

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Review Working Group  
Thursday, 26 April 2018 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-26apr18-en.mp3>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Attendance

Members:

Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)  
Sara Bockey (RrSG Primary)  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP Primary)

Participants:

None

On Audio Only:

None

Apologies:

Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)  
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)  
Lawrence OlaWale-Roberts (BC primary)

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund  
Emily Barabas  
Berry Cobb  
Marika Konings  
Terri Agnew

Operator: Recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Review meeting taking place on the 26th of April, 2018. On the call today we have Jen Wolfe, Sara Bockey and Wolf-Ulrich Knohen. We have listed apologies from Lori Schulman and Rafik Dammak. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Emily Barabas, Marika Konings, Berry Cobb and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Terri. And actually I'll go ahead and turn it over to Jen. Go ahead, Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thanks, everyone. And thanks, Sara and Wolf-Ulrich for being here today. We do have a smaller group so prior to the start of the recording we just discussed that we're going to go ahead and move forward but we'll make sure that if there's any, you know, final decision making we'll leave that open to discuss on list and into our call next week.

So our agenda today was to do an update on the consensus call for revised implementation charter for 7 and 12, which was actually scheduled to close today, so we'll do a brief update on that and then we can take a look at the revised implementation charter for Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 as well as Recommendations 20 and 21. And I think with our low group we'll just – we'll leave that open for any further discussion next time and then move that towards a consensus call.

And then we want to take a look at our work plan through the remainder of the year and certainly to closing out the work of this group and then our next meeting is scheduled for two weeks from today.

So just very briefly, with Sara and Wolf-Ulrich, are there any updates to your statements of interest? Okay, why don't we go ahead, Julie, so where are we on the consensus call? Have we had any issues there?

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So the consensus call for the charter for Recommendations 7 and 12 closes, as of close of business today, April 26. Thus far there have been no comments or suggested changes or objections. If that continues to be the case as of COB today then the charter would be deemed to be accepted by full consensus. But I see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up, please go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes, just small typos, more, which I would like just to tell you about in these recommendations. You know, if you look at – it's not on the screen here but I do have it here. So the headline, for example, you know, it's just a typo, it's the Recommendation 7 and 12, not 1, 2 and 3, which is here in the headline written, that's one point.

And then there is on the Number 3 in the solution under Solution, Number 3, which is called, Translation of Documents, two small typos. The one is in the first line at the end it's – should be translation and trans (Latin) and the second one you call it "transition" which means translation. So these were the two typos, you know, I'm just – aware about. Nothing – no comment with regards to the content, that's all okay, and there is no objection anything else. That's it.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. Just where – I have the document up on the screen now. Where was the – I got the first correction, where was the second one, on which page?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The second and third were under Number 3, Translation of Documents.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Number 3. Oh I see it down here, yes okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Translation of documents and then there is the first...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I see it, yes, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...second line is translation – transition...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yes, exactly. Well and there's also a typo in the first line as well I see now so thank you for that. Those are both noted, thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Or all of those I should – perfect. Okay, so then we'll make – staff will make those changes and then if there – if they end up not being any further changes or suggested changes or objections then tomorrow we'll send a note to the list letting everybody know the status and, you know, that – and if it is the case that it's accepted by full consensus. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. That's great, so we can move that one forward then if there are no other comments today. So then let's go ahead and move on with the revised charter for Recommendations 1, 2 and 3. Julie, could you give us an update on the changes that have been made there?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Thank you. So – and these are highlighted here. Let me get to the first of the changes. And so these were suggested changes based on the discussion on our call two weeks ago. So on Page 3, with respect to the Council's comments on the CROP – the Community Regional Outreach Participation program, it was suggested to add the text that, "Staff notes that the Council comment is focused on its role as manager of the PDP and does not necessarily incorporate more views of individual stakeholder groups and

constituencies, some of whom submitted comments separately.” So it – so the working group suggested adding that text, so that has been done.

And then moving ahead, let’s see, to the next changes. This really is wonky. Okay, so we also had a query out to ICANN staff with respect to the Fellowship Program and asked about metrics. And so we noted that there are metrics that are gathered and tracked and we have a pointer to the link – the link actually goes not only to some metrics but also to the Fellowship Community Process Review, which has just closed. And so we also include here a representative table with some statistics.

And there was a question from the working group and the question was whether the data that’s gathered is based on information that was self-reported from the fellows or captured based on their participation. And ICANN staff has confirmed the latter; that the data is based on the actual participation/roles of the fellow that ICANN has captured and confirmed.

