

**ICANN Transcription**  
**Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG**  
**Tuesday 02 December 2014 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG call on the Tuesday 02 December 2014 at 15:00 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-pps-a-20141202-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Steve Metalitz - IPC  
Graeme Bunton – RrSG  
Frank Michlick – Individual  
Chris Pelling – RrSG  
Justin Macy - BC  
Susan Kawaguchi – BC  
Kristina Rosette – IPC  
Val Sherman – IPC  
Volker Greimann - RrSG  
Theo Geurts - RrSG  
Stephanie Perrin - NCSG  
James Bladel – RrSG  
Tatiana Khramtsova – RrSG  
Griffin Barnett – IPC  
Darcy Southwell – RrSG  
Alex Deacon – IPC  
Kathy Kleiman – NCSG  
Jim Bikoff – IPC  
Paul McGrady – IPC  
Osvaldo Nova – ISPCP  
Phil Corwin – BC  
Sarah Wyld – RrSG  
Todd Williams – IPC  
Susan Prosser – RrSG  
Keith Kupferschmid – IPC  
Vicky Scheckler – IPC  
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC  
David Heasley - IPC

Holly Raiche – ALAC  
Christian Dawson-ISPCP  
Carlton Samuels – ALAC  
Michele Neylon – RrSG  
Don Blumenthal – RySG  
David Cake – NCSG  
Luc Seufer – RrSG

Apologies :

Dick Leaning – no soi  
Lindsay Hamilton-Reid- RrSG

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong  
Amy Bivins  
Danielle Andela  
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the PPSAI Working Group call on the 2nd of December, 2014.

On the call today we have Holly Raiche, Tatiana Khramtsova, Stephanie Perrin, Chris Pelling, Graeme Bunton, Justin Macy, Sarah Wyld, Steve Metalitz, Theo Geurts, James Bladel, Alex Deacon, Todd Williams, Kristina Rosette, Kathy Kleiman, Michele Neylon, Frank Michlick, Darcy Southwell, Keith Kupferschmid, David Heasley, Philip Corwin, Jim Bikoff, Susan Kawaguchi, Kiran Malancharuvil, Susan Prosser, Christian Dawson, Osvaldo Novoa and Griffin Barnett.

Apologies, we have Dick Leaning and Lindsay Hamilton-Reid. From staff we have Mary Wong, Amy Bivins, Danielle Andela and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Don.

Mary Wong: I don't think we're getting Don so, Graeme or Steve, would you like to kick off the discussions today?

Graeme Bunton: What a delightful start to the call this is. Good morning, everyone. This is Graeme. As per usual do we have any updates to SOIs? I think James is probably typing that he can't hear me very well. Delightful. So we'll see if Don can get in on the Adobe bridge. We'll see how long that takes.

So we've been going through our categories previously and I think have been going reasonably well. Last week's call on - I think it was D was a little contentious but not too bad. And now I think we're going to try and go through E, looking at the agenda. Where we want to sort of go through the conclusions that we've got. And see if there's any issues we still need to clear up.

Is that Don there? No, apparently not. Let me just see if I can find E and we can get going. All right so Category E, Questions 1 and 2 were around the baseline minimum standardized relay processes that should be adopted by ICANN accredited privacy and proxy service providers.

Should ICANN accredited proxy - privacy proxy service providers be required to forward all customer (unintelligible) relating to specific domain names to the customer?

We had a fair amount of discussion on this when we worked through the question. And I don't think - it was somewhat contentious but I think we got to a reasonable place which was that (unintelligible) sort of two options we were proposing.

Before that there was the fact that all consensus policy - sorry, all communications related to consensus policies must be forwarded. And then providers could choose from one or two options. Option 1 was to forward all electronic requests received, including (unintelligible) Web forms but the

provider may (unintelligible) commercial reasonable safeguards including capture to filter out spam.

That commercially reasonable bit was pretty crucial to our discussions as it was, I believe what registrars were looking for or service providers were looking for to reduce spam abuse.

