
SUE SCHULER: Great. Thanks. Okay, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Sue. Welcome, everybody, to our first RySG DNS Abuse Discussion Group meeting. I just wanted to spend some time today hearing from everybody about what they'd like to get out of this group and spend some time discussing purpose, mission, scope, and whether there's any immediate issues that we need to address. Because I think DNS abuse, as we know, is quite wide-ranging, and I think we've done a really good job in the last 12 months or so in doing some combined work on the topic within the stakeholder group and also the work that the DAAR Working Group has done as well. I think it's been really helpful.

So I just wanted to get from everybody to the extent that you want to share right now. What do you hope to get out of this group? Just as a kind of lead-up question. I did send this around on Friday but I appreciate that people may not have seen them all or had much time to think about it, but I guess just as an opening question if people would like to contribute to that. Brian?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Donna. Just a couple of initial thoughts. First, I think that just sort of optically and pun intended symbolically, this group serves a purpose.

DONNA AUSTIN: Nice one.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Yeah, there you go. I use that about once a week in most conversations. I think that it serves a purpose just the fact that this group now exists, even though this is the first meeting, to another stake in the ground for registries are really taking DNS abuse seriously. So I think once—and if/once we start having some sort of potential output from this group, that would be a really good thing to communicate across a community. As far as what outputs we could look for or what we would do, I think as an initial task, I'd like to tee up the Registrar counterpart to this group put out a DNS abuse referral path. Basically, what does a registrar look for when it gets referrals for DNS abuse?

I think that that would be an easy place for us to start, sort of a low-hanging fruit. We could, by and large, I think, borrow and credit of course the Registrar Stakeholder Group's work on this. As well as the Internet & Jurisdiction Policy Network recently just in the last couple of months actually put out some roadmaps for DNS operators to consider DNS abuse. As a first step, I think that would be a good place for us to start but I think that this group has a possibility of really being a hub for discussion at the Registry Stakeholder Group level for things like the work that Martin and Craig were spearheading on data sharing. I think that this would be a great place for that to really sort of live.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Brian. Jim?

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Donna. To build on what Brian just suggested, let me broaden that category. I guess I have two things I was going to suggest that might be considered here. They're sort of broadly scoped. Brian's suggestion there about the Registrar abuse reporting sort of fits in to this first one here. I think one of the things that I have learned out of coming out of the DAAR Working Group—and I think it should be fairly obvious to us in the community at large—is there clearly is a relationship here between us and registrars and DNS abuse.

I think we're finally getting to a place where registries are recognized as kind of the last stop or they should be the last stop, and yet there's still a lot of this first stop kind of role that people reach out to us for. I think there's an opportunity here for us to think about what else can we do with our registrar relationship. And Brian's suggestion certainly fits into one category, but what other kinds of things can we do with them to just have a better, more structured relationship, sort of respond to the community better, make DNS abuse look a little more well-mannered in general.

I think there's an opportunity there and something to think about as part of this for me coming out of DAAR. Right now DAAR has been very focused on registries and what we look like. We have heard ICANN say that they do want to expand it to include registrars. So I think that figuring out what we might be able to do with them in that space with respect to DNS abuse and how things are counted and how we get represented just feels like there's probably some opportunity there. A little bit of brainstorming about what we might want to propose to them and maybe we need to

have some kind of joint activity with them to go forward in some of these kinds of things. So more broadly, the registrar relationship in DNS abuse I think is a scenario that has a number of opportunities that we can sit and think about how to prioritize what we might do. So that would be one.

Another topic and this one is kind of provocative but it also comes out of the DAAR stuff, and I put it out here just to see what people want to think and they can jump all over and say no, and that's fine too. But we did have some discussions. I'll give this a very provocative, sort of pejorative title, and call it "name and shaming or registries." We've had this discussion in the DAAR Working Group about the fact that you can just feel that DAAR is sort of moving in that direction and the community is moving in that direction. And even we feel pressure, a recognition that there's "a few bad apples" that tend to make the vast majority of us look bad.

