.

6. If the GAC chooses to participate in some way or form, then it should not have other preferential treatment. ATRT2, recommended that if any AC gives formal advice, the Board must respond positively or explain why not.

Middle ground might be that the GAC cannot issue advice counter to the advice of the community council. Others suggest CAG should pick one or the other.

May be heading to a bylaws amendment that only where the GAC has consensus must the board provide deferential treatment. Note, GAC advice may have been given to the Board prior to the community council meeting. Don't tie voting to the giving of advice that the group was created to give.

Avri: feel they are getting a double bite at the apple. Feel the two powers are incompatible. Falls to the category of making the governments more equal.

Hearing today, Fadi made a statement about governments, we should check.

OK if they opt out of the mechanism. Need to think about them having additional powers.

Steve to capture comment and send to Alan.

Action for Alan: To translate the discussion into the public comment report of May 4 and redline it ready for Paris. And will redraft the paper.

AoC update, revised text as circulated.

OECD privacy guideline and other tweaks.

Steve: Edits since Monday.

Page 3, Board and GAC chair designate members and there is no diversity requirement. Our requirement to be as diverse as possible is a new proposal.

Question then how many? Steve's proposal, keep open, but voting would be equalized among SO/AC.

Avri: the complication of votes, from an indeterminate number of participants. These ATRT processes are meant to be consensus affairs, not jumping too quickly to voting. If we can reach consensus then that is best.

The numbers flexible. Keep the core group small. Something predictable, easy to decide. Diversity: the instruction the two chairs had did ensure diversity, and wish to transfer that to the five chairs.

Overall concern about putting the diversity requirement into the bylaws when diversity is undefined. The number 3 doesn't help anyone, not a natural number. If we talk about diversity and representativeness then can't ignore where they come from. 3 is unhelpful.

Greg. Is membership an important factor, or is participation key? If membership less important then easier to accept.

Alan. Don't ignore the board in this. Strong support for Avri's view. People who have the skills for the task.

The number 3, the smallest number with a wide spread of opinion. Believes skill set dependent on diversity, but can be swapped.

Jordan: instinct, don't make a distinction between us, but use the CCWG.

But concerned that neither proposal doesn't limit the number participation and that doesn't seem right for this issue. Put to the CCWG in Paris. And in text, remove the name labels.

Steve. Public comment from Spain, first element about putting for public comment. Bottom of page 4. Remove the requirement that the ATRT look at other review teams. They only review ATRT implementation. Timing: 1 year of convening. And from convened to convening in terms of frequency. For each of the AoC reviews.

WHOIS review, page 7. OECD guidelines, not force of law. Steve alternative, to look at privacy guidelines.

Convene: might say when the group meets for the first time. Suggest pass through as a note and see what lawyers drafting think about it.

Assent on the OECD tweak.

Friday call: recall of the board, and community powers on Friday

Monday call: bylaws revisions, Alan on removal of individual directors and text mark-up on the community mechanism.

END

Action Items

Action for Alan: To translate the discussion into the public comment report of May 4 and redline it ready for Paris. And will redraft the paper

Chat transcript

Brenda Brewer: (7/8/2015 11:04) Welcome to WP1 Meeting #17 on 8th of July at 18:00 UTC! Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: <http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards>

Alan Greenberg: (11:54) Is there really a meeting?

Kimberly Carlson: (11:55) Hi Alan, yes!

Adam Peake: (11:56) morning all (or evening etc)

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (11:59) Good Evening!

Keith Drazek: (12:02) Hi all

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:04) I'd like to join a sub-group working on budget / strat plan if possible.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:06) will do. thanks.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:06) Staff - can people be given scroll control please?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:09) I think there were few comments because the questions weren't all on the website page asking for comment

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:14) I also think it's more important for them to be there if it's a group, so they can offer advice

Keith Drazek: (12:15) +1 Avri, a choice to not participate now should not prejudice the ability of an SO or AC to exercise its powers/authority later.