And then Option 2 was to forward all electronic requests received via emails (unintelligible) received from law enforcement authorities and third parties containing allegations of domain name abuse. And then in all cases the providers must maintain a point of contact for (unintelligible) to use for escalation.

I can hear myself (unintelligible) through someone else's speakers and it sounds rather unpleasant.

So that's where we got to as (unintelligible). There's a couple of outstanding questions we can get to in a minute but I just want to check in and see if there's any response to those sort of first preliminary conclusions. Going once. Going twice. Great, we're all happy there. So that's good. Hooray for us.

So (unintelligible) discussion questions and maybe this is where we get a little bit of back and forth. So this was all around escalation and failure and that was should a provider have to or must notify the requestor when a communication has failed?

And this is where we talked a lot about, you know, email services and whether they're reliable, etcetera. And we didn't, I don't think, really get to a place of satisfaction on this. In general the - if I can describe these arguments from both sides, one it was useful to know from someone, a complainant or requestor, that communication has failed and they can know if they need to escalate or not.

And, then on the registrar side it was difficult to even know if that communication has failed or not for a variety of technical reasons. So that's the question that we should probably spend a little bit of time on. Does anyone have any thoughts they would care to raise?

I'm seeing no hands. So, Don, if you're back on line I'm perfectly happy to pass this back off to you. We're going through Category E Questions 1 and 2. We went through the preliminary conclusions that were generally agreed so the Options 1 and 2 and there didn't seem to be any comments there.

We move now down to the still under discussion components of this - of Category E and the should and must is, as Mary just pointed out, thank you, the options that we need to discuss around notification of communications failure. So feel free to take it over if there's not a variety of (unintelligible) summary is so great and I've managed to induce consensus or people are feeling awfully quiet today.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. I appreciate it. I'm just catching up in the document here. But thanks for the rundown. I just heard the last couple of sentences. Let me ask, do we have control of the screen? I'm trying to scroll and I'm getting a lot of interference - the document screen.

Mary Wong: Don, you should because it's been unsynced.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Well maybe my mouse is just being quirky today.

Graeme Bunton: We're more or less right down at the bottom.

Don Blumenthal: Graeme, you really could have phrased it a little bit better, couldn't you? Still under discussion? Okay. That makes it easy, now I won't touch the screen for a while. This call has got to go uphill, Steve.

Can hear you, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Hi, this is Steve. Can you hear me? I got back on the phone.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. Yeah, you're fine.

Steve Metalitz: All right, I really think the main point of contention here is the last phrase about cost. When we're in a should versus must, I mean, we're doing minimum standards here so if we can agree on what the standard would be then our recommendation I think should be a must.

But I think the divisive or the unresolved - the main unresolved question is this last sentence about - I think - again, there's agreement that in this situation when electronic communication has failed repeatedly and there's a request to use some different medium providers should have the ability to select the most appropriate means and can take cost into account in doing that but the question is whether they can charge a fee to the requestor for that.

And I think, you know, the viewpoint from the standpoint of requestors was, you know, this is a failure of the system and it doesn't seem right that that cost would be imposed on the requestor rather than on the customer who has failed to keep some type of up to date functional email address which he could be reached by the provider.

So I think that's kind of where that breaks down. I don't think this is a major point but I don't think we necessarily have agreement on it. And I don't know whether we just leave some stuff in brackets and further discussion in the draft report or whether we can resolve it. But I think that's where the main difference came in. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks. Yeah, I agree on that point. Does anybody have other thoughts on the "should" versus "must" and how it works out in the context of establishing

baselines versus stricter standards? I think that - you know, that is a base piece of the question. I agree with Steve.

Does it matter how the communication has failed? And that's a term that we struggled with. What really is a true, for lack of a better term, failure. Ah, Michele. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Can you hear me okay?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, I'm sorry (unintelligible) audio which I normally don't. I'm a little bit confused here by this concept. If the (unintelligible) domain name doesn't respond to an email that doesn't mean that they never got the email. It sounds to me like (unintelligible) is making non response or lack of response equate with something to do with a bad contact which - or maybe I'm misunderstanding something. It's just what I understood. Again, I could have misunderstood it. (Unintelligible) disagree, I'm just not quite understanding the issue. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Tell you what - let me let Steve address that directly and I'll circle back. Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, can you hear me?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, Michele, you are misunderstanding. And this misunderstanding that you and Chris and others keep bringing up is so repetitive, so persistent that I just have to think it's intention that you aren't listening when we say failure to respond is not a failure of communication we're talking about here. We're talking about a bounce back or situation where it's the clear message has not been delivered, not that it hasn't been responded to.

