
SUE SCHULER: Perfect, thanks. Okay. Go ahead, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you very much, Sue. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I'm Rick Wilhelm from Verisign, and welcome to today's regularly scheduled meeting of the RDAP Working Group. Today is 29th October, Halloween Eve-Eve for those that are tracking. I hope that everyone's doing well. Thanks, everybody for joining. We've got a pretty good quorum.

I saw, in my e-mail, regrets from [Kathryn] today, so she's unable to join because of a conflict. Other than that, we've got a pretty good crowd here. Hope that everybody survived ICANN69 in good stead, and that your sleep schedules are all relatively back to normal.

We've got our regular agenda posted, so just a quick moment for agenda bashing that was sent out a littler earlier today. Any hands related to the agenda?

Seeing none, we will proceed. We'll start off with implementation status. Anybody have any topics there? We'll wait for hands, and while I do that, you see do see the URLs so you can look up the bootstrap files there.

Alex, please go ahead.

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.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks, Rick, and good morning. Yeah, based on the conversation we had, or the issue I raised the last time, I think it's more important to track how many registrars and registries do not have an entry in these bootstrap files. It seems to be a more interesting and important thing to track whether that's something, Rick, you do ... Sorry.

Can people hear me okay? Okay.

Whether, Rick, this is something that you do ...

RICK WILHELM: A little choppy, but okay, kind of.

ALEX DEACON: Okay, sorry. I guess it's a local network issue. I guess I just want to make the point that tracking the number of registries and registrars who do not have a base URL in these files is more interesting than tracking the list of those that do, especially given some important registrars seem not to have these services up and running. Whether that's you, Rick, or whether that's ICANN, I don't know. But I think that's more interesting in terms of tracking the status of what's going on here. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thanks, Alex. Anybody have any comments related to that topic from Alex? I'll look for hands.

I will just offer this. There was a report a couple of weeks ago of a particular registrar not having URL in the bootstrap file. Someone in my

company contacted that registrar. They actually weren't aware that their URL wasn't in the bootstrap file, so they reached out to ICANN to get that corrected—to the Help Desk to get that corrected.

I didn't actually check at press time if that had gotten fixed or not. A couple of days ago, it wasn't. So, that is something that I think it would be good for registrars to check and make sure that their URL is in there. But as far as tracking whether a particular registry or registrar's URL is present, I would offer that that's actually a job for Compliance. It's not something that, as the RDAP Working Group, we're going to be tracking.

And then Alex, for those that had a hard time hearing, he did put his point into chat.

And then I would say, though, that sort of in the spirit of what we have been doing within this working group, if you notice a registrar or registry of note that you're curious about, like on the case that the one that folks at my company contacted. We just reached out via some contacts, and they were a little bit surprised that the URL wasn't there, so they went to set about fixing it. So, that was something that at least happened on our end. So, that's just two cents.

I think Alex's point is well made that it is good that more registrars and registries do have their URLs in there. So, I think that is a fair point to be made.

Any other topics? Any other points related to this? Thanks, Alex, for that point.

Seeing none there, we will go on to the next part. Really, the next part is related to meeting planning. Our mailing list has been quiet.

Looking at our calendar, we didn't have a meeting during ICANN Week, of course. Gave everybody a break. I presume everyone was thankful. And so our next meeting right now in two weeks would be calendared for November 12th. Even though I'm not anticipating a ton on the agenda, it's calendared in that way so that we would—because in our normal bi-weekly cadence, we would be having a meeting targeted for November 26th.

For those that are familiar with the American business calendar, that's an U.S. business holiday known as Thanksgiving, so most people in America will be not working on that day. So, we'll plan on skipping that day, and then coming back two weeks after that, the next meeting would be targeted December 10th.

And then two weeks after that would be December 24th, also typically not a very heavily attended workday in the U.S. or in Europe, and in large parts of Asia. So, in looking at the calendar, I'm proposing that we would meet on November 12th, skip the 26th, and then meet on December 10th. And that would likely be our only December meeting unless we would have something to cause us to want to wedge in a meeting off-cadence for us and possibly wedge one in on the 10th.

