

24 October 2019

SUE SCHULER: Thanks. Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Very good, thank you, Sue. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is Rick Wilhelm from Verisign, and this is the regularly scheduled meeting of the RDAP Working Group. Today is 24th October, 2019, and thanks everybody for joining us. This is probably, unless someone disagrees, our last meeting before the ICANN66 meeting in Montréal, and if I'm guessing correctly, we'll probably have a relatively light agenda, today. Thanks, everybody, for attending. I've gotten regrets from Catherine Merdinger, a little bit earlier, I believe I saw those come through. I've not seen any other regrets come across, I don't believe.

We've got the agenda that I sent out about two hours ago, and just as we normally do we'll take any questions, comments, or concerns, and we will do our customary agenda bashing. You can please come to the mic, or show your hands, if you've got any agenda topics. As that happens, I'm seeing a couple of ePDP members trickle into the room, fresh-faced after their ePDP conversation for the day.

Seeing no hands, we will go past our agenda bashing and go into our usually customary first topic of implementation status. Just a quick check of the URL submissions in the IANA file for the registries. We had two more in the last week or so, here, from the registries, so we're now up to 836. And a few more into the registrar IDs file. I botched the update, it should be 1,023, not 1,003. We're now up to 2,073 of the registrar IDs in the registrar IDs file. That's

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.

my bad on the thing there that was in the e-mail, which Sue quickly corrected in the Google Doc there, in her window. Any questions about that? We are seeing some good progress there on the registrars. We seem to have stalled out in the registries, but no worries there.

Questions or comments? Seeing none, we will just quickly look at our ICANN schedule, here. 10:30-12:00 on Sunday, our regularly scheduled meeting of the RDAP Working Group. Jim Galvin has his hand up. Jim, please come to the mic.

JAMES GALVIN:

Sorry, Rick. I kind of took it down when you went on, I was a little slow, there. Now that you've called on me, it suddenly occurs to me I love this tracking of the number of registries and registrars. Do we actually know what the number should be? Do we know what the target goal is here, for these, by any chance, or a way to find it? Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

I can give you my own take and how I find it. Here's my take, looking first at the registries. The registries, I don't have a target, but someone who is wiser than I and very familiar with what the IANA number would be, would be able to do it. I get the count in here simply by looking at the number of ... I go into the IANA file and I just search for the term "HTTP." That's how I come up with 836.

I'm trusting, there, the search function in Google Chrome. Assuming that there's not a material bug in that, that's how I find it. I don't download the file and do any parsing of that. I'm relatively lazy, so I don't do any parsing to find out how many TLDs are represented there. This is purely RDAP URLs. Someone who is a little bit more

curious than I – and it doesn't take much to exceed my level of curiosity – would do a download of this thing, pull it apart via some JSON parser, and tell us how many TLDs are represented, there. I've not done that. That's the registries. On the registrars ...

JAMES GALVIN: Rick?

RICK WILHELM: Sure, go ahead, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: I'm sorry to interrupt, but I wanted to jump in and say I'm in no way impugning anything that you've done here, in terms of the numbers that you've created. That wasn't the question I was asking.

RICK WILHELM: Okay.

JAMES GALVIN: I'm wondering ... It's 836 out of how many? It's 2,073 out of how many? Do we know what that other "how many" number is? That's all.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. So, the denominator on the registries, I'm saying that I don't have a number, there. On the registrars, I can give a little bit better target because if you go to the registrar file, and you search for the word "accredited," there are 2,450 occurrences of the word "accredited," and I think that that would be the target for the number

of registrar URLs, there. I think that that's the right target for registrars, but I don't have a target for registries, there. Does that help?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes, okay, thanks. That was my curiosity. You have a little bit of curiosity, that was my one-step-further curiosity about whether or not we're done in this process, or how to know whether we are or not. But thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Now, one of the reasons that I'm not even acting like ... I'm really trying to track roll-out, and not even acting like I'm trying to track compliance, here. That's one of the reasons I don't report that because I don't want to even get into it, because there's a number of reasons why these URLs may or may not appear. I'm trying to track deployment. Does that make sense?