I just hope that we can put this issue, which has been raised I would guess at least 15 times on these calls, to rest. It's a total waste of time for you to bring this up again. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Alex.

Alex Deacon: I guess I just wanted to say (unintelligible) we're not talking about here failure to respond (unintelligible) respond may not (unintelligible) return by domain name (unintelligible) when there is a (unintelligible) failure, a hard bounce, that (unintelligible).

Don Blumenthal: Okay so we are focusing on hard bounce. That's what I was looking to clarify. Just to roll in from the discussion. Steve. Steve? Still not hearing you. Oh old hand, okay. Never mind.

Well let me go back to Steve's question in chat. Is - okay, all right well, Kathy, I'll point at you because I think Steve's made it clear that he should be (unintelligible) why should - Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. Don, can you hear me? Or am I breaking...

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: Yeah now. No I got you now.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah, we've got - yeah, I'm glad Steve already said - as I understood this first paragraph and this is when a proxy privacy service providers should or must notify the requestor of becoming aware that the delivery has failed. Yeah, first I think we should clarify that the electronic communication has bounced.



So, you know, so I would recommend we clarify the language on that because it has come up a few times and it still has that same ambiguity so it has failed - it has bounced.

And there may be ways to clarify or extend the "should" under - so that it's not, you know, completely voluntary or optional. But I think if we go to must we've heard that there could be all sorts of difficulties on the technical side implementing that. But depending on the scale that these bounces are coming back in that the bounces may be difficult to link back.

We heard a long list originally of technical problems as well. So I just - there may be ways to go somewhere in the middle of between "should" and "must" maybe that's something worth talking about. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Okay, appreciate it. Alex.

Alex Deacon: Yeah, just on the - on that point that Kathy made I just want to reiterate something I made several weeks (unintelligible) several months ago which is I don't agree that it's (unintelligible) to detect when hard bounces or a bounce is determined, you know, (unintelligible). When I send message, for example, I'll just use Kathy for an example, to Kathy (unintelligible) and your email address is not responding or for some reason I will get a bounce back and I will know that that happened.

And it seems to be that when we're communicating via (unintelligible) email, via the privacy proxy service that same (unintelligible) should have (unintelligible) communicating to the proxy privacy service be forwarded on to the person behind the proxy and that mail bounces then (unintelligible) difficult for that proxy (unintelligible) response and send it back to the original sender (unintelligible).

Sure there may be scaling issues but I don't believe that (unintelligible) I think it's well known how this works and how to do (unintelligible) so I just wanted

to kind of disagree with that (unintelligible) technical point that this is (unintelligible).

Don Blumenthal: Okay, appreciate it. Let me just - okay I'm not just focusing on (unintelligible) alternatives and I don't want to go there. But, you know, just to wrap up a few things I'm seeing in chat, we do need to tweak "bounce." I'm not suggesting and I hope nobody else is suggesting go back to that. But we still do need to work on accurate description.

You know, if a system doesn't do - sticking with bounce - well it strikes me that it's not going to be reported and therefore be like any other notification situation. So I think what we need to be focusing on here is what to do when there is say an affirmative notice that email has not gone through and not worry about a lot of the issues that were discussed where we talked about how that might not happen.

I think what I hear people saying is that we need to have language in here for when there is an affirmative notification. James.

James Bladel: Hi, can you hear me, Don?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

James Bladel: Okay (unintelligible) I was very reluctant to weigh in on this topic but I think that some of the previous comments require a little bit of clarification that our experiences as, say, individual or even experience (unintelligible) emails sometimes do not translate well when you're talking about systems that are processing, you know, thousand or perhaps even millions of messages per hour.