So the question is there a way for us to get in front of that? Is there something for us to think about there in terms of how do we address that problem space? We don't really want to name and shame. The Registry Stakeholder Group certainly has a long-standing position of not doing that but you know this pressure to go in that direction. And then this also ties back to the registrar relationship topic. There's also a few registrars that fall into that category like registries. There ought to be something there that we have to think about. How can we manage that better? How can we get that under control in a way that isn't really naming and shaming but better represents where the real problems are or not.

So that's my two suggestions—registrar relationship and dealing with the naming and shaming issue. Thanks. Sorry to be so long-winded.

DONNA AUSTIN: No problem. Thanks, Jim. Kurt?

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Donna. I think the formation of this group gives us a strategic approach, a strategic tool for addressing DNS abuse. The previous two speakers talked about different projects we've undertaken such as the DAAR Report or webinars we've done in the past or improving on Registrar/Registry communications, those sorts of things. So those are all projects that are all really good projects. I think this group is kind of the program office that oversees all these projects and which ones have the most value and what the communication's tones for those are. So again, I see this is like a program office that oversees and launches all these different projects. As part of that, we might just talk about first what's our mission, what are our guiding sets of principles, what are the things we need to do first so that we can make these decisions on which projects to undertake with this mission and principles in mind. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Kurt. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Building on what Jim was saying, the kind of name and shaming topic, and I agree that the concept of naming and shaming is always a really uncomfortable one, I think certainly back in Montreal and probably earlier than that, we've had frustrating cross-community discussions where those who are concerned about DNS abuse spiraling us as it's claimed feel the ICANN Compliance does nothing. ICANN Compliance will say, "I'm sorry, we're not able to do anything." We have someone like Elliot Noss standing up in that same cross-community session and saying, "We all know who the bad guys are. If there's a problem with Compliance, why don't we get together and fix it?" But as yet, it doesn't feel like anything has been done to do that and that seems like a perfect kind of cross-community discussion where we might actually be able to make some progress collectively on what can Compliance do without even changing the contract. Are their hands really as tied as they say they are? I mean, frankly, many people don't think they are but there's a reluctance to act on Compliance's part that perhaps needs to get addressed.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Susan. Brian?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Donna. Just reacting briefly to Kurt's contribution. I think it's really good as far as scoping what we're doing. I just want to make sure we're crawling before we're walking before we're trying to run. I think that a mission statement may be helpful in organizing our thoughts but for right now it feels potentially lofty, like we're just getting together. I think that it's almost best to focus

on discrete tasks first and as we coalesce, look what we're at three months from now and see, "All right, is this thing really off the ground running?" before we really set things out in stone.

As far as what Susan just said, I think it's really helpful topic for us to tackle. But admittedly, I do think that there's an argument that when it comes to registries, Compliance doesn't have the same tools that it does have with regards to registrars. There is a provision in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement that ICANN Compliance for some reason is [inaudible] them to even talk about but would allow ICANN to terminate a registrar's RAA if a court of competent jurisdiction finds that the registrar's enabling fraudulent activity, basically getting a declaratory judgment that the registrar is knowingly facilitating abuse would be enough to pull the plug on the RAA. That provision doesn't exist in the base Registry Agreement but I'd certainly be curious to have that conversation as it relates to registries.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Brian. Martin?

MARTIN SUTTON: Hi, Donna. I think following on from Brian's comments, it feels to me as if we probably still need a bit brainstorming. I think there's a lot there already, so there's a lot of things that have been happening and outside of the Registry Stakeholder Group there's probably many things that are occurring, whether individually or with groups of other registries or parts of the community. So it might be useful thing to take stock of that. I know we referenced it

in the paper that we talked about in intelligent sharing, so there's elements of that. But as Brian has alluded to that, there's other aspects here that could be thrown into the mix, which is exploring the current RA base agreement and see if there's any improvements that can be suggested. But that's a good conversation for us to have within the Registry Stakeholder Group and within this small group as a sort of nucleus to begin with. So I think it's got a good scope to be a very positive aspect and I would be interested in seeing this come to fruition. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Martin. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, I would be really, really careful with what we're saying, "Oh, Compliance doesn't know how to do things. Let's change the contract so they can do it." First of all, I would like to know what they cannot do because all I heard is, "Oh, Compliance couldn't do something." It's really nice but it's not a proper reason to change contracts. Also, Compliance is about following contracts, not about inventing ways of doing things. It's just making business according to the contract. No more. So I would recommend to split activities into: first, fighting abuse, and second, contract. Please do not mix because we will have lots of issues because of that. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Anybody else want to contribute anything at this point? Okay. I guess just a few points from my perspective. What I

