

**ICANN
Transcription
Cross-Community Working Group Discussion call
Friday 20 September 2013 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Cross-Community Working Group Discussion call on the Friday 20 September 2013 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-20130920-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#sep>

Attendees

Mike O'Connor - ISPCP
John Berard – CBUC - chair
Chuck Gomes - RySG

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Alan Greenberg
Jonathan Robinson

Coordinator: Excuse me, I'd like to remind all participants this conferences being recorded.
If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone this is the cross constituency working group call on 20 September.

And on the call we have Chuck Gomes, John Berard, and Mikey O'Connor.
And for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong and myself Glen DeSaintgery.

We have apologies from Jonathan Robinson and from Alan Greenberg. And I think that is all the apologies that we have. Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Glen this is Julie Hedlund...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: And I see that we're still waiting for Mike O'Connor Mikey O'Connor to get - he is in.

Glen DeSaintgery:He's in.

Julie Hedlund: Wonderful.

Glen DeSaintgery:Fine.

Julie Hedlund: Welcome everyone. This is Julie Hedlund. And I want to thank Mary Wong for all the work she did to set this call up.

And I guess the first thing that I would ask the participants of this call and also point out is that we did indeed reach out to all of the original cross community work - working group members of which there were 13 now there are 12 since Mary Wong has now joined staff but she was part of the original group.

And we have on this call today three people. So I would like to ask you Chuck John and Mikey - and I see Mikey already has his hand up how would you all like to proceed with this particular call and in general? Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julie. I'm sorry I was so difficult to get on the call. My recollection at the end of the group that was working before was that we were really down to a very small group.

(Jamie) was on there. (Jamie)'s now not very active in ICANN. Jonathan has got a conflict. So, you know, the -I was actually a little startled to hear that it was actually 12 people on the working group because certainly at the end it was much smaller in terms of the number people working on it.

So depending on what you hope to get accomplished today I think we'd probably be fine with just a few people. I'd be willing to proceed.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Mikey and John Berard.

John Berard: Yes. So I'm - I've got all these empty glass bottles of five gallon containers gasoline, old rags, and matches here.

And I'm thinking that what I might like to recommend is that we issue a report to the community saying that clearly there is no appetite for this.

And so because based upon a lack of participation which has been persistent it's clear that ICANN community has no interest in community cross community working groups. I would be willing to post that publicly and see what happens.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you John. And Chuck I see your hand is up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I'm not ready to concede that yet John. It may be right. And certainly it's not going to work if there isn't broader representation. I don't think it has to be a big group. But we need to have certainly the ccNSO and GNSO represented.

And within the GNSO we need, you know, to have certainly both houses represented hopefully a little bit better than that.

I personally think that this is really an essential issue. Now if we can't get at least minimal representation from the ccNSO and the GNSO then it probably won't work okay? And then I'd be willing to concede what John suggesting.

I think it's been so long since we dealt with it. And since, you know, I'm sure there was broader outreach than just the message to those that - of us that participated before.

But the reality of the matter is people are so busy right now with - which is probably always the case. But certainly the new gTLD stuff is just absorbing huge amounts of some people's time.

So I think before we - I mean let me back up a step here. My understanding was this meeting was just a meeting to kind of get - put our heads together since we haven't met in a long time.

I see the DT with the name a drafting team. But I don't think we're drafting anything are we or our we am I missing something there?

Julie Hedlund: So this is - I see that Mary has her hand up. So maybe I'll defer to Mary and also Mikey has his hand up.

So but there is the issue of the ccNSO letter on the table and how the GNSO should respond to that. So conceivably this group could come up with a response and that might be something that is a draft that they draft.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again thanks. The - yes and by the way I think that the - what the ccNSOs response was easily predictable.

Having been one that kind of pushed for us to start working on the a cross community working group principal I didn't think that we went a smart direction in the GNSO when we decided to do our own thing first and then bring the ccNSO in.