JAMES GALVIN: It does, and that's a very good point. Now, you've made me disappointed that I asked the question, and I won't do that again. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: No, that's okay. No worries. Any other questions in or around the topic, there? Okay, very good. Now, onto Montréal. Regular Working Group on Sunday morning. By 10:30 AM, everyone should have had a good cup of coffee, and we will be halfway through the morning TechOps session, and we can do our regular meeting, there. We'll have some good discussion.

It is like any other meeting, but since we will have probably a little bit better than usual crowd, and we will of course be welcoming dial-ins and remote participation for those of you that aren't able to make it in person.

As is our custom, please do attempt to participate remotely. We will be making sure that we get people in on the audio bridge and such. We will be bringing up and making sure to brief in on some of these old business topics that maybe we're blasting past, here, in our regular meeting. I think that the face-to-face meetings are a good chance to get some good discussion on this, especially considering some of these old business topics that have been stalled-out, awaiting some feedback from ICANN, related to quality control in the bootstrap values, and timing of the registrar IDs files, and the authoritative nature of registrar IDs versus the MoSAPI. We will probably go into those a little bit later, in more detail, on Sunday in our Working Group meeting.

We have that, and then, just recapturing here, on Monday afternoon from 15:15 to 6:45, we have our public outreach section. We, last week, did a great job of recasting our blurb, and I did see that that was posted up on the meeting website. Thank you, Stuart, for getting that accomplished. Then, we do have our Google Doc there, which has our other topics that we'll be discussing during this session. Of course, this is going to be rather free-flowing, and very much dependent on what kind of questions we get from the audience. Hopefully, it will be a good discussion. Any questions or comments, or discussion about this, related to this topic?

SUE SCHULER:

Hey, Rick, it's Sue.

RICK WILHELM: Yes, Sue, please go ahead.

SUE SCHULER: Just one insert. I was requested to have TechOps and RDAP put on as an update during the CPH membership meeting. I just wanted to let you be aware that that was requested.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. That sounds good. When is the CPH member meeting, Sue?

SUE SCHULER: It is the slot right before the board session.

RICK WILHELM: On which ...?

SUE SCHULER: On Tuesday.

RICK WILHELM: Tuesday, okay. TechOps, probably either Marc or Tobias will give that update, and then I'll probably give the RDAP update.

SUE SCHULER: Okay, great. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good, that's no problem. That sounds very good. Then, Sarah says, in the chat, "For the public meeting, did we decide no

slides? Are we putting up an agenda slide?" I did not mention that while you weren't listening, so you gave away your position there, Sarah. Sorry, you can go back to not listening. Correct. I was planning on no slides, and just discussion.

However, what I thought we would do is we would all have this topic Google Doc in front of us, either on your laptop or on a printout. It's up to you how you want to handle that. That's actually up to you. That way, you'll be ready when I throw some of these questions towards you, and you will also have these topics as prompts, and things like that. The thought was roughly that we would go slide-free, because I think that that will, I hope, prompt more questions from the audience. I'm not really a big fan of PowerPoint anyway. Sarah, your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Hello, thank you. Do I sound okay? My mic was weird on the last call.

RICK WILHELM: You sound fantastic.

SARAH WYLD: Amazing. It's just wonderful what a restart will do. I think an agenda slide would be helpful, because people who are there to participate in this might have questions that relate to one section or a different section, and if we're going to have a few different people saying things and then open it up for questions, whatever order we do things in, it's just useful, I think, to give people a sense of what topics will be covered, and if there's certain times to talk about things, then they should know when those certain times are. That's

my suggestion, is just to have one single slide with a very brief list of stuff. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Okay.

SARAH WYLD: I can make it, too, if you want.

RICK WILHELM: Oh, my goodness. My thought there was that we maybe just go ahead and do the two main topics, which would be what we've learned, what we've done, and then the other one, which I can't remember. Then, just the main sub-topics underneath, there, and then leave off the third-level topics, which are the more detailed ones. Is that sort of what you were thinking, Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Yes, exactly.

RICK WILHELM: Yes, and then that should collapse to one slide, and you were probably thinking of doing that in a two-column style, if I can use my ESPN to read your mind?