think I would like to get out of this group—and I think Martin might have touched on this a little bit when he said brainstorming and I think it also serves as the group that we come to when there's a DNS abuse topic that comes up that we think we might need to respond to. Then I think there's a part of it that we try to be proactive to the extent that we can. And Jim talked about strategic relationships and I think the Registrars is absolutely one also conscious that the PSWG is another one, and to some extent the Board is also one that we need to look to as well.

I kind of think we should give some thought to the purpose, mission, and scope of what we want this group to do. And one of the reasons I say that is because when we started the DAAR Working Group, it was about DAAR. But then we had some concerns coming out with the stuff that Brian, whatever consumer safeguards guy was doing, and we actually went to the DAAR Working Group to help us out with that because we had nowhere else to go.

Brian, I take your point about we need to crawl before we can walk, but we should have some idea of what we hope to get out of this group. Because at the moment, we've heard quite a few different ideas and it's how we pull those altogether and get an understanding of what we want to take forward and how we decide on priorities. So I think good exercise in having a bit of the discussion about what we can do, and certainly Graeme Bunton has offered just to share with me some of the agendas that he's had with the Registrar Working Group because they've been working for I'm going to say 6 to 8 months now, maybe since Montreal, but they've been doing some working and coming out

with some practical stuff as Brian referred to. So I think maybe there's some things we can learn from them.

One of the things that wasn't mentioned, which kind of surprised me, is education because I really think that from my perspective, that's something that we need to be a little bit more proactive about. Maybe that actually fits within the scope of some of the other things that people have raised. But we've had really good responses to a few of the pre-webinars and the plenary session we were involved in in Montreal, and also the DNS abuse one that we did prior to ICANN68, which focused on COVID. But we need to do more in that regard. I think it's important that we are a little bit more proactive in seeking opportunities to educate the community.

One of the things that surprised me when we put the DNS abuse definition out there is that Contracted Parties one before ICANN68 was the number of people that picked up on that, including Maarten Botterman who actually pulled it out when he was talking to something. If we've been able to—and I know we tried to do this but we ran out of time—but any time that we introduce something like that, we should take the time to just set up a webinar and explain it so that people understand why we've done it. So I think education—what I'd like to see as an important part of what we do here. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thanks, Donna. I think that's an excellent point. That seems to have been very well received over the last few meetings. What I was just wondering though—and this is more about thinking about

how to do some of these things before we get into too much detail—but for instance, we’ve already created some good content so that’s available recording-wise, and somebody could actually run through those and pick out all the salient points and create a smaller set of educational videos or webinars, whatever it is, perhaps via ICANN themselves. So, some of these things may not need us to do an awful lot of time and effort because we’ve already got some resources to rely on already. So I think that’s important as we go through this. We have already done quite a lot of work in this area. It may be a bit fragmented but some of this could be about coordinating that better and thinking of smart ways to reuse that and get that out there as good information and available through various sources, including the ICANN website if anybody could navigate it. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

The website is changing again. Martin, that’s a good point. One of the challenges for us is resources. I’m very grateful to Brian who’s been the one that’s willing to get in front of everybody and talk about what we’ve done. But we really do need to—and interestingly enough, we’ve just come off of another call where we’re talking about a webinar on GDPR. We’re looking for new faces to get in front of the community, and I think that’s also important as well. We’ve got to encourage others that aren’t always part of these discussions to get involved because I think it’s important. The resourcing issue is another one that, unfortunately, we have those that are willing and able to help us out and readily do so, but I think from our community perspective and the Board perspective, they need to see other faces so that

they recognize that the registries aren't just half a dozen people, that there is more to it than that. So that's a bit of a challenge for us as well.