It's not a question of whether or not certain things are possible, it is more a question of whether or not they are feasible at scale and whether or not they become reliable or their reliability breakdown (unintelligible). You know,

again, you know, to Steve's earlier point (unintelligible) reluctant to reopen some of these conversations. But I think that (unintelligible) comments have been raised since then.

We need some clarification and we need some explicit language in this particular section so we don't have to keep coming back to this (unintelligible) 15 times or 16 times. You know, I don't want to be here either. And I do think that we need to have a fulsome discussion about the cost.

You know, I'm probably a naïve (unintelligible) of economics would be that the cost would follow the benefit. And certainly wants to understand who the beneficiaries of this communication system - these facilities will be and make sure that the costs are tracking the beneficial users of the system. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Appreciate that. That gets us into the whole issue of who pays but I think that's jumping ahead a little bit. I think we're at the point where we can say we'll do some cleanup of this language.

And again I'm hoping that focusing on this affirmative notification will ease a lot of the concerns about different mail systems and whether there is or isn't - whether they are or aren't incapable of sending or accepting those messages. I think that's (unintelligible) an issue about volume being the problem.

So without concern can we move on to - let me throw it open. Is there anything somebody wants to add or correct before we move on to alternatives or move on to notice rather?

I'm reading some chats here. (Unintelligible) conclusion is we need to come up with some amended language that clarifies that we're talking about, again, hard bounce and (unintelligible) we might still have one or two issues floating underneath here but I'm not sure of that.

Okay, let's go on to bullet point 2 here. Alternatives - alternative notices. And that gets us into who pays, it gets us into - well first should there even be a requirement that the provider use an alternate mechanism? Who will pay in those situations? Because, you know, the alternatives to me are going to, in one form or another, be paper-based.

Okay, let's break it down. Should the provider follow up upon request when there's been an email failure defined as hard bounce or here certain minimum number of hard bounces?

Okay, to the registrars: Do you want to deal with additional requests for you to follow up with physical mail, Fed-Ex, I'm blanking on the system I know if in Europe. Well Fed-Ex is there but there's another one that is more local.

Okay, Steve said, yes, the provider should. Are we going to go back to a "should" versus "must"? Well should versus must is there. Okay I've got to go back to something in the chat here. We're moving forward on the basis that only hard bounces require further action. If they're not notified nothing is required. No notify - if they don't know that something has failed nothing further is required.

Mary, I think we'll go back and try to come up with something. Carlton liked the affirmative wording that I used. Okay could folks contribute to the phone please? It would be a lot clearer than forwarding - having to read the chat particularly since I think a lot of people don't go ahead and reread the chats - a lot more useful.

Graeme Bunton: Don, this is Graeme. I'm gathering that people are suffering because of the quality of the phone bridge so we're moving by - moving to the chat because they can't hear so well.

Don Blumenthal: In some cases.

Graeme Bunton: It seems to be a pretty widespread frustration.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. (Unintelligible) folks on - maybe more people are on the bridge than I realized. Okay, David.

David Cake: I'm just going to say, look, with apologies to Steve earlier because I thought he's right about why we keep having to deal with this issue again and again (unintelligible) reasonable because I'm finding it frustrating too. But I'm just going to (unintelligible) in the chat that (unintelligible) certain time then we escalate which is exactly the sort of (unintelligible) this issue about (unintelligible) I think lack of (unintelligible) coming back to lack of response being, you know, an escalation (unintelligible) lack of response.

It doesn't seem to go away. I don't know why it won't go away. I'm as frustrated as Steve, I think that (unintelligible) come back already since (unintelligible).

Don Blumenthal: Right, no I appreciate that, David. Again I think a lot more people are having difficulties than I'd realized. I'm sorry I leaned on the mute button without realizing it.

Let me suggest this. I'm seeing a lot of repeat - returning to issues and I apologize if people can't hear me or can't hear me well. I'm seeing a lot of repeating of issues that I thought (unintelligible) on the call.