And I expressed that then. The GNSO council decided differently. That's fine. But it was predictable that, you know, here's our - we decided to draft our

own thing. And then send it to them and get their reaction. And so their reaction was easily predictable.

I don't see that as a problem though. But we have to have representation from both ccNSO and GNSO in any sort of working group that is formed to work on this otherwise it won't work.

And I think that was our mistake. The first time around we did a GNSO thing first and then we brought the ccNSO in. And I'll stop there.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Chuck. Mary and then Mikey.

Mary Wong: Thanks Julie, and thanks Chuck, and John and everyone. Let me just pick up on a couple of the things that Chuck and John said.

I think first of all Chuck on the DT issue I guess this was formed as a DT. I mean under the circumstances that you've described to create this set of draft principles which were then sent for comment to the other SOs and ACs.

It may also have been and Glen or Julie may recall better than I can that perhaps invitation to participate in the DT itself may or may not have been to other groups. I think there is representation from ALAC for example on this DT.

I'm not necessarily sure that John this either the level of attendance or anything else demonstrates the lack of interest in the community as a whole.

I think first of all we have a ccNSO. But I think this team either currently constituted or reconstituted will have to come up with some sort of short report on.

It may - will be that this DT might end up recommending to the GNSO council convened by the GNSO council that this is it. We don't do anything. We thank

the ccNSO for their comments if and taking up what Chuck said if we do want to move forward enough people in the community believe this is important then maybe there really should be a cross community working group of sorts that could take this as the starting point. I mean that's totally open to this group to recommend.

I think the intention of starting this up again -- and I think we all acknowledge that this work was done well over a year ago and that may partly explain the lack of responsiveness -- really is to just figure out what next steps this DT wants to recommend back to the GNSO council

And given how long this has taken that maybe if this can be done within the next couple of months perhaps say setting Buenos Aires as the delivery date then the next steps can then be put into place at that point in time.

And again, you know, there are things that the DT can also do. It shows up the work it right away and now breaks for example go on with the work as this DT, go on with this work is a reconstituted DT of a new powerful participant, or simply have the group that interest at work and what we have now with (unintelligible) of recommendations back to the council. So that's both I guess some background as well as the intent for this call right now.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Mary. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julie. It's Mikey. I'm sort of, you know, John I love your gasoline. But I think this particular one is one that why don't you put that back in the closet for a little while.

I - I'm reading the note that Mary sent out and it says dear members of the drafting team while right off the bat that's basically me, Chuck, and Jonathan, you know, (Jamie) is gone nobody else but, you know, by the end of the drafting team is down to a pretty small group.

And so when I read that I knew that we were going to have a really small gang on this call. So I don't think there is any information to be gained from the fact that this call is small.

You know this - if we had done a communitywide announcement of, you know, we're starting up again. And here's the work plan. And so on and so forth yes then fine.

But, you know, this wasn't billed as that. I'm going to be a little less diplomatic than Chuck and just say look that - I think that's out of line at this stage of the game.

I think Mary has got the right set of choices. We as the drafting team could go a bunch of different directions and it would be useful at think to have a bit of discussion about that.

So I think what I'd like to do is sort of hew to the letter that Mary sent which is yes I think it's timely for the DT to reconvene, review their feedback, propose some next steps to the council. That seems like a good agenda to me.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Mikey. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So I'm going to make a recommendation and we have a small enough group here that we should be able to decide one way or other on this.

And since we're the one on the - we're the ones on the call we have the power I guess at least to make a recommendation.

My recommendation is is that we first of all forget about the previous drafting team and that we recommend that the GNSO reach out to the ccNSO and suggest forming a new drafting team to come up with some recommendations for a way forward.

Now first of all that will give us a test of whether there is enough interest in the ccNSO to work with us on this.

And if there's not, you know, it's not going to work. Like I think I said before we're going to have to have cross community working groups. And the ccNSO have their procedures we have ours.