And then in addition, with respect to the CROP program, staff notes that extensive reports have been produced for each year the CROP has operated, including statistics relating to effectiveness and use. And staff points to those statistics as well.

And then with respect to tracking newcomers to apply for and participate in the Fellows program, these data are collected and noted above. And then with respect to statistics from stakeholder groups and constituencies on membership numbers annually, including engagement, level, activity sustainability, such as statistics on member attendance and participating in working groups, these data are collected, staff notes. And staff tracks stakeholder group and constituency’s participation in working groups via the attendance sheets that are collected on the working group wikis.

Furthermore, the stakeholder groups and constituencies use these data to determine their members’ participation. And that has been confirmed through

inquiries that staff has made to the staff supporting the various stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And then on Number 4, whether to develop and fund more targeted programs beyond those already offered, staff notes that with respect to the Fellowship program, there is already a community consultation underway that is – sorry, that’s a typo – that is working to address questions relating to the effectiveness of the program and whether metrics could be useful in this regard with respect to the CROP. Staff notes that extensive reporting has been performed for each year of the program and notes the above links.

And so finally, I think the most important addition that staff has made here is staff has put some language into the working group determination. So I’ll ask first – before I go in to that if there are any questions about the text that has been – that staff has added thus far. Not seeing any hands up. So I’ll go ahead and go over the suggested working group determination.

So Recommendation 1 was that the GNSO develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard to GNSO working groups. And the determination is that the GNSO Review Working Group has reviewed existing metrics and determined that these are sufficient to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard to GNSO working groups.

And moving to Recommendation 2, that the GNSO develop and fund more targeted programs to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP working groups given the vital role volunteers play in working groups and policy development. And here staff says, “The GNSO Review Working Group evaluated the current programs and determined that these are sufficient to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP working groups while noting that the Fellowship Community Process Review will likely result in

improvements to that program and additional metrics to measure effectiveness.”

And then on Recommendation 3, that the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups. And here, the determination is that the GNSO Review Working Group notes that participation in working groups is already a low cost or no cost option for members and observers. All meetings are accessible via remote participation and there are recordings and transcripts for meetings at ICANN meetings, real time transcription and translation of transcripts often are provided.

Newcomers may be eligible for travel funding for ICANN meetings via the Next Gen and Fellowship programs although face to face participation is not a requisite for effective participation in the policy making process. Furthermore, the working group notes that a traditional RTT solution typically includes professional translators, understanding that the costs of such translators may be prohibitive for some uses, other solutions may include automated services, volunteers or translations of executive summaries of transcripts after public meetings.

And that was text – that last two sentences were text that was specifically recommended to be included in the determination in the discussion we had at the last meeting. And then the final sentence is that based on its evaluation concerning the three recommendations, the GNSO Review Working Group determines that the recommendations have been implemented based on current processes and programs and that no further action is required. And I’ll stop there and ask for any questions or comments.

So, Jen, this is Julie again. May I suggest that perhaps we could put this text out for a review prior to doing consensus call, I mean, given that we did...

Jen Wolfe: Yes, agreed. Right.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, no that's exactly what I was about to say. And I think you circulated it yesterday because I was just pulling up my email and taking a look at that. But, yes, I would say after this call, and we'll probably do the same on the next one, that we'll circulate what the changes are and ask people to read them and then the next call we can just pick it up and if there's any further discussion we can add to that and then take it out for consensus call. I think that makes sense.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, great. That's perfect. We'll go ahead and do that then. And I see that Wolf-Ulrich notes in the chat that he agrees to circulating it, so we'll take that action item. Great, thanks. Let's see, that's plan. Let's see where's the next one?

Okay, so, Jen, the next item on the agenda is Recommendations 20 and 21.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, perfect, let's go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Okay great. So we did a first reading of this on the last call and there were no changes but we didn't spend more than say – I'd say about 15 minutes on it. So maybe what we could do is go through the sort of the solution section and the determination section. But just as a reminder, there's two recommendations here, 20 is that the GNSO Council should review annually ICANN's strategic objectives with a view to planning future policy development. This strikes a balance between ICANN's strategic objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development.

And Recommendation 21, that the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs, in order to forecast likely

requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well represented in the policy making process.

So moving to the solution, so one of the suggestions that staff made in here, and I'll note what one of the suggestions then that was made on the call last time, relating to this, was that with respect to Recommendation 20, staff noted that the Council does not currently have a formal mechanism to review annually ICANN's strategic objectives. But it does have a standing committee on ICANN's budget and operations that was chartered in December 2017 to coordinate and facilitate dialogue to fully understand ICANN's strategic and operational planning and budgetary processes in particular in preparation for the annual budgetary comment cycle as it relates to the GNSO Council's remit.