We've had a brief discussion about mission and purpose. I think we'll work that out as we go along, but I wonder if there's any immediate issues that folks think need to be addressed. I don't know if you all saw the plenary session topics that Jonathan shared with the list that there is one that's DNS abuse-related and it talks about practical solutions. I think, Brian and Susan, the conversation you had about our agreements, this will be front and center as far as I can tell. There is no guarantee that we will be—and Jonathan will try—we will try to get the DNS abuse sessions kicked off because ICANN68 was so focused on it but we don't know that we'll have any success in that yet. So from my perspective, one of the immediate things that we need to look to is the possibility that that session will actually get up and get some air time. If we're talking about practical solutions then what does that mean for us? So I'm just wondering if there's any other immediate issues that folks think that we need to deal with.

Brian, you pulled out a couple of things that we can do about that. DNS abuse referral path and that's something that we could certainly look to do. Martin and Craig have also done quite a bit of work on that trusted network and I would like this group to have an opportunity to have a look at that and see if that's something we could grasp because they had done quite a bit of work on it. It may be that if we've got two or three projects going at the one time that we're in smaller groups as we work through them or if there's one that we consider a bigger priority than the other then it's all hands

on deck on one thing and we just leave the other one to the side.
Brian?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Donna. Yeah. I think for this group to get traction quickly from an external point of view, I think it's important that we have something we can point to as an output before the next ICANN meeting. To be honest, to me it doesn't necessarily matter what it is but just so that it's easy to communicate that the Registry Stakeholder Group has a dedicated group on DNS abuse. And look, it's already put out an output regarding topic XYZ. Just like, as you pointed out, the CPH definition on DNS abuse really got a lot of traction. I think the fact that this group would be seen as up and running and/or will be having an output would be really important in advance of the next ICANN meeting.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Brian. While this isn't an output of this group, Kurt has raised that we need to publish the DAAR Report and maybe that could serve as our possible output even though it's from the DAAR Working Group, but that is something that we need to get out there. But if there's anything else that folks could think of then maybe that's something we want to pursue. But I think it's important. Brian, as you say, we have touch points with the ICANN meetings. Maybe that will change after ICANN69 because I think there's going to be a conversation about what's the long-term future of face-to-face meetings or virtual meetings. But I think they're important touch points for us so, to Kurt's point, I suppose, about a strategic overview, if we look at the ICANN meetings as

something tangible that we want to hold out before every meeting then we should be focused on what that might be and how we deliver it. So that's something that we can focus on.

Any other thoughts from other folks? I see Cyrstal Ondo has joined this call. Crystal, I don't know what call we're on last week but you were talking about the need for not just education but more tutorial-focused, if I could put it that way, a walkthrough of how a registry or registrar does something. I thought that was an interesting concept because it's something that I don't believe we've discussed before. We've done the webinar set which is an education "this is what we're doing" type arrangement. But I think what you were talking about was something slightly different. I don't want to put you on the spot but I just wondered if I've characterized that correctly and whether there's something else that you wanted to say about that.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

Sure. I'm not sure if it necessarily lends itself to a webinar for the general community, but I think for people like the ICANN senior executives and the Board members, it would be a useful task for them if we assign, "Hey, these are three domains and three sub-domains. Go figure it out what you would do with them if you were a registrar or what you'd do with them if you were a registry based on these contractual obligations that are contracts." And then have them go and use the tools that OCTO has just like everyone else—virus totals, safe browsing, whatever else is out there—and understand that it's not so clear-cut. I think a lot of people when they talk about abuse say, "PhishLabs has five million domains on their list. Go take them down." And if you actually dive into each of

them, it's not as clear as, "Yes, it should go down." A lot of them are third-party content sites and what do you do about that? I just think it's hard but I think they need to understand that this is not a discussion about us just inputting list and taking them down because it's not what it is. Exactly like Brian is saying, some of them are compromised sites, what do you do about that? I just think at least it would flavor what they understand and what recommendations they give ultimately based on all of this nonsense that we've been talking about for years and years now.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Crystal. That's something else that we could aim to do. I have been talking to Becky about trying to get a little bit more time in front of the Board for education purposes because you might remember when we did put out the DNS abuse definition. Becky was coming back with questions because the Board was asking questions and she did not have a response. And get the Board to see us as a resource. So if they have questions like that, they can come directly to this group and use us as that resource and even other groups.