We really need to -- and I don't think it's terribly complicated -- to come up with some procedures for cross community working groups that respect each of the two SOs that are primarily going to be involved. And of course the ALAC will be involved with this too we know that.

But I would just say that we -- I'm talking about this group right here since we're the ones on -- that we recommend the GNSO counsel simply reach out to so Jonathan can reach out to the ccNSO and basically just say hey okay we've talked about this for a long time. Nothing's been done.

We'd like to get a few volunteers from the ccNSO, we'll provide some volunteers from the GNSO to come up with some recommendations for both of our SOs and the ALAC to consider for a plan going forward.

I think eventually we've got to get to this. And the longer we put it off the longer it will be before we can take advantage of some general principles for such groups.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Chuck. This is Julie Hedlund. Just one thing I would mention is certainly, you know, we've got, you know, the comments received from the ccNSO and you mentioned ALAC as well and ALAC was, you know, part of the original group.

I know that Alan Greenberg wanted to be on this call but could not. But it I think that, you know, when we were - after these principles were drafted you know, we did reach out to all of the SOs and ACs and asked for comments on

them. And it was only the ccNSO that sent comments which is what we have here.

And - but just to note that of the other SOs and ACs that have been involved in cross community working groups the SSAC has been involved in two of those the international registration data -International Registration Data Working Group and then also the DSSA working group DNS Security Analysis Working Group.

So I'm - I think that's a wonderful idea. And I see Mikey has his hand up, you know, to reach out to ccNSO but also expand it to the other SOs and ACs.

It's entirely possible someone from the SSAC for instance would be interested in participating because I think based on their participation in previous groups I think they would be quite interested in, you know, in participating and developing some principles even though they had not, you know, offered any up to the original GNSO principles.

Yes and thanks Chuck (unintelligible) is also a cross community working group. And I see that I had jumped the queue and didn't raise my hand before speaking. I apologize for that and Mikey over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh no worries Julie. You said a lot of what I was going to say. I like Chuck's idea a lot. I think, you know, we just sort of, you know, hit the restart button.

I would tend to reach out to, you know, everybody ALAC, SSAC, even the GAC if we can figure out a way. I know it's trickier for them but - and in the case of the DSSA we also had the NRO in there.

And I'm a customer of this because, you know, as the GNSO co-chair of the DSSA working group but effectively the chair of the whole thing it was really helpful to have a very carefully written charter.

And I'm sort of buttering up Chuck because he had a lot to do with that. But it would be nice to have some of these things ironed out so that future drafters of cross constituency charters would have a bit of a framework to work in.

And certainly the ccNSO participation in the DSSA, you know, Bart Boswinkel -- I can't even say his last name on -- is the staff side. And then Jorg Schweiger is the ccNSO co-chair was very enthusiastic.

And so I would also agree that everybody is really busy. You know, this wasn't - I really want to amplify that no I don't think it's from lack of interest it's for lack of other things. And so I'd ride along with Chuck and also with Julie in extending the reach.

I'd be a little uncomfortable in us doing this the agenda sort of startled me because we are pretty thin to be a work, you know, a drafting team but I really like Chuck's idea.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Mikey. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Julie, and thanks Chuck, and thanks Mikey. It sounds like folks on this call at least who I think as it's been noted were also probably be more active members of the original general drafting team have hit upon a way forward. And we can do a bit about how mechanical you want to approach that

I guess Mikey just to complete the loop on an earlier - so I looked at the updated mailing list -- and unfortunately updated on the wiki -- but there is about -- and Glen can correct me if I'm wrong I believe there's ten or so -- and I think Julie you mentioned 12 groups that are GNSO participants who are on this drafting team but for various reasons obviously they are not participating on this call.

That said I guess what we could do is we could - staff could do a summary of the recommendation that you guys are talking about today.

And send it out to the DT such as it is for any sort of feedback. And then obviously forward the same message to Jonathan and the GNSO council.