So in this case any and all of its recommendations are submitted to the Council for consideration and as currently chartered, it is providing input to ICANN's annual budget from the Council's perspective as the manager of the GNSO policy development process and also as a decisional participant in the empowered community.

So the SCBO could potentially be the structure through which the GNSO Council develops input on ICANN's strategic plan once strategic planning for the next cycle begins. That would require scope of the standing committee to be expanded in its charter. And but this would indeed complement existing responsibilities relating to analyzing the annual budget.

So one of the things that we discussed last meeting and you'll see in the work plan that staff has included this as well, is that there be an update at the next Council meeting, not the meeting that's today obviously, the timing is not right for that, but the Council meeting in May that's the 24th of May, that there should be an update to the Council from this working group on a couple of items you know, not only to update the Council on the status but to alert them to a couple of things, one of which is that this proposal to possibly expand the

scope of the charter should be made to the Council for consideration and so that can be raised.

And then some other points that could be raised in addition to this would be the status of the recommendations relating to GDPR and also the status of recommendations relating to diversity and in particular the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 diversity recommendations that have now been finalized and are now out for the Board to make a determination on implementation.

So at any rate, so this is one item to bring up to the Council. And then I can go onto Recommendation 21 but I just want to pause here with respect to Recommendation 20 and see if there are any questions. And again, not seeing any questions, I'll go ahead and move onto Recommendation 21.

And here staff notes that there are a number of initiatives underway within the ICANN organization to collect data and analyze trends in gTLDs to support decision making by the ICANN organization and the ICANN community, including the GNSO. And this data can be leveraged by the policy development process working groups and the GNSO Council to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well represented in the policy making process.

So for example, the gTLD Marketplace Health Index is an ongoing project producing statistics and examining trends related to the health and diversity of the gTLD marketplace. So this is where ICANN is publishing statistics semiannually to track progress against its goal for the domain name marketplace to be robust, stable and trusted. I won't read through all of this – the text there.

Another example is ICANN's Domain Abuse Activity Reporting project, which is a system for studying and reporting on domain name registration and security threats, threat behavior across top level domain registries and

registrars. There's also the Identifier Technologies Health Indicators, which is a project organized by the Office of the CTO to develop metrics to quantify and measure the state of the unique Internet identifiers that ICANN helps coordinate.

And then there's been a significant amount of data that's been commissioned from additional studies to support the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice review and that is also data that is being leveraged by other policy development processes including the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures and, yes, and also actually the Rights Protection Management – Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP Working Group.

So and currently the GNSO Council also requests and receives updates on the data collection initiatives on an as needed basis and maintains open channels of communication with relevant data collection projects and has access to the outputs of these projects. See report and public websites. So it's not anticipated that a formal mechanism for communication is needed at this time, and it might be beneficial for the GNSO to review these inputs and request updates as needed when data is release rather than according to rigid timelines.

So that is the heart of the report. And then we have some recommendations in the working group determination that I'll just go ahead and run through. So the recommendation is that the charter of the SCBO be revised to include an annual review of ICANN's strategic objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's strategic objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development.

And then the second bullet, given that there are already a number of data sources available and research initiatives underway that provide information about trend in gTLDs, the working group does not anticipate a need for additional data collection and analysis efforts. The GNSO Council already maintains ties with the coordinators of these efforts and receives updates

when they are timely. This approach allows the Council to receive information as it becomes available rather than setting rigid timeframes for updates. Should the Council decide that a different approach is needed it may consider setting up a regular review of data and analysis at set intervals.

So I'll stop there and ask if there are any questions. And again, suggesting Jen, and Wolf-Ulrich, that staff could also circulate this charter for review and then see if there are any final comments as of the next meeting.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. I think that's a good approach with this one as well, but Sara and Wolf-Ulrich, do you have any comments? Oh, Wolf-Ulrich, is your hand up there? Go ahead

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks, Julie. Well, I'm fine with this – these recommendations and with the charters, especially also with the last one. If I'm correct, you know, regarding Recommendation 20, I think Rafik had made a comment after last meeting with regards of the question whether the committee, the standing committee might be the right place or either the Council should be the one – the entity, well, to decide upon. Well, so that is something I would just raise, you know, I'm fine with the committee because in the end, you know, the Council has to decide upon – and to approve what the committee is going to suggest. But we should that leave open so for further comments, you know, from Rafik's side or others if they would like to chime in. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And thanks for reminding us of that point, that's a good one. And I think it's worth noting again that yes, you know, any recommendations that come out of this committee do have to be approved ultimately by the Council so it is the Council whose the final arbiter of, you know, any decisions that arise from the SCBO.