If we think about ICANN69 is only two months away, is there anything that we would like to get out before ICANN69 or something of value that we think we could put together in that time? Putting aside the DAAR Working Group Report, I think we need to do that. We definitely need to get that out there, but if there's anything else that we think would be of value. Jim?

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Donna. I want to go all the way back to something Brian said when we first started. I think that the abuse path stuff that the registrars did, I think that doing something analogous and reaching out, doing with them, that feels to me like it ought to be fairly straightforward to do. As Brian is saying in the chat room again too—he's adding another low-hanging fruit item. But that feels like a real low-hanging fruit item to me, the abuse referral path process and seeing what we can do there. It gets us to the other item—I forget who mentioned it—about wanting to provide an opportunity for us to go on the record and become visible. I think that making this group visible by ICANN69 is a good thing. I don't know that we necessarily have to have something for every ICANN meeting but I think now is a good time to go on record as having something, and we should definitely find something. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jim. Maybe people can give some thoughts on that. If it turns out that there is the DNS abuse plenary session then this will be the group that we come back to, to see how we respond to that. I guess if you haven't seen the description then it would be worth having a look at. But it's calling for practical solutions and I think it's come from the BC so you can get to play where maybe what their practical solutions might be because I think it relates to contract changes. But that's something that we will need to focus on in the event that goes ahead. Kurt?

KURT PRITZ:

We might have to have something done in time for ICANN69 but we could launch a couple of initiatives. So going back to this vision of maybe this is a program office running a bunch of projects, it would be good that we launch one or two or even three substantial initiatives for study or communication or education, something like that that we could show are underway. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Kurt. I think it also goes back to Brian's point about serving a purpose that we're being taken seriously, that we take abuse seriously because we've set up this group. I think, Kurt, to your point, even if we haven't got anything tangible to show, the fact that we can say we were actually looking into these issues, it would be helpful in and of itself.

Sue has put up the DNS abuse session so people can see it. And as you can see, there's still challenges associated with how people perceive abuse in COVID-19 situation. Okay. Thanks, Sue.

So a couple of things. Becky asked to join this group and I was reluctant to do that without the agreement of the group. So I just want to ask if anyone has any reservations about Becky joining this group. I'll be up front about one of the reasons I hesitated, and it is because of the experience we had when we had that definition of DNS abuse statement that I would have preferred if the Board had questions that we interacted with the Board on that rather than Becky doing a back and forth piecemeal thing. One of the things that I'm concerned about is that any information that comes up here might be shared with the Board and maybe it's unfiltered. I'm not saying that Becky doesn't have our best interest at heart

but I am trying to get into a mindset that the Board should be looking to us as a resource. But if Becky's acting as a kind of an unofficial liaison then that takes a little bit of that away from us. That's why I was a little bit hesitant but I do see value in Becky being an observer of this group and understanding what we're talking about and working on. Does anybody have any concerns about Becky being part of this group? Martin?

MARTIN SUTTON:

Hi, Donna. I do appreciate your explanation there and I would support that concern as well and prefer not to put Becky in an awkward situation. I think that's the main thing though. In case there's ever a reliance that is put on her from other Board members, for instance. If the points are made clear and Becky appreciates that it's an observer status, but we would expect not for her to have to relay messages back to the Board, but look at ways to invite us in on specific points that would be of interest to the Board, that may be of a good value and sort of tie in with what your ambitions are there as well. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Martin. I am working with Becky to try and change that mindset but it takes a while. Sam, go ahead.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Donna. I am intrigued by something Brian put in the chat and I think maybe it's worth building on. He's suggesting that we could always invite her to particular meetings that she wasn't a formal member. I definitely understand and I definitely agree with