What I'm going to suggest is that we wrap the call. Steve, Graeme, I, Mary, Marika, will write up what we think are the conclusions we've reached so far and then just clearly specify what we see remain in bullets -in the two bullets here. Then next week move on to F and G. And hopefully wrap up this - wrap up this review and go and get into the writing phase.

And as part of we'll bundle up the chat and distribute it because, you know, I don't know that that many people go back and look at it. As part of what we

send out we're also going to ask that (unintelligible) actions to the definitions that Steve posited last week on the call that we should use going forward in discussing the transactional versus non transaction issue for eligibility. So with that unless - I mean, I'll stick around for 20 minutes but if people who are struggling want to drop off the call we'll cover as best as we can. But if anybody wants to stick around and just kick ideas around I'm happy to do it.

Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi, can you hear me?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

Stephanie Perrin: Wonderful. I just thought I'd join in here and suggest that it wouldn't take too long to read all the chat for the transcript (unintelligible) for those who listen to transcripts. And secondly, I hate to stop because I think we're having a good discussion.

I know we've had the discussion in the past but we still have to resolve this. And it ultimately boils down to allocating the costs for failure to respond, right? And determining the nature of the failure to respond always costs money. (Unintelligible) I don't think we resolved this the first time around although I missed a few calls so maybe we did and I've forgotten it.

But once you've established that the person is not responding for whatever reason, then it seems to me that the issues of who's benefiting from the transition going through it's pretty clear who has to pay whether or not ultimately the person is found to be behaving badly or not.

At this point you don't know (unintelligible) does not have to pay for escalation then there is, A, little (unintelligible) while we wait to escalate and, B, no incentive not to - not to escalate more often than they need to. I mean,

obviously (unintelligible) something by registered mail you have a different (unintelligible) so I think (unintelligible) go back to the sender.

Don Blumenthal: Okay for anybody who's still online anybody want to respond to that? I guess we'll continue the call for anybody who wants to stick around and make sure we distribute what goes on if it's just too frustrating to stay here. Steve, I thought you might.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, as I said in the chat, I don't think Stephanie has phrased the same question that we're talking about. It's not who bears the cost for failures to respond. I'm comfortable that if the - if for that there's some additional service that's a different question.

It's who bears the cost when the customer hasn't given the provider an email address that works at which - which a message can be delivered. And there's no reason for the requestor to bear that cost. The customer should be bearing that cost because that's part of the deal.

If you - you can have a proxy registration but you have to provide an email address at which something can be forwarded to you. And whether that's done through email or through a Web form, you know, there may be different methods of doing that but you have to provide an electronic point of contact that works.

When you don't, then, you know, either it should be on the customer because they failed to live up their end of the deal or it's on the service provider because they've failed to make sure that their customers did what they were supposed to do.

So, again, it's not a question of failure to respond after a message has been delivered; that's a totally different situation. It's a question when the message cannot be delivered. Hopefully we will soon have language that satisfies

everybody to describe that situation. I thought we did before; I agree with David, I thought we had resolved this but evidently not.

Carlton has made a suggestion. I don't know if that's the right wording but hopefully we can find the right wording. But once you get into that sphere then I think it is not appropriate to impose the cost on the requestor. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Thanks. Barring other comments I'm going to pick on somebody who said something in chat. And I'm going to repeat once again, if there are no hard bounces there will be no further action required.

And, you know, we have gone back to this many times just on this call. If the server can't reply with a hard bounce or for whatever reason no action is required.

Let me go back to Christian's point here. In what way is an email reliable enough in this context?

Christian Dawson: So I'm dealing with bounces in - can you hear me, by the way?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

Christian Dawson: Okay. I've been in the hosting space for 16 years and dealing with bounces in all sorts of different ways. And I honestly am not - am new enough to your world that (unintelligible) different part of the supply chain. But I'm not exactly sure what we're talking about; we need to work on definitions for hard bounce, soft bounce, etcetera. But I have - because I'm not completely following.

But I see bounces for all sorts of different reasons. I was explaining that people go (unintelligible) space, they don't pay their bill and the server goes down, unintentionally because their bill went to spam, there are all sorts of



reasons why emails bounce on a regular basis for customer experiences where the customer is completely - they're good natured, they're not trying to have an email address that doesn't work, just for a certain period of time it doesn't for some reason.