SARAH WYLD: You are absolutely correct.

RICK WILHELM:

There you go, very good. Well, that sounds great. Sarah, I'll go ahead and do the slide, that's no big deal. I appreciate you volunteering, and your helpful spirit. I'll take care of it, it's no problem. That kind of PowerPoint, I can muster. It's no problem at all. Thank you for volunteering, but I'll pick it up. That sounds good. Does anyone have any objections to that suggestion? I'm going to assume that silence is agreement? "No one would dare," Sarah says. There we go, that's what I like. No objections, I'm guessing? Okay, very good. Brilliant. Any other questions or comments about Montréal? Very good, seeing none.

On our two old business topics, I have no comment from ICANN on either of these. They are still open, as far as I know. They're still open with the ICANN Helpdesk. Anyone have any questions or comments about that? Rocketing right along in Roger-esque fashion, a new business item here, a blog by Cyrus. I wanted to just get that one on everyone's radar. It's a quick blog from Cyrus. I won't say it was dashed off, but I don't think that anyone here is going to learn anything new from that. I think, for the folks that are not as close to RDAP as you all are, this might be some news. For those of us that are here, this is well-worn stuff, and we're going to get the URL in the chatroom, is my bet, here, in a second. There we go.

I seem to be in the prognostication business today. If you haven't taken a look at that, you can do that. That's good. That's something new. Any questions or comments about that one? Alright, very good. Seeing none, we will head over to the microwave, and the usual and customary appetizer in the microwave is the ePDP IRT. Who wants to grab the first straw? Sarah WYLD.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, hello. There's really not that much to report for the IRT. We continue to go through closing comments on some of the recommendation implementation bits, and not a lot has changed since our last RDAP meeting. We do look forward to having two early morning meetings in Montréal.

RICK WILHELM: Alright, both early morning, congratulations.

SARAH WYLD: Yes, I did want to also just add, regarding what closing the comments means. It's not the same as a consensus call. I will say I really like, Rick, how you handle a consensus moment in these meetings, where you say what the question is, and then everybody gets to vote yes or no. I think that's super clear and understandable. This, closing comments in the IRT, is not that. It's not the same thing. It's just saying we've now all gone through the document, we've figured out what comments we want to make, and we have nothing further to say, but we have not necessarily reached consensus, or finalized what the policy would be. That's the stage that we're at right now, and we look forward to seeing a full version of the new policy in Montréal.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. Thank you for that update. Anybody else have any questions on the IRT, for Sarah? Seeing none, we will go over to our second dish coming out of the microwave, ePDP Phase 2. Looking for a hand, I'm looking for a hand. Mark Svancarek. Mark, please go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Yes, I've been dodging this one for several weeks, so I guess it's my time in the acronym microwave. We had a really great meeting today. The other people that are on the call might agree or disagree. I thought it was very productive and useful. We covered a number of building blocks. We're still focusing on building blocks. Alex Deacon, who's on the call, did some homework and submitted a bunch of details about accreditation and credentialing, and things like that, which led to a very productive meeting about what those things will mean in an actual SSAD system.

One of the things that we seem to have consensus on today is the idea that SSAD, which is the consensus policy thing, it doesn't stop us from building another thing in addition to it, will only take accredited users. Now, what that means for one-off users, people who only want to request disclosure once a year, or once ever, or something like that, we will figure out what that detail means. In terms of streamlining the system, and really coming up with a predictable, implementable policy, I think that was a great step forward. I think I'll leave it at that high point, there. If anybody wants to chime in with some other details, go right for it.

RICK WILHELM:

Alright, very good. Thank you. We'll go Anderson first, and then Galvin. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick, can you hear me okay?

RICK WILHELM:

Yes, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Alright, great. I see Alex has his hand up, which is great. I was hoping to put him on the spot a little bit, because a lot of what we talked about today, as Marc SV noted, was related to the accreditation building block, which Alex Deacon's done a lot of work on, and was really the main focus of today's call. At the end of that, there's a note at the end of the building block, where the Working Group's asked to consider how RDAP will be leveraged to meet the policy recommendations put forth in accreditation, and really the broader implementation of these policy recommendations. I thought that was notable, something we touched on briefly one today's call, and something that's going to be important to those of us on this call. Alex, maybe, can expand on that a little bit.