Keith Drazek: (12:15) ...or to add future community groups as needed.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:16) I'm happy for us to leave them in for now, so long as we reflect their feedback abck to the community in our draft 2 report

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:16) (we can't assume everyone will read all of the comments, after all)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:16) I do think we ought also to explicitly ask them again, it's good that SSAC is coming on with reps and hopefully they will be in Paris

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (12:17) +1 Steve

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:18) This relates to the suggestion to have it as an actual group

Alan Greenberg: (12:21) i am back

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (12:21) we either need fractional or multiple votes. Either way, an AC/SO could divide it's "vote" to reflect differing views within their membership

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:28) i'm pretty confident they won't take up votes under any circumstances, but I do want them in the room for sure (now that there seems to be some consensus that there should be a room, a group)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:29) neither do I

Avri Doria: (12:30) they most definitely represent the technical community

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:30) i don't think we can resolve this here, so I suggest we move on?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:31) (after the speaking list, of course)

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:31) the distinction between expertise / advisory role and a representational role. I think Greg is right on this.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:32) what is differential voting?

Avri Doria: (12:32) i think they presen the technical community. i do not support the logic of deciding one is greater than the others.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:32) Alan: I don't agree with that. It implies registries aren't interested in that. Of course we are - it's absolutely fundamental to our businesses :)

Greg Shatan: (12:33) I suppose it means having some ACs and SOs have lower votes than others.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:33) let's leave it open

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:33) and move on on...

Greg Shatan: (12:33) A number of SSAC and RSSAC members are associated with registries or ISPs or registrars, etc.

Greg Shatan: (12:34) Steve you're coming in and out.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:34) One of the SSAC nominees to this CCWG is on the board of AUDA, the .AU ccTLD manager, for instance

Avri Doria: (12:34) and a number if GNSO people are in At Large structures, and a numner of IPC are in business and some are .brands.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:34) I support fractional voting, as long as we don't see a Council of 40 GNSO people and one ccTLD person

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:34) so I htink we should set some high maxima

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:34) GNSO's share needs to be 25% to each Stakeholder Group, and then stakeholder groups can decide how to subdivide them.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (12:35) we either need fractional or multiple votes. Either way, an AC/SO could divide it's "vote" to reflect differing views within their membership

Avri Doria: (12:36) Robin i agree with the way the GNSO would be subdivided, but i do not think it is a task for the transition to determine. i think the SOAC should make their own decsions about the way to subdivide.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:36) do we think that the SO or AC should make the decision?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:36) I do remember discusssions about 1.25 votes per quarter of the GNSO

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:37) so we are in violent agreement? :)

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (12:37) @Jordan --empowered AC/SO would make its decision about how to vote. Then one person would be designated to communicate that vote into the voting mechanism (whatever that is)

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:38) NCSG has members that is in no constituency, so dividing it by constituency doesn't work for NCSG.

Avri Doria: (12:39) and the RySG uses interst groups instead of constituencies, do they have to subdivide as well?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:39) we do still need to make sure the vote is cast as per the will of the group

Greg Shatan: (12:39) As I said, that's probably up to each SG to decide what to do with its vote. Though it would hopefully decide to give a piece of a vote to a recognized subgroup (e.g., NPOC).

Greg Shatan: (12:39) @Avri, I think that's up to the RySG.

Avri Doria: (12:40) i think the complexities are such that subdivisions are a matter of local decsion.

Greg Shatan: (12:40) These are intramural issues. If the GNSO wants to regulate it, then it's up to the GNSO.

Avri Doria: (12:40) exactly, we should stick to the ACSO formulas.

Greg Shatan: (12:40) @Avri, I agree -- it's local.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (12:41) but even when we say the designated communicator MUST follow AC/SO instructions...we have to anticipate that people will make mistakes

Keith Drazek: (12:41) Isn't directed voting a fundamental requirement?