I guess one question I would have for you folks is, you know, this is one DT that doesn't have a chair. So who should those communications come from and especially if as may happen this group could then be tasked with writing up the invitation for the reconvene truly cross community drafting team. Does anybody have any thoughts on that?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Can I nominate John right now?

Mikey O'Connor: Second. I - this is Mikey. Let me second that.

John Berard: Geez I couldn't un-mute fast enough.

Mikey O'Connor: We win. You're it. Besides you're the only guy on the council geez tough bounce man.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm not really trying to put you on the spot John but I couldn't resist that.

John Berard: No I appreciate it. I, you know, look I don't - the only reason I'm involved in this silly thing is that I think it's important.

And I - I'm trying to - I'm dealing with some personal frustration that it doesn't rise to the level of, you know, actionable in other people's agenda. But I'm, you know, more than happy to be this - the (hod) carrier on this.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Way to go.

Mary Wong: Thanks John. This is Mary. And I...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: ...add sometime the reason why this DT doesn't have a chance. What?

John Berard: I'm sorry.

Mary Wong: Let's say that the reason why this DT is chair less at the moment -- and this goes back to how long ago the work that was done what these draft principles -- was that Jonathan was a chair at the time and having become chair of the council he is no longer chair of his drafting team. So if John you're willing to take it on that would be terrific.

John Berard: Sure. Sure so, you know, do I want to put a motion forward for the next council meeting which is 10 October?

Chuck Gomes: I think that would be good. I mean it may take a little while to get a group formed, you know, inviting new people, inviting old people, et cetera and the ccNSO.

And we may ultimately want to have a maybe even a co-chair situation with somebody from the ccNSO as well if they're open to that.

But I think doing something like that like a motion John would be at least get it moving. And it'll take a while to get a response from the ccNSO, and other SOs, or ACs. I think we'll, you know, likely end up with mostly ALAC, GNSO, and ccNSO.

John Berard: Sure. So - and if I can get the help of the staff to write the thing. And if I can get the help of everybody on the call right now what is it you want to ask for in the motion?

Do you want to express that we - the interest in reinvigorating the effort and we want to extend information to every, you know, to every member of the community? What do we want to say to get the thing rolling again?

Chuck Gomes: Well this is Chuck. And I'm thinking about that right now as - just as you've asked. I - we're going to need - if a working group a cross community working group is formed to deal with this issue which is kind of what we need right do we need a charter? I mean should we form a group to develop a charter or is that premature?

John Berard: Well maybe that's the focus of the motion.

Chuck Gomes: That's kind of where I'm - that's what I'm asking, you know?

John Berard: Sure, sure. That'll be I think that's a reasonable first step. It shows a certain level of seriousness sticking to the rules of the road as an opportunity to encourage a Vice Chair or from outside the GNSO.

Mikey O'Connor: John this is Mikey.

John Berard: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm looking on the screen and that frame that paragraph right under framework for analysis seems like...

John Berard: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: ...that kind of justification.

John Berard: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: And, you know, so I think there's some material in here that could be stolen to sort of puff up that memo a little bit and/or the motion a little bit.

But I think you're on the right track. And I agree that it would be great to get a chartering drafting team put together for the subsequent work. I think that's...

John Berard: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: ...right track.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Mikey. Thanks John. And I note that Mary has her hand up.

Mary Wong: Yes I do. And I think this is a good way forward. I guess and John staff will obviously be happy to work with you to craft the language for the motion that the group can then look over with all these different subtopics.

I think the thing I would add is probably pretty odd but it is, you know, thanking the ccNSO for its response to the original draft principles.

The other point is with respect to Chuck's question about the charter and the working group and what is it and so forth.

If there's a charter for this new working group the charter will have to be approved by each of the SOs and ACs that take part right I mean i.e. the GNSO will have to approve the charter as well as the ccNSO, and ALAC, and whoever else SSAC that's involved.

Salt that may determine not just the language of the motion but the process by which we go about convening the working group.