RICK WILHELM: Sure, very good. Thank you, Marc. Alex, your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

ALEX DEACON: Yes, hi. I think, given where we are in the policy definition of accreditation, it will soon be time, if not already time, for this group to start looking at the details. I see what's happening with regard to accreditation in the ePDP, on one road heading north. The work that's happening here, in the RDAP Working Group, is another road heading north, but separate. We had the TSG report, also, that described a technical framework with regard to how we could support some of the concepts that we need to support.

As we move forward in time, these three highways, I think, will need to merge, somewhere, together, in a policy implementation, and eventually a technical implementation of the functionality that will be defined. I think it will be soon time for this group to take a look at the policy language, make sure it's on the right highway, if you will,

and doing that will ensure that all aspects of our lives will be easier in the future. I think I just wanted to make that statement, because we will need to start thinking about the implications of the policy on RDAP and technologies like Open ID Connect, and the like. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Alright, thank you very much, Alex, appreciate the comments, there. The thing that I might offer here ... This might be an interesting topic for us to dive a little deeper on in Montréal at our meeting on Sunday morning, largely to take advantage of the face-to-face opportunity that we have. I don't know how that works out with the ePDP schedule, I say that with ignorance of that topic. If it does, that might be something to consider bringing up, if there's any discussion that we want to have, just because we will have a number of us that are face-to-face, to just talk about what the evolution of the model is looking like, and to think about some of those things, would be good to have people thinking about, and such.

That's something for contemplation in the week or two, here, before we get to Montréal. Something to think about. Any other thoughts or comments on the topic from Phase 2? Alright, seeing none, flip it over to IETF regex. Let's see. Jim, Can I call on you for a regex discussion?

JAMES GALVIN:

Certainly, thanks, Rick. I actually don't think I have anything really too specific to say, here. I'll repeat that we are having a joint meeting with TechOps on Sunday. For those who come to the RDAP Working Group meeting from 10:30-12:00, we then get a lunch break. Immediately after lunch, the next two TechOps sessions will be for the IETF regex Working Group. If folks want to stick around,

you'll have an opportunity to join that joint meeting. We'll be looking for the next set of documents out of TechOps that we can progress along on the registration services part of the regex work.

There's no particular change to the RDAP work, at the moment, that's going on in regex, but we do have an IETF meeting two weeks after the ICANN meeting. Hopefully, that should be something somewhat more interesting to say in the coming weeks here, before the end of the year and the major holidays come around. I think that's it. Thanks, unless anybody wants to suggest I forgot something there, and that we have some other folks here who are active in that space. Feel free to add something if I am overlooking something. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Okay, thank you very much, Jim, appreciate that. Hopefully, members here will be able to hang out and participate in the regex meeting in the afternoon, on Sundays. On the RA/RAA amendment, I'll take that one. Jim, you can chime in, also. ICANN issues the notice to commence the negotiation period for the RA and RAA amendment. That came out a couple of days ago. It came from Goran, and was issued to the registries.

I believe that a similar, although I haven't seen it personally, notice was issued to the registrar community, also. I saw the registry one. That commences a 90-day negotiation period that's started some time here, I don't recall the exact day, in late October. That will wrap-up in 90 days. That's underway now, so there will be discussions happening in Montréal, and then calls subsequent to that. There was nothing that surprised me in the registry notice, that I saw. Anybody have any questions or comments about that? Jim,

anything you care to add on that topic? Sue raised her hand. Sue, please come to the mic.

SUE SCHULER: Hi. I just wanted to let everybody know, if you are on the RA/RAA amendment Working Group, that we have added a second session in Montréal. The first session is on Monday, and that includes the ICANN staff. We've added a session without ICANN staff on Sunday evening. I just wanted to flag that for everybody, and we will try and get something out. That will be from 17:00-18:30, on Sunday evening.