Sue has her hand up. Sue, please go ahead.

SUE SCHULER: Yeah. I just quickly want to also ask because of Daylight Savings Time ending if we wanted to stay in 16:00 or if you wanted to move to 17:00, which would leave us at this time slot.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. So, let's see. Does anybody have any particular preference? It's been so long since the time shifted that I don't recall what we did during the last standard time session. Do you recall, Sue? Did we go to ...?

SUE SCHULER: It seems to me we had to finagle around the EPDP meeting.

RICK WILHELM: That's what I call, that our time was picked by the EPDP meetings, but I don't know ... The EPDP isn't meeting right now. Is that correct?

Marc Anderson has his hand up. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. Thanks, Rick. The EPDP kept the same UTC time. It did not adjust its schedule, and so I believe RDAP did the same last time around. But EPDP is not currently meeting on Thursday, so we don't have that same constraint to deal with.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. So, they kept the UTC time. Justin says, "Prefer time shifting to keep our same time of day." So, keep it the same, relative. Alex is speaking up in favor of shifting it also. So, that's two hands in favor of

shifting. In other words, it would keep it at the same relative time, in other words noon Eastern. Marc has no preference.

So, let me put forth a proposal to shift it on UTC, but then keep it on the same relative time.

Let's [inaudible] a hand raise. Jothan says he's good with that. Sarah says she's got a standing meeting at 16:45. "Good with that." Okay. Justin, I got a check mark. Jody has a check mark. Sean has a check mark. Very good.

I think that's carried, so I think we're going to go ahead and shift. So, that keeps us at noon Eastern. Does that sound right, Sue?

SUE SCHULER: Yes. That's [correct].

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very good. And it will allow those dog walks to happen. Very good. Okay. Look at us making important decisions. He grins. All right. Very good.

So, let's head over to the microwave. So, first off, IRT, quick summary: topics relative to the RDAP Working Group. Looking for a volunteer from the IRT.

Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rick. I'm virtually looking at Sarah; maybe Alex, too. I don't think there is anything going on in the IRT that's relevant to us. The IRT has really been focused on redlines to existing policies that are impacted. I think I noted this last time, so I don't think this is new.

But that does include things like changing where there are sort of old references to WHOIS and updating them to RDDS, which maybe is a little noteworthy in the RDAP output where previously there was an obligation to say "Last update of the WHOIS database." There's a proposed change on the table to change that to be "Last update of the RDDS," which I think is an improvement, and may be about the only thing I can think of that's impactful to this group.

RICK WILHELM: All right. Very good. Any other updates from any of the other members? Not seeing any hands. Good. Thank you very much, Marc.

And then relative to Phase 2, any updates on EPP Phase 2?

Marc, again. Please go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: I'll jump in again. I don't think there's anything going on there that impacts this group. Just maybe big picture, my understanding is that the GNSO Council is working on the ... They have a formal letter that they draft to send approved recommendations to the ICANN Board, and I think that's either being worked on or has only just been worked on. So, either way, this is in the process of going from Council to Board, and I guess ...

So, there's not really any impactful movement for us, but I guess just big picture, that's where that work is in its life cycle.

RICK WILHELM:

Sounds good. Very good. Thank you very much, Marc. Anybody have anything else related to Phase 2?

Seeing none, IETF REGEXT. I think I see Jim Galvin. Jim, could you give us a brief update?

JAMES GALVIN:

Yes, I can. Thanks. Thanks, Rick. I apologize. I don't have the page open in front of me. I think the important thing to call out here is that there are a couple of RDAP documents that have been in Working Group last call. We've extended the last call, and the concern here is that being such a small group now, we much prefer to have good consensus; and when we have a couple of people who raise some interesting questions, we'd like to get some other voices, make sure that we have other voices in the picture.

So, I just want to put a little appeal here to this group that we could use some other voices on a couple of issues with some of the documents. I'm hopeful that most people here are on the mailing list and you notice the Working Group last call thread go by. And you should look for messages from me [inaudible]. Please do reply and comment on your feelings about the status of the questions that are on the table so we can move these documents forward.