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (12:41) Yes, Keith

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:41) I think directed voting should be required.

Keith Drazek: (12:42) I agree. I thought that was already an assumption.

Avri Doria: (12:42) i do not agree on a requirements for directed voting.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:42) It is the community members who hold the authority, the person should just relay that vote to the others.

Avri Doria: (12:42) that should be up to the various ACSO as much as anything else.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:43) we are still agreeing here team, I think - can we move on?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:43) (in terms of the item we were discussing)

Avri Doria: (12:44) i dont

Keith Drazek: (12:44) What SO or AC would allow an individual to vote his/her heart rather than the interest or direction of the group?

Greg Shatan: (12:44) I agree they should be traceable back to some organization or subgroup.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:44) it is a good point - how do we show the vote cast is in fact the will of the community (or just someone's interpretation)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:44) it will have to be reflected in the text, and debated in Paris

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (12:45) Jordan and Robin: AC/SO officers and members can be counted on to sound the alarm if they see that their vote (s) was mis-cast

Greg Shatan: (12:45) frac-tion-ate (frakSHnt/) (verb): divide into fractions or components; separate (a mixture) by fractional distillation.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (12:45) and THAT would suspend the voting

Avri Doria: (12:46) Keith, in a case where a group is divided and have elected it reps, it can leave the decision up to the elected voter to take into account the things they have heard. also by requiring a forced vote, we mean there is not negotiation on wording whiel decision making becasue everyone will hav eto consult their capital.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:46) approach seems sensible for now, to me

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:46) [as set out in 4 in the paper]

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:46) what if 50% of community think the vote was supposed to be "yes" and 50% think that vote was supposed to be "no". the person casting the vote will just be guessing what is the majority view, unless an actual vote is taken from the emembers. or not?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:47) I support the actual formation of a group in this sort of ad-hoc function - it helps cut through the silos

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (12:48) @Robin -- an AC/SO with that kind of division had better conduct some formal voting internally. We will fail a key stress test if we allow AC/SO to avoid transparency and inclusive voting

Keith Drazek: (12:48) Thanks Avri. I think in that case fractional voting would come into play, would it not? I prefer fractional directed voting over non-directed unified votes.

Avri Doria: (12:49) i tink that if we are having directed voting we might as well cut out the sock puppets from the middle of the transaction.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:49) I don't think we should provide for it to meet in person outside ICANN meetings, but virtual meetings/discussions important

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:50) it could precede a decision by a set amount of time

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:50) "vote can only be cast X hours / X days after the discussion of the Council"

Avri Doria: (12:51) so we are taking the model of assigned negotiators and then a vote recorded from the ACSO itself.? like ratifying a treaty.

Avri Doria: (12:52) i really think we need to make this very simple and straightforward, wherever we do.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:52) I think I would prefer that, Avri. The group should primarily be about facilitating the community wide conversation, but the decision should still rest at the edges, with the community members.

Avri Doria: (12:53) i am mmuch more comftrtable with the ACSO in the body of the chair expressing the vote, i am just not in favor of directed voting.

Greg Shatan: (12:53) It's merely an option, only to be used if necessary. If we are going to spill the whole board, that should be discussed in a very serious fashion.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:58) I don't think in respect of #6 that coexistence of advisory roles and participation in the mechanism is a problem

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (12:59) i.e. I agree with Steve, and it seems with Alan

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:01) I agree with Avri. It should be one or the other for GAC, not both bites at the apple.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:01) It's not a trump card. GAC advice is a Queen or King, perhaps. But no an Ace of Trump

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:01) but we would otherwise make them less equal by leaving them out?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:02) The Board has not agreed to negotiate with us - they said in Singapore that they'd pass our proposal through. They had better not back away from that...