RICK WILHELM: Very good, thank you very much, okay. Jim, anything that you'd care to add on that topic? Just want to make sure you had a chance, there.

JAMES GALVIN: No, thanks. I said in the chat, sorry if you didn't see that.

RICK WILHELM: Sorry, I missed that. It got sandwiched in between, there.

JAMES GALVIN: No, you're awesome, Rick. I wouldn't dream of correcting you.

RICK WILHELM: Oh boy, I heard your eye roll here, all the way in the Washington suburbs. Very good. Justin, can you ...? Let me see. There is a chat going on about the dashboard, that I think I'm not keeping up with

because I'm talking too much, here. Does someone want to come ...? Justin, please come to the mic.

JUSTIN MACK:

Hey, thanks, Rick. Yes, I was just finding a link ... Our conversation at the top of the meeting about the stats of registries and registrars made me think of that RDAP dashboard that I think Gavin Brown created. I think he showed that to us a while ago. It looks like it's constantly up to date, so it's being refreshed. I dropped the link there, in the chat. If you're a Firefox power user, you can select all the data out and put it in a spreadsheet, and then sort and filter it, if you choose.

You hold control, or command key on a Mac, and then shift. It's a double-finger operation with a drag of the mouse. Then, you can copy out that whole table and paste it in a spreadsheet. Just a quick note on that, because if people were looking at even ccTLDs, right? I know we're primarily focused on gTLDs, here, but it is interesting to see which ccTLDs also offer RDAP, just to complete the whole picture, there. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you very much, Justin, for that. I had actually lost track of that thing. I'm going to be bookmarking that, here, in a few minutes, after we wrap up. That's a good one to hang onto, so thank you very much, and thanks for the Firefox tutorial. Good stuff. Okay, let's move on to any other business. Anyone have any other business that's they'd care to bring up, here? Any other topics? Okay, not seeing any other hands in the thing. Let's look at our schedule, real quick.

I'm going to propose that we skip our 10/31 meeting, that would be next Thursday. Reason A, because we have our work largely accomplished to be fully prepared for our meetings in Montréal, and reason B, because we don't have a lot of other work going on. Reason C, because it's traditional that as people get ready to travel to ICANN, that we ease up on the meeting tempo. Unless anyone strenuously objects, I'm going to propose that we cancel 10/31. Waiting for objections. Seeing none, alright. Nothing but agreement on that. Let's do this.

Right now, I'm leaning strongly to cancel the 11/14 meeting, but let's pencil it in for right now. That is, it's the week after we get back from Montréal, but we are on the backside of the travel and stuff like that. I'm going to suggest that we pencil it in for now, but Jim is traveling to IETF. I leave 12 hours after our meeting. Jim leaves a little bit earlier, just due to the way that our flight schedules work. We may end up traveling this. IETF is in Singapore. Yes, I can't type, Sarah. I thought I'd gotten rid of all the July dates. For some reason, I had July. Maybe my fingers were thinking it's July because it's going to be July heat when we're in Singapore. Thank you for fixing that, Sue.

We will likely end up canceling the 11/14 meeting, unless something comes out of Montréal that has us needing to have a meeting, based on what we learn in Montréal. Unless we pick up a bunch of work in Montréal, we'll probably end up canceling 11/14. Let's do that for right now, and then we'll discuss in Montréal. 11/21 is IETF Singapore. I propose we cancel. 11/28 is the US holiday, we'll cancel, but we will certainly be meeting on 12/5. Does anyone have objections to that schedule?

Then, the real question is what time, exactly, we do. Then, the question that we had was what we do about ... Do we stay right

adjacent to the ePDP, or do we put an hour gap in between us and the ePDP? Do we know what the ePDP is doing with their times, after the time zone change? Anybody know what the ePDP ... Have they done their post-time zone ...? "You will stay on UTC time," okay. That means that the ePDP will be ending at 11:00 AM Eastern, is that correct? Yes, okay. Sue, why don't we do this? I'm going to propose that we stay on UTC also, for consistency, and we keep ours on UTC. Does anybody have any strong objections to that? I think that that keeps the same, relative .. Jim says, "Sort of, yes." Jim, care to comment?