I don't think that they are major issues, although I suppose your mileage may vary. And that's why we would like your voice. And I guess that's my update for right now. There are a couple of documents that are about to go forward, updating the query and response with respect to RDAP, and it would be good to get some other voices.

So, please do speak up and help us out here. And, of course, take note of the fact that there will be some minor changes that may or may not affect your implementations. Thanks.

Oh, I'm sorry. I should also mention that Blanchet's document, which is the update to 7484, will eventually get to be updated by the Working Group. It's going to be taken on as a work product in the Working Group, so people should look for that opportunity, too, and please indicate their support for moving that forward. Okay? That's it. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you. Marc, new hand? Old hand?

MARC ANDERSON:

It's a new hand. Sarah might want to jump in because we've been having a conversation about something that may be impactful to this group. So, I'm going to paste some text in: "[For data values] where new data has been collected or generated, the value may be left blank."

So, Sarah, do you want to go ahead?

SARAH WYLD:

Yeah. I can try, and I kind of understood your question and not the answer.

So, in the IRT in the draft policy we are working on, which we refer to as the OneDoc, there is a section about publication of domain registrant data, and there is a subsection of minimum publication requirements.

So, it starts off as we would expect it. "In response to queries, the registrar and registry operator must publish the following elements subject to redaction outline below."

Then it says what Marc pasted into the chat: "For data elements where no data has been collected or generated, the value may be left blank."

And Marc left a comment for this group, saying that in RDAP we do not return fields with blank values, and suggested that, instead, it should say that for data elements where no data is collected or generated, the field should not be returned.

And then Dennis gave a response that I kind of don't understand, so I'm going to paste that into the chat.

Where am I? There I am. It's a little bit long, sorry.

And so, I think Dennis is saying that sometimes responses can be blank. I would like for us to hopefully clarify: when can responses be blank? Can they sometimes? Can they always? Never? And maybe Marc and I could take the information back to the IRT so we can make sure that the policy will be appropriate. I hope that was okay. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Sarah. This may sound a little bit familiar to some people. Previously with WHOIS, ICANN Org had wanted registries and registrars to return in their WHOIS responses which were [par values]. They wanted to return the field label even when there isn't a value associated with it.

For example, if there were no name servers with a domain registration, you would still return the name server field with a response with just no value there. And it seems like ICANN is wanting the same thing with RDAP. They're wanting registries and registrars to return the label even if there's no value. I hope I didn't butcher that.

And I guess, I think one thing I would like some help with is how much do we care about this? Is this something that we should push back on hard, or is it really not that big a deal for us to return fields with blank values?

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you very much, Marc. Scott, please go ahead.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK:

Thanks, Rick. Unfortunately, Marc, I can't give a very exact answer to your question, other than saying it depends. And what it depends on is the specific field in question because, ultimately, we have to take a look at each field and go back to what the underlying—like in the case of contact information—what the vCard specification says about what needs to be there or what can be omitted to make something be a valid vCard.

So, I think the best thing to do in terms of guidance would be to provide some wiggle room that says something along the lines of, “Hey, look. It might be possible to have blanks in some places; and in other places where it’s not possible, you’d have to put something to indicate that the field was redacted; something that is a syntactically valid but otherwise obscuring type of value.”

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Thanks, Scott.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Scott. So, when you say “redacted,” I wonder, do you mean data that’s redacted for privacy or GDPR, or are you talking about where data just doesn’t exist like my name server example where there’s a domain registration that just doesn’t have name servers added yet? I guess I’m not sure what you’re referring to, or maybe you’re referring to both.

RICK WILHELM: Scott, do you want to go ahead and respond to that? And then we’ll bring Jim Galvin to the mic after that.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK: Sure, thanks. Marc, probably more the former than the latter, as in if you’re talking about something that is truly optional and is not there, I can’t think of a single instance of something where ... Again, using vCard as an example, that would cause us a problem because if it’s an optional

field, the vCard spec is going to say it's optional; doesn't need to be there.