So for example an invitation for each SO or AC to send participants to the working group but would that be also a drafting team for a charter for the working group that then goes back to the respected SOs and ACs.

I guess that's a question that I don't immediately know the answer to and I think maybe we should sort that out before ending this call.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Mary. And I see Chuck you have your hand up?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. And Mary I think you're right. In fact I don't know that we need to debate it. I think it will have to be approved by certainly the two SOs and I don't have any problem with the ALAC approving it too but it's primarily the two SOs in the name industry that probably are impacted by this although certainly the SSAC like you said it often comes into play.

In the - you know, I don't know if this is part of the motion or what but I think to - I think we need to avoid what's happened before the GNSO kind of doing something and then bring in the ccNSO after the fact.

So it's probably helpful to think in terms of a co-chair situation with someone from the GNSO and SO going forward.

And I think suggesting that the ccNSO right up front kind of gives them equal footing I think. I think that's important.

With regard to the ccNSO response as well as the original principles that the GNSO came up with I don't know that GNSO needs to - I mean it's good to thank the ccNSO for their response.

But really the ccNSO response as well as the principles that the GNSO developed just become building materials for the charter and ultimately for the work of the group.

And I don't think we have to resolve any issues but rather the two documents become elements for the charter and the working group itself if and when it's

formed would be able to build on the points that were made which I think in both cases have a lot of good material.

Mary Wong: Right. This is Mary again. Thanks Chuck. So what I was thinking about was basically just the usual one line result in a GNSO motion thanking this ccNSO for its feedback to the original principles probably somewhere in the where is clauses we would capture exactly what you just said about these principles and the feedback responses forming the backdrop and the background document.

I might also suggest that with respect to the invitation that one thing we could consider is maybe not using terminology like drafting team capital D capital T or working group capital W capital G in the GNSO context because what I'm told is that these words either don't have the same meaning or don't have any specific meaning outside of the GNSO.

So in other words we could have an invitation for participants for this group that should be formed small g. And we could also obviously invite ccNSO to appoint a co-chair of the group as well.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Mary. And I see that Chuck has done a checkmark to what you just said. Does anyone else I see Chuck has his hand up. Chuck please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry for raising it so many times. But I wonder also do you think that it would be a good idea -- and this would be a part of the motion -- but there -- I don't think it has to be we can talk about that -- should Jonathan should we suggest that Jonathan reach out to the chair of the ccNSO just to tell them what we're thinking and give them a heads up?

And that we're going to, you know, considering having - passing a motion to formally do this but just from a protocol point of view I think that might be

good for Jonathan to do before it ever becomes a motion and is acted on by the GNSO?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Chuck. John?

John Berard: Yes Chuck that's a good idea. (Byron Hollins) from Canada is now the Chair of the Council. He just chaired his first meeting a couple weeks ago.

I serve as the liaison for the ccNSO. So the fact that I would be the chair offered up by the GNSO might be meaningful.

And I would suggest that the motion that we draft draw heavily on the considerations that the ccNSO made in their letter focusing specifically on the need to accommodate the experiences from each SOs past participation an appreciation for where the current policies and practices align and a focus on paying close attention to where they don't and could.

So mean I think we could make effective use of the ccNSO's letter in drafting this motion that would reinvigorate at least that would be our goal reinvigorate the discussion about cross community working groups.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Thank you John and I see Mary has her hand up. Mary.

Mary Wong: Yes I think I'm rivaling Chuck in the number of times I'm putting my hand up in this call. That sounds really good.

So I just wanted to I guess bring us to this point where John staff will work with you over the next few days you get a language you get language for the motion which I previously said we can circulate to the group noting that the deadline for motions for the next council meeting is May 30 September. So we would want to get all that stuff done by sometime next week.

Secondly I know Jonathan's been personally somewhat concerned about what we're going to do next on this overall issue.

So my plan is to touch base with him if not today given the time in the UK now certainly Monday or Tuesday to let him know Chuck exactly what you said, give a bit of a heads up, and maybe have him reach out informally to (Byron) which John you can do as well.