JAMES GALVIN:

Well, I personally like this time slot, but I'm just voicing an opinion. I'm happy to go with consensus. If you're not getting a lot of people who want to stick around, then I'm fine.

RICK WILHELM:

The main reason why I'm ... We seem to be doing a good job of picking up the ePDP folks straight after their call, and my thought about keeping it the same is that we're more likely to keep picking up the ePDP folks if we don't introduce a gap. This is really emotionally looking at team ePDP, if that logic holds, or if it's better to give you all a break. This is really to Sarah, Mark, Marc, who's not helping me out at all, right? Let me see. Sarah, please comment.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Personally, I would rather have a break in between. I do not strongly feel, so if everybody else would rather not, that's fine. I thought we had decided not to make it later in the day, because it's really hard for people in Australia, and other countries in that time

zone of the world. That would be a reason to not make it later.
Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. For the Australians, I think they're torched either way, but it does help the European folks if we push it an hour earlier, I would offer that. Why don't we stick on UTC, and keep it the same, relative? We'll see how it goes, and if we need to we can always switch. We'll do a couple in December, and then we can always make a switch in the January timeframe. Not overlapping, I agree, with ePDP is really key. Let's see. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Go ahead and finish your thought. I wanted to come back to the IETF meeting for a moment, if you're done.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. I think, let's just go ahead and keep it on UTC. Let's just keep it on UTC, because I don't have a reason to shift it. Maybe that helps the European team a little bit more. Let's go ahead and flip back to IETF. Jim, please?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes, so I just wanted to call out why we're actually canceling this one at this IETF. We haven't done it in the past. We've met while the IETF was going on. I appreciate it's a 12-hour time-shift for those of us who will be locally in Singapore, but maybe we should feel a little pain that those folks over there feel, sometimes, too. Anyway, I just wondered if there was a reason why you jumped right on canceling that meeting, versus trying to make it happen. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Good question. For me, I'm going to be on a plane at that time, actually, coming back. That was one of the reasons why I went there, because at that time I'm going to be on-route back on the ... Let's see if I can get that date correct ... At midnight, at that time period. That's one of the reasons why I moved to cancel it. I figured that, between it being at basically midnight, Singapore time, and that being late in IETF, when people would be largely adjusted, and the fact that I wouldn't be able to be hosting it, I didn't want to impose that on folks.

I also thought about trying to move it to a different time slot, but then that seems to make it worse. That was my thinking. I'm not averse to trying to find a time during that IETF week, but trying to find ... That seemed kind of difficult to me. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yes, thanks. I agree with you not to move it. I think that if we're going to have it, it should stay at its regular time, and those of us who just happen to be newly on Singapore time, if you will, should simply make the adjustment. I'm not sure how many of us this really affects, as far as that's concerned. I appreciate that you won't be there, so we would be dependent on Roger. Another opportunity to have a speedy meeting. We know that Roger is the speed demon when it comes to running these meetings. Maybe, if he's available to host it, that would be fine.

That's what I would suggest, looking for someone to host the meeting, moving along. If you were suggesting on the 14th having the meeting, especially if we have something coming out of ICANN and it's worth progressing, maybe we line it up with that? If we actually come out of the ICANN meeting with actions, and we really

push ourselves into having a meeting on the 14th, we should probably have this one, too, is all I'm suggesting. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay, very good. That is a very fair point. We can do this. I will not be able to attend on whatever date that is, I don't have the date. Sorry, I'm looking at it, on the 21st. I can get a guest host on the 21st, and we can see who could attend. At that time of the meeting in Singapore, I don't know if we'll have a meeting room at Singapore, but I don't think that that matters that much, per se. We could certainly have the meeting on the 21st, and that wouldn't be that bad. We could pencil that one in, and see how that goes. Totally fine with me.

Okay, very good. Anybody have any other comments? Jim's happy. Alright, anything else? Okay. I think that's all we have, so we will cancel next week, and I will look forward to seeing you all on Sunday, if not sooner, in Montréal. Sue, that's about it. You can wrap us up.

SUE SCHULER:

Thanks, Rick. Okay, Michelle, we can end the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]