And maybe what I need in order to better understand the situation is for us to really walk through the difference between what we're talking about when we're saying soft bounce and hard bounce. And are we going to use that terminology? Are we committed to using that terminology is another thing I want to know.

Don Blumenthal: No (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Christian Dawson: Okay, well if we're not going to use that terminology then I have even more problems with trying to figure this out.

Don Blumenthal: Okay we're talking about - and again, we used this terminology earlier in the call and Carlton even responded in writing, I assume it'll be something along the lines of an affirmative notice of non delivery. That help at all?

Christian Dawson: Okay so are we going to use the technical terminology in the report?

Don Blumenthal: What do you mean by technical terminology?

Christian Dawson: Well is hard bounce a bounce that's a technical terminology?

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: No, we've said a few times we're not going to use the term hard bounce. We've got to come up with better wording. One of them might be affirmative notification of non delivery.

Christian Dawson: Permanent non delivery.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, we can tweak that. No, and you're right, it would have to be permanent non delivery, absolutely. But that's to be tweaked. We'll work on that. Okay, (unintelligible). Alex, did you have your hand up?

Alex Deacon: I did but I (unintelligible) put it down. I think - we've come to an agreement on the definition kind of similar to what Carlton mentioned and you just (unintelligible).

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, Don. I'm sure I'm breaking to everybody. Well...

Don Blumenthal: No. I can hear you fine.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. So I would add the word "timely" - timely affirmative notice of non delivery because we're talking about systems operating in real time and so it doesn't impose any duty if you find out a month later or six months later, you being the proxy privacy provider, that something didn't go through. This should, you know, these should be close to real time systems or short delays. Anyway I'd add that. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. I put your definition and put Chris's permanent term in it. So and we're building something, that's what we'll have to continue to do during the (unintelligible) but there'll be plenty of time to work on that also in the drafting stage.

Yeah, it would be helpful if we're going to talk about timely to get an idea of any standards there are in the email management or the - or in email systems for how long before a permanent bounce will be generated. I'm sorry I used

the word "bounce." Need to get away from that because it's obviously causing confusion (unintelligible) using it informally on the call.

Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Don. And this has been a good discussion. I think it's reminded a lot of us of discussions that took place a while ago. I just wanted to say a couple of things as follow up. One is whatever the proposed revised language coming out of today is from the staff perspective we would ask that the providers and particularly the technically-oriented folks, do give us the feedback as to whether that's workable definitions.

Because I've gone back and just looked at some of the notes from our previous calls from this category and, Don, to your last comment, one of the notes we have is that if we're talking about the provider receiving a notice of a delivery failure two things might be noteworthy here.

One is that someone did make the point that there is no equivalent in the RAA for the registrars for (unintelligible) relevant here and I just bring it up. And another point is that someone also made a comment that, you know, because different systems are configured differently there would not always be a notice (unintelligible) that kind of delivery in addition to the points that others have raised on Adobe.

So while this is a good discussion, cleaning up the language would probably require a lot of folks chipping in, if you like. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks and I hope we do get a lot of contributions. There will be plenty of editing, tweaking to do as we go forward with the template and the draft. Any other - David, is that an old hand? I guess it was, thank you.

I'm hearing an echo of myself, it's very distracting. Any other comments here? Or should we wrap up? I think it's going to take a lot of distilling of the chat

and the transcript in general. But more, you know, possibly more detail here because so many people were having audio issues.

I appreciate those who did stay on even though we were having difficulties. It doesn't look our attendance in Adobe anyway went down much but there was a lot of good stuff in the chat so that's - could have been sufficient.

Okay well - oh okay wait for this one last - tell you what, why don't we close it down formally, keep the room open for a couple just to see if - oh, I was going to say see if there were more comments (unintelligible) like the one I just saw. It's been a challenge in a few different ways today.

Okay we'll give folks - we'll give you three minutes back and start working. Appreciate your time.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Don. Thanks, every...

Terri Agnew: (Andre), if you can please stop the recording.

END