the concern you raise, which is there's some value in being part of the conversations and observing the discussions and thinking that lead to an output, but there also then is the risk that things get communicated out before they're fully baked. Maybe there's a way for us to sort of thread this needle and go a middle path, if you will, and have her be sort of like a Board observer to this group but we bring her in on maybe like time intervals or at specific milestones and sort of give her briefs about how we get to things so that she then is empowered to take our position. In to our Board discussions and she knows what's going on, she has an opportunity to ask questions and get some of that background, but isn't necessarily a party to every single discussion and every single e-mail exchange that happens on the topics over the course of developing position papers or whatever this group ultimately is going to end up doing.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Sam. This is a little bit of a new situation for us, I suppose. It's interesting because Becky's a Board member but she still has access to the registries. And it was certainly the same for Bruce. He had access to the Registrar list. But I wouldn't want Becky to be party to the RA Amendment Discussion Group that we have going on because of her Board fiduciary duties. That makes it a little bit of a different line for us here. So maybe we can give a little bit more thought to this. Maybe I'm overthinking, I'm being overcautious, but we'll just give a little bit more thought to this and maybe come back to it next week and decide whenever we decide to meet again and go from there.

The other thing I want to talk about is select—I think the DAAR Working Group works well with co-chairs, with Jim and Kristine. So I suggest that this group has the same, and particularly if there's going to be discrete projects that this group is working on at one time, I think co-chairs are probably a good way to go. I think what I'd recommend for this group is that we have co-chairs. And if there's any volunteers for the group to consider then I'm sure people would be receptive to that. I'm trying to catch up on chat. I see that Jim has volunteered. Anybody else interested in volunteering?

Crystal, on your question about whether we might get a single CPH, I think we're going to keep two distinct groups. But my hope is that we will have conversations on a regular basis. So there'll be a sharing of information. I think that's the intent at this point. Okay.

Brian has volunteered as well. I think we have co-chairs in Brian and Jim. Anybody concerned about these two fellows? As Kurt said, you know, leads for each project, which I think it makes sense if we're going to have discrete projects that crop up from time to time.

Tim and Brian. Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Donna. I'm sorry if this is sort of totally off topic, but I put a suggestion in chat just that maybe we should marinate on because it's something that I think would show direct engagement and not actually require any sort of heavy lifting on our part before the ICANN meeting. That's if we were to come up with sort of a

questionnaire and we could carefully draft the questions to get at the input that we're actually interested in receiving, but to send around to the various constituency and community leaders, basically getting at what is their current concern with DNS abuse. Can they provide us with examples? We can then ingest that and have direct feedback as opposed to just sort of the general feelings, we know everyone's against DNS abuse. But then really be able to show two things, one that were directly engaged and really acting in good faith to get feedback directly. And then two, we would have the opportunity if there's an actionable item that comes from another constituency to say like, "Okay, hey, the NCUC suggested this. We think that's a really good idea and here's a document that we've put out to address it." So to the extent we're looking for things to sort of get things going and show the community we're really taking this seriously and directly engaging, I think a sort of questionnaire or something like that would be a really great first step.

DONNA AUSTIN:

My initial reaction, Brian, is it's fraught with peril but that doesn't mean we should step away from it. We need to be really careful about what the question is and expectations. I think tying it to our definition of abuse makes a lot of sense, and maybe that could be the focus. Not as broad as what are your concerns about DNS abuse, but maybe focusing on our definition of abuse and why the rest of the community doesn't think that that works or something like that. I'm a little bit nervous but it doesn't mean we should shy away from the idea either, so I think it's worth exploring.

Okay, so Brian and Jim. Unless there's any other business, we probably should have a conversation about how often we want to have these meetings. Probably weekly, initially, but maybe that'll pay it back to something less than that. I don't know if people have thoughts about how often they want to meet at this point. Brian, is your hand up or is that an old hand?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: That's an old one.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. I think what I'm going to do is I'm going to close out this meeting but we'll hand off to Jim and Brian to take over the logistics of working out when they want on hold these meetings moving forward and scoping out what we want to do moving forward. Is that fair to everybody? Does that sound like a good idea? I see everybody's shaking their heads so we'll go ahead with that.

Thanks, everybody, for getting on this first call and I look forward to the discussions moving forward. Thanks to Brian and Jim for volunteering to co-lead this effort. I think it's going to be really important for us. We've done a lot of good stuff in the past 12 months and I think this is a good time to build on that, get some more structure around what we're doing and make some real progress. So thanks, everybody. I think we can end the recording, Sue.

SUE SCHULER: Okay. Thanks, Donna.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]