John Berard: Yes that's fine.

Mary Wong: Thank you.

John Berard: And, you know, I mean (Byron)'s a pretty easy going fellow. And it strikes me that there are enough reasons for people to see the value of creating a set of policies, practices, and procedures around cross community working groups it makes too much sense to ignore.

Mikey O'Connor: Rest in peace gasoline.

John Berard: No, no it's here. It's at the ready. Don't worry about that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you John. You still have your hand up. Did you have something you wanted to add?

John Berard: Note I'm just trying to balance out the number of times I've had my hand up with Mary and Chuck. I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: All right so...

Chuck Gomes: You could count more John if you take it down and raise it again. It does - you can't count a multiple times just because you left it up a long time.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm counting.

Mary Wong: Yes. I am too. I've got a ticker here. So, you know...

Mikey O'Connor: ...oh look at that 48. It's like crazy. It's up to 113.

John Berard: There we go. Good.

Mikey O'Connor: I think he's the winner. And new champion John Berard. Way to go John.

John Berard: All right so what are we doing this afternoon?

Mikey O'Connor: Well it seems like the ball is sort of in yours and Mary's court right?

John Berard: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Get a draft motion out. It sounds like that motion could go together pretty fast. And I think it would be great if we could get it done in time for the 30th deadline.

If you guys got one out in the next few days we could, you know, this group...

Chuck Gomes: I'm going to check you on that. How - could you get one out today and we could review it?

Mikey O'Connor: Well, you know...

John Berard: I couldn't get it out today.

Mary Wong: This is...

John Berard: Mary maybe you and I get it out Monday or Tuesday.

Mary Wong: Yes. This is Mary. I think Monday is more realistic. I'm - the deadline for motions is Monday the 30th. So not this coming Monday but the Monday following.

So if John and I got some out to folks by hopefully Monday but say Tuesday at the latest to the drafting team assuming people have a couple days to give feedback not that we expect anything other than, you know, feedback from you guys that will be very helpful we can certainly get in by Monday is my expectation. Does that sound okay to you John?

John Berard: It's fine with me. So do you want to do the first draft and then I can respond?

Mary Wong: Yes. So let me do this. I will do something over the weekend and send it to you John Monday. And you can edit it and let me know.

And once we're both okay with it then either you or I can send it to the mailing list hopefully by Tuesday.

And the meantime I'll ping Jonathan sometime on Monday to let him know what we talked about today.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie Hedlund. I see Mikey has his hand up? Mikey.

Chuck Gomes: Yes this is just a drafting note. I think if you go back in the transcript about ten or 15 minutes ago John almost rattled it off as he spoke.

You know, I think that this is pretty straightforward to draft. I think that might have been why Chuck was saying maybe we can just do it now. But anyway I would certainly think that Monday for a draft would be a good target.

Mary Wong: Yes. This is Mary. I think Chuck just wants me to look at this as well as the IGO report all at the same time before it goes up for public comment right Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: That's correct. And could you...

Mary Wong: Yes I can.

Chuck Gomes: ...look at some stuff on the policy and implementation things too over the weekend?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh and by the way I've get something on name solution.

Chuck Gomes: You asked Mary.

Mary Wong: I know. I know who I'm asking too. You know, seriously I guess I could otherwise have done it today but I'm actually at a conference. So I don't want to overpromise and under deliver. But Monday is certainly definitely doable.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Mikey O'Connor: That's good.

John Berard: All right I've got to drop off just now. I apologize setting a bad example.

Chuck Gomes: That's all right. I do too. So I think we're done aren't we?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think so great work.

John Berard: All right Mary I'll talk to you over the weekend or on Monday.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone. This is Julie Hedlund. (Unintelligible) this morning. Thank you Mary for all your hard work and for offering to help out. And have a nice weekend everyone.

Chuck Gomes: You too.

John Berard: Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

END