But in the case of things that are redacted, I think again, if you go back to what the definition of redaction is, it's obfuscation. Omitting something wouldn't be a redaction. Redaction would be, if you think about how this works on a piece of paper, marking all the text out with a big, thick black magic marker so that you can't see what was actually underneath there. Make sense?

RICK WILHELM:

Yeah. Got it. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Rick. I'm just going to complicate this further. I think that the discussion between Marc and Scott is important, and we should probably think about some clarity there in that.

What I wanted to point out is, there is a proposal for a new work item in the REGEXT Working Group to talk about deprecating the JS Card syntax and going something a little different. And so, it's also possible that we could ... There's an opportunity there, I guess, to maybe add some additional clarity to that in RDAP to this issue in general.

So, I just wanted to put that on the table as something to think about as we look to do something here [to the] short-term need. We might be able to do more down the road here as we take on that work item. So, folks here should be aware of that and might be interested in participating in that work in the REGEXT group. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. That is considerably complicating. I'm grinning. Alex, please go ahead.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks. I think we need to answer Marc's questions about how much we really care. I think that's important. But if we do, it seems there are two ways to solve this. You either specify that in RDAP, you return every field even if a value doesn't exist for it; or two, you create a display profile that detects when a field wasn't returned from RDAP, but you make sure it was displayed to the user. I think the end result would be the same, again.

How much we care about this and what we want and how we could squeeze it into the existing capabilities of RDAP and the like is, I guess, something we need to discuss.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Alex. Marc, is that an old hand or a new hand?

MARC ANDERSON: New hand.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Please go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks. Alex asked clearly the question I was trying to get at. So, thank you, Alex. Yeah. Alex described two scenarios, and the first is what ICANN seems to be looking for. And then second is how I understand RDAP should—using a loaded term there—be implemented.

So, yeah, I'm really looking for direction on that. Truly, I don't know if this is a big deal. What does that mean for our implementations? As Alex said, I think under an RDAP-like implementation, it would be up to the client to figure out how to display the data it receives and what to do with values and with data that hasn't been returned; whether it wants to display those as blank fields or not.

I guess I just don't know how to tackle this within the IRT and if this is something we want to make a point on, or if it's just something we can give on.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you, Marc. Jim Galvin, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks. A question that occurs to me. I think this is something that we should take on and talk about a little bit and think about it. What occurs to me from a policy point of view is, a receiver needs to be able to distinguish between data not present or data that's been redacted. We need a way to distinguish the not-present, the I'm-not-going-to-tell-you, and the data's been redacted. And we should think about what we want that to look like in our implementation choices.

The standard, of course, would allow you to either include the field or not include the field; but I think about what we want that to look like and make that the right thing.

So, I guess I'm taking the question on board. I don't think we can set this question aside. Maybe we need a little discussion on the emailing list about what people's implantations want to do in those situations about blank or nonblank because the receivers certainly have a ...

It should be possible to make the distinction. Now whether or not policy lets you make the distinction is a separation question, but it ought to be possible to have an implementation that can make that distinction to the receiver if it's allowed to do that. Does that make sense? Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Let's see. I'm not sure who was first, Sarah or Alex. Sarah wants to respond to Jim's point. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Yeah, hi. Marc kind of beat me to it in the chat. I don't think that it's such a problem of distinguishing between redacted and not-existing data because there are also requirements in the policy that if the data exists but is redacted, then it needs to be displayed in a certain way. There is specific text to show in those fields. So, I think really what we're looking for here is what to do when there is no value in that data element.

If it's a country that doesn't use states, what do you put in the state field? Can we return it blank, or do we just not return it at all? And does not returning it work in the system? And also, is that helpful to users?

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Good point. Alex, please so ahead.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks. I think Sarah's right, but I think we also need a way to determine or to indicate to users when an error occurred, like in the situation we talked about last time. An RDAP query on a domain name didn't return any contact values—zero. And so, there wasn't even a way to determine whether that was expected behavior or not.