But I think also it's worth, you know, pointing this out to you know, when we do the update to the GNSO Council that, you know, it can be their prerogative

to take on this review themselves and perhaps have a separate standing committee for that, although I suspect that the Council would probably want to, rather than, you know, create a new process or new standing committee would probably prefer leveraging the existing committee, but that, you know, that should be left up to them, so that's something that we can brief them on and can be part of the discussion on the next GNSO Council call.

So this is Julie again. Jen, should I go onto the work plan?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, let's take a look at the work plan.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks. Again, Julie Hedlund from staff. So this is starting from April, so, I mean, our last meeting was on the 12th. We noted that Recommendation 22 that the implementation was complete. We had a discussion of Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, and we released 7 and 12 for a consensus call. And we added language in 7 and 12 with respect to budget effects that any demand for services with budget implications must be brought to the working group leadership – from the working group leadership to the GNSO Council for consideration.

And this can be included in part of our update to the Council on 24 May just indicating that, you know, that note from that particular charter is, you know, something that then would, you know, fall to them to decide, which I think any kind of budgetary demands, you know, that would affect the GNSO's budget would naturally fall to the Council for consideration. But it will be worth noting to them.

And then we began on the 12th the discussion of Recommendations 20 and 21. And also noting that raising the change – possible recommendation to change the SCBO charter raising that with the Council also at its meeting on the 24th. And then today's meeting we did, again, talk about Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, and we'll take the note to send that out for review. And Recommendations 20 and 21 also send out for review.

Now we did not, today, talk about Recommendations 6, 33, 35 and 36. But I will note that staff has begun looking at the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 recommendations which were finalized by the CCWG in March and cross reference them with these four recommendations, 6, 33, 35 and 36. And so what staff will do is provide a report for our next meeting on the links – linkages between the GNSO review recommendations and the CCWG recommendations.

On the whole, the CCWG recommendations are broader, as one might expect, and so could be conceived to encompass some of the recommendations from the – resulting from the GNSO review. Staff notes that one of the recommendations – I forget which one it is – but one of the recommendations is for the GNSO Council to establish a working group to develop recommendations relating to diversity and it might be that the existence of the CCWG diversity sub team and its recommendations may have actually fulfilled that role. So that's an analysis that staff will make to see whether or not that might be a possibility.

And also staff notes that one dependency, if we do link the GNSO review recommendations to the CCWG recommendations as far as implementation, that implementation will be dependent upon the Board's decision concerning the implementation of the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 diversity recommendations. The Board has the final decision to determine how – whether and how those recommendations will be implemented.

So we'll consider that as well as we develop the charter for these four recommendations. But just wanted to note that work is underway in that area and that we're in the process of conducting an analysis there that we'll have ready for the next working group call. And here Marika is saying, "Whether implementation is achieved for those recommendations may only be possible further in the future as Board consideration is still some time out."

Yes, Marika, so that's what I note. It is possible that there might be a dependency on if we do tie the GNSO review recommendations to these then that – they would, you know, they would not possibly not be implemented until the Board consideration is complete. However, we'll see whether or not, you know, in our staff analysis we'll see whether or not it makes sense to tie these two together or whether or not there are steps that the GNSO could take separately from the CCWG recommendations.

Perhaps it might be more lightweight steps with respect to diversity to address the GNSO review recommendations ahead and in, well, in a way that perhaps is not inconsistent with the CCWG recommendations but that does not then delay their implementation until the Board's consideration is complete. And that will form part of our analysis from staff.

And just noting, these are the recommendations here actually, let me go back to page – this page. Yes, so just as a reminder, Recommendation 6 is that the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on working group participation including diversity statistics, that 33 is that stakeholder groups, constituencies and Nominating Committee in selecting their candidates for appointment to the GNSO Council should aim to increase the geographic, gender and cultural diversity as defined in ICANN Core Value 4.

Thirty-five, that the GNSO Council establish a working group whose membership specifically reflects the demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity of the Internet as a whole to recommend to Council ways to reduce barriers to participation in the GNSO by non-English speakers and those with limited command of English. Now that is the recommendation that might possibly be covered by the CCWG's Sub Team on Diversity and its recommendations. Staff will provide that analysis.

And then 36, that when approving the formation of a PDP working group the GNSO Council requires that its membership represent as far as reasonably practicable the geographic, cultural and gender diversity of the Internet as a

whole. Additionally that when approving GNSO policy the ICANN Board explicitly satisfy itself that the GNSO Council undertook these actions when approving the formation of a PDP working group.