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:02) If Board decides to accept GAC advice in opposition to a Community vote, I bet the community would file an IRP

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:03) Fadi said the same thing in BA.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:03) I was there.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:03) the don't have a voting mechanism - they have a consensus approach :)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:04) I think that GAC will opt out anyway, but I think the GAC needs to work through this

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:04) at this stage, us saying there has to be a choice would just be a distraction?

Keith Drazek: (13:08) +1 Steve. The proposal does not give the GAC more weight or influence relative to the rest of the community.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:08) Good work on that, sub-group

Greg Shatan: (13:09) I'll continue to work with Alan on the redlining.

Greg Shatan: (13:09) of the first draft to turn it into the second. I've already "clipped" the section we need to redraft and put it in its own doc.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:10) Good work, Greg

Alan Greenberg: (13:11) Greg, I don't understand what you just said. Can we talk offline?

Greg Shatan: (13:11) Alan -- certainly.

Avri Doria: (13:21) WP2 is working on diversity

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:22) what one views as "diversity" is too arbitrary to enshrine in bylaws. dangerous.

Avri Doria: (13:22) i am fine with being specific mention of gender and geo

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:24) this issue is definitely moot from my point of view

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:24) neither proposal suggests limiting "participants"

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:25) Board is on the review team. See first paragraph on page 3

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:26) so Avri's proposal is OPEN to ALL participants? More than 3 from each AC/SO?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:26) Steve, that's what it says in blue and white

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:26) first sentence

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:27) Jordan -- the 3rd sentence says 3 are chosen from each AC/SO

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:27) those are the "members"

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:28) Alan -- one reason for lack of participation was that GNSO was limited to number of participants

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:29) So neither proposal meets what Alan has said, to keep the group small (and, may I see implicit, functionally sized?)

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:29) if a F2F meeting were held, should we assume that only the Members would get travel funding. Right?

Alan Greenberg: (13:29) 3 forces hard decisions instead of easy political ones.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:30) how does 3 force anything, Alan? that number only matters if we have a consensus call. And we have yet to have one in this CCWG

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:31) neither of these proposals limits Participants. The only limitation is ... Exhaustion !

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:31) glad to move on

Alan Greenberg: (13:31) 3 does not allow you to divide by "party line" (ie SG/Const/Region). That forces more considered choices

Greg Shatan: (13:32) Exhaustion is not a limiting factor!

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:32) If only it was!

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:33) as agreed, yep

Keith Drazek: (13:33) This is my 6th hour of conference calls today....so far!

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:33) text looks good to me

Avri Doria: (13:34) i think the large number of people we have as participants in the CCWG has not been an impediment to moving forward. perhaps some few people with hard positions has been, but not the number of mostly silent participants.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:34) Keith, that's horrible

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:34) Avri: so you reckon it works better than the more closed approach?

Avri Doria: (13:34) make the number too small and all you get is those with a strong PoV.

Avri Doria: (13:34) Jordan, i do.

Keith Drazek: (13:34) What's horrible is I'm not the busiest among us.... ;-)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:35) Avri: me too

Alan Greenberg: (13:35) #Keith, only 5 for me.

Keith Drazek: (13:35) Avri, are you in favor of "Directed Membership" but not "Directed Voting?" ;-)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (13:35) I prefer Steve's text with one change, "and amended in 2013" rather than as amended

Avri Doria: (13:36) Keith confused you have made me.

Keith Drazek: (13:36) It was a poor attempt at humor. Disregard!

Avri Doria: (13:37) then again i am in my 8th hour of calls so far starting at 2am with isoc

Alan Greenberg: (13:37) Silence = exhaustion

Avri Doria: (13:38) Keith sorry, alwasy feel bad wen i do not get the joke.

Greg Shatan: (13:39) Only in hour 5, but there's still the WP2 call in an hour!

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (13:40) bye all

Keith Drazek: (13:40) Thanks everyone. Great work on this.

Adam Peake: (13:40) thank you. all

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:40) Thanks, Jordan, and all. Bye!

Greg Shatan: (13:40) Bye all!