Again, I think this is more of a display thing than an RDAP protocol thing, but I think it's important that we allow for that also in terms of user experience and the like. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Let's see. I think Jim had his hand up, but Scott's hand shot up on the error topic. So, Jim if you're okay, let me go to Scott because I think he's going to comment on the error topic. And then let me go to Jim. So, Scott, can you please go ahead?

SCOTT HOLLENBECK: Yeah. Thanks, Rick. A little bit about the error, but also about what Sarah said about the situation where the data doesn't exist. What do we

return? And I'm going to posit that RDAP itself already answers that question. Right? There are situations where the spec says if, for example, there are no name servers, that's optional. It's not going to be returned at all.

And there are other places where the syntax specification for the underlying data structure will tell you if there's nothing there, you'll put a blank there or you just don't return anything at all.

And I would try to caution. Anything from a policy perspective that's starting to wade into, "What do we return when there's nothing there at all" territory should first look to the specification to make sure that you're not somehow stomping on something that is already there from a protocol perspective. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you very much. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yeah, thanks. Just to build, maybe frame a little bit differently what Scott just said. It occurs to me that the policy thinks it wants to distinguish explicitly this notion that data exists or doesn't exist, and it's not clear to me that that's relevant. I think going back to what Scott's response was several responses ago where he said it really is on a case-by-case basis about individual elements, the standard says what you do whether or not data is present. So, the standard has an answer to that.

And so, the question here is, if the query asks for particular data and you got back an answer that didn't have that data in it, the assumption

should be that the data was not present because if it was redacted or otherwise, that's what you should say. That's what the policy should be. That if [you] can't give you the data, then you should indicate that there was no data to give you. Otherwise, there was already a defined protocol response for data not present. And I don't know why we would want to change that, I guess is where I'm going with that.

Now I understand the comment I made before was kind of overreaching. The policy should not try to change what the standard already says; and if we think that the standard got it wrong, that's a different issue. So, I hope that makes sense. I just want to reiterate and reaffirm what Scott just said and go back to what he said before. Maybe a blanket statement is a little bit hard because it really is an element by element kind of question, I think. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This has been very helpful. I think right now where we're left at is that it's in the protocol, but I don't know where to find it; and I need to have some kind of documentation that I can take back to the IRT and show them, "This is how it's supposed to work. This problem is already solved, so we don't need to solve it again now. Here's how you do it."

Can somebody help me with finding the documentation, maybe? Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Sarah. Marc has his hand up. Marc, please, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I agree with Sarah. This has been a useful discussion, so thank you, everybody. This had sort of slipped my mind until Sarah reminded me of it, so thank you to her.

Something Jim Galvin said sort of, I think, bears highlighting a little bit because it gets to the heart of my uncomfortableness with this. You said it seems like ICANN Org, in implementing this, is looking for a way in implementation to provide an indication in the response of where data ... They're trying to create a way to indicate where data does not exist, which I don't think corresponds to any policy recommendations.

I think Jim said it a little bit better there, so apologies, Jim, for mangling your words. But I think that's one of the things that sort of makes me uneasy. It sort of feels to me like they're overstepping in implementation and trying to create something in the response that shouldn't be there, and it is maybe why this topic makes me a little uneasy in the IRT.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Marc. I can see where you're coming from on that point. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Rick. You know, Marc, I guess what makes me uneasy about all of this ... I share your unease, and let me try to frame it this way. There's always this question if I'm the querier about what data I'm going to get. And this is something which as always bothered me a little bit because if you're doing a lookup by domain name to get registrant information, I'm going to do a lookup by domain name; I'm going to get back a bunch of stuff.

And the question that the querier no doubt has is, did I get everything I could have gotten? And so, there's this interesting missing piece which is, what data did I expect to get, and is that expectation understood on both sides of the query response? Right?

And maybe that's part of what's going on here, is the definition of exactly what the full complement of information is supposed to be, and an understood piece. If I ask for an address and I don't get an address back, then it obviously wasn't available. But if I just enter a domain name and I'm expecting a bunch of contact information to come back, how do I know that I really got it all? And was something missing, or was something blank, or is something redacted?