Now that one may require a change to the PDP Manual or possibly –yes, possibly the PDP Manual and maybe also possibly the Working Group Guidelines. And again, that’s something that staff will include in the charter for these recommendations.

And then we’ll just note – I won't read through all of these, but, you know, the budget – the budget effects that would of course depend on how these recommendations might be implemented. And then with respect to Recommendations 26-29, as you may recall, we have a completed charter for these recommendations that has been discussed and reviewed fairly extensively and is really just on hold based on the implementation of GDPR and what steps ICANN will take with respect to the data collected as part of these recommendations as these all relate to statement of interest, statements of interest have personally identifying information that’s publicly available.

There will be a – some type of I think statement or mechanism that ICANN will put in place with respect to these data in – to address the GDPR. And so staff will gather further information on that. That’s not settled quite yet but once that is determined we’ll be able to include that in these charters and then I think what we had determined was that these were all recommendations that had been implemented based on current processes but that they needed to reference what would be the mechanism with respect to the data relating to GDPR.

And moving along, so for May then, we’ll do an update to the Council on Recommendations 7, 12 to also 20 and 21 and we’ll do the – we’ll provide the charter for actually this should also include the charter for recommendations relating to diversity and then also we’ll have the changes relating to GDPR

with respect to Recommendations 26-29. So we'll make the change actually that will reflect that this group will be considering the diversity recommendations in May, not in June and we'll move that up.

And then we'll note in June then – by June Recommendations 7-12 should be complete. If the GNSO Council has agreed to change to the SCBO charter or some other mechanism then – and if that has been approved, then Recommendations 20 and 21 would be complete. Recommendations 26-29 would conceivably be complete and there we might anticipate that there might be a need for a Council motion if there are changes to the way the statements of interest are collected, although that's just a placeholder for now, it's not clear whether or not that's necessary.

And the same with Recommendations 6, 33, 35 and 36, there's a placeholder there for a possible motion if one is needed to implement those recommendations. And then of course there's a status report to the OEC – and to the GNSO Council that will be done in – as part of the update that's required for the OEC every six months. And then we would hope then that the goal is to have everything complete by the deadline, which was September 2018 and possibly sooner.

So we'd have from July to September to make sure that – to finalize completion and then of course if there's any dependencies those would be noted to the OEC such as whether or not we needed to await Board consideration on the diversity recommendations before noting that those recommendations are complete.

So that takes us through to the end of the implementation plan. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thanks, Julie. Any questions or comments? Looks like we're staying on track with everything.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I see Wolf-Ulrich has...

Jen Wolfe: Yes, did you have something, Wolf-Ulrich? Go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. Just thanks very much, Julie, this is very comprehensive and so I understand that we have then for the next time – for the next call in two weeks really we have to talk about and to finalize the question about what to submit or what – how to update the GNSO Council. This is what I understand with regards to the deadline on 14th of May, I think so, and then that next meeting is supposed to be on 10th May around that time, I understand, yes, is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes, that's correct. So staff anticipates getting out a draft of the – a draft of the update to the Council. The goal is to get that out early next week. That will be in the form of slides, I think as we've done in the past, and that would give the – this working group time to review those and then they could just be finalized on the meeting on the 10th. And that would be time for them to be submitted to the Council not later than the 14th for the motion and document deadline for the meeting on the 24th.

So, Jen, I don't have anything else I don't think, let me look at the agenda here.

Jen Wolfe: I think that brought us to the close. We'd just talk about the next meeting.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so next meeting is the 10th of May also at 1300 UTC. And just to note the action item is again, staff will send out Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 and 20 and 21 for review and then we'll hope to finalize those on the meeting on the 10th. Staff also will send out draft slides for the update to the GNSO Council. And that will be on the agenda to finalize. And then third item on the agenda would be – and the charters for the diversity recommendations and

also any update on the GDPR recommendations – the recommendations that have may be affected by GDPR.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Excellent. Well, Wolf-Ulrich, and Sara, thanks for taking time to join today. I'm glad we went ahead and kept this moving forward, I think that'll be helpful to keeping us on track. And Julie and to all of you, staff, again, thank you for your continued support and making all this move forward smoothly. Any other final comments? Okay, if not I think that brings our meeting to a close. And we'll look forward to talking again in two weeks. Thanks, everybody.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks so much, Jen. Thanks Wolf-Ulrich, Sara...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...and we'll talk in two weeks. Thanks, everyone.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Have a great day, everybody. Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. (Rachel), the operator, if you could please stop all recordings. To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END