That is not flagged in any particular way. And I'm not sure that it should be or needs to be. But I think from the technical point of view, that's what's going on, and maybe the policy is overreaching a bit.

We should probably have a little bit of discussion about this offline. I don't know if you want to spend a lot of time on this here, Rick. I'd be willing to talk more about this with you, Sarah, and look to things try to understand what's going on. I've always been uncomfortable with this

query response stuff in the policy because I never really felt good about what is supposed to be returned; and what's the expectation and what's being returned, and how we know, and whether the right thing is happening.

Anyway, thanks. Sorry.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Jim. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Jim. I appreciate that. Great points. I totally agree. I'm sort of nodding my head to everything you were saying. And I think that's maybe the point Alex was trying to make earlier about error checking. How do you know that you did or did not get back what was expected? And so, yeah, I think these are all great points and may be worth us spending a little more time on. If not here, maybe on the list or in another offline discussion.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Marc. I think we'll maybe draw a line under there. I think this would be a good one to post on the list. I for one would look forward to folks having a little bit more time to think about this. I think there's a number of our group that are not present today that would probably have something to say about this—folks like Marc Blanchet. Folks like Quoc come to mind immediately, as well as ...

I'm sure there's folks within earshot presently that, after they get a chance to drink a cup of coffee and think about it further, will have some points that they might want to bring up on the discussion. So, I think that would be good for us to contemplate because there's a lot to be doing here, especially because if we codify something about where clients are required to send back a bunch of empty data, it's going to have implications for servers and clients for a very, very long time.

And so, it's important that we think about these decisions and their long-term implications from a number of perspectives, and are thoughtful about our recommendations to the IRT because we want to make sure that we work on getting this right; that we don't have people look back in five years and say, "What were all those people thinking? Look at this blob of JSON we have to render with all these double quotes."

If you scroll back in the chat and you look at that blob of JSON that Sarah pasted in for us with all those double quotes, that's not the most flattering blob of JSON. And you can imagine if you're one engineer talking to another engineer, and the engineer just joining the team is saying, "Why do I have to do this? Why is that there?" And you're left to explain it. We don't want to make it be unflattering. So, that's something to think about.

Jim Galvin has to drop. I will chime in, just before that, that we were on IETF. The REGEXT meeting is on November 18th for those that are going to be attending IETF.

One last thing. Let me pivot over, but I would like this discussion to hit the list, so maybe between Marc and Sarah they could seed the list with the discussion, and hopefully we can have a good topic on that. That would be good for us.

I think as the RDAP Working Group we have a bit of a responsibility to get some input here, so that would be great.

Let me draw a line under that and pivot over to the next topic of the RA and RAA Amendment. We've been getting back to work there as we've entered our hiatus after ICANN69. There's a meeting today with the ...

So, ICANN has gone back and presented some new points to the Contracted Parties House group, and the Contracted Parties House has listened to those and had an internal meeting recently. And then next week, there's a meeting between the CPH and ICANN staff where ICANN staff is going to be talking about some data related to its position regarding the round-trip response time SLA. So, that's coming up next week on Thursday. So, that's the timing of that meeting. That's a brief update on the RA and RAA Amendment.

Questions about that? Seeing none, our last regularly scheduled microwave item: any ICANN feedback on changes to the NSp. I think I saw Karla here. Karla, any updates from the folks working on the NSp? "Not at this time." Very good. Okay.

So, onto everyone favorite acronym in the acronym microwave: any other business? Anybody have any other AOB topics that they would like to bring up? Not seeing any hands.

Very good. All right. I think with that, we will go ahead and wrap it up. Just to remind everybody, November 12th is our next meeting. We look to have a vigorous discussion between now and then on the list on the topic that we just talked about. I won't attempt to assign it a name or a label yet. So, we will look to see [you] on the list.

Sue, you can take us out of here.

SUE SCHULER:

Thanks, Rick.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]