

---

CR - Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey Report  
Thursday, March 15, 2012 – 08:00 to 09:00  
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Rob Hogarth:

Good morning, everyone, welcome to the 2011 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey Session. My name is Rob Hogarth, Senior Policy Director for ICANN.

The purpose of this morning's session is to review for the community, the results of the Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey that ICANN initiated at the end of last year, 2011. And what we're going to do is go through the overall results of the survey and then see if anyone from the community here and Costa Rica has any questions.

This session will be posted on the meeting site so that people can check it for posterity. And as you'll hear later, we're also going to look for a dialogue via the community Wiki site as well.

To give you some general background as to why this survey came about, clearly, everyone is aware of the Affirmation of Commitments. That and community comments spurred the Executive Team within ICANN to seek out and begin to dialogue with the community on their level of satisfaction with what we're doing and try to find a set of benchmarks, try to find a way for us to over the longer haul assess how people are perceiving ICANN's service effectiveness, and their level of satisfaction through the various ideas, through the various programs, through the various processes that ICANN staff engages in. And so the goal of the survey concept was to get stakeholder perceptions across a large range of services that are provided by ICANN.

The idea was that we would be able to identify those areas that were strengths, those areas that needed improvement, and essentially create a baseline from

---

*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.*

which we could measure the impact of future improvements. And of course since this was going to be the first time in late 2011 that we were conducting the survey, to really use it as a learning experience and to refine the process over time.

There were several key process steps that we used, since this was the first survey that we had embarked upon of this type. The first step, of course was to get familiar with survey literature, come up with a design that was really a foundational element from which we could build on future surveys.

The other thing was to really make sure that we had the right service areas. And so a lot of dialogue with the executive team and other staff to make sure that we had identified the right areas for performance evaluation. We also looked to not only develop the survey, but to test it internally with selected staff members and a few members of the community just to get a sense that we were moving in the right direction.

And then of course as we are doing now report the results of it after getting a lot of feedback from the community. I skipped a step on the slides which was to basically use the leaders of the various supporting organizations and advisory committees to announce the survey and to get participation from their members.

The key audience for the survey was volunteers and stakeholders within the major supporting organizations and advisory committees, and so that's why we focused on that particular area. The survey was conducted online via the Question Pro infrastructure. We chose that because that was a vendor that our IT team had vetted, and it provided some useful analysis and reporting tools. Again, this was our first time using Question Pro in a major way. And so we're looking for feedback in terms of how respondents like that infrastructure and found it be easy to use.

Now I mentioned that the population that we were looking at for the survey were essentially the stakeholder groups of ICANN, the major supporting organizations and advisory committees. We also reached out to the ISTAR

community as well, to get a sense from that community what their perceptions were regarding the effectiveness of ICANN's various services and activities.

And the slide that I've just put up, number four on the screen shows in general for you the general population potential and the response rates. I think the key thing on this slide and as we evaluate all the rest of the results is the sense that when we embarked upon this, looking at the various survey literature and the rest, we were hoping for a response rate in the 20% range. And we had an audience of approximately 1,700 potential respondents.

The actual survey respondents in which we actually had completed surveys was only 60 which is about 3.5%. So there was a significant gap there between our expectations and between the final results. And that's a key component I think in terms of looking at some of these surveys. We have a question real quick from the audience. Marika, yes, thank you.

Marika Konings:

Yes, hi, thanks Rob, this is Marika. This is a question how did you calculate the actual population, because for example in the GNSO, did you ask the stakeholder groups about their membership? Because as well, of course are many that are outside those stakeholder groups, or did you make a rough estimate thinking this is probably the right number of the total population.

Rob Hoggarth:

For this first survey, we reached out to the various members of the policy team who are responsible for liaising with those particular areas. For the most part they have complete mailing lists for those communities. At least, again, remember of the people who are primarily volunteering or active receiving emails in the ICANN community. So that's where we started.

A number of the secretaries observed that in some cases there were duplications in terms of email addresses, some people used multiple email addresses, but we were comfortable that the universe was in the 1,600 number. Your question also raises I think an interesting point for folks to appreciate why the policy team, the

---

policy development support via club ICANN was administering the survey to begin with. The reason for that is that we were reaching out primarily to the stakeholder groups, the supporting organizations and advisory committees with whom we work very directly and on a regular basis.

So from a staff perspective it seemed to make sense for us to take the initial crack at this. We'll see how things develop as we go forward. I should also note and I'll apologize to Ken Bauer who is on the phone with this. I wanted to introduce Ken who is a policy consultant to our policy development team. Ken was the external administrator for the survey, and Ken, I wanted to make sure that I welcome you to this event as well. So thanks for joining us. Can you say hello for posterity, Ken.

Ken Bauer: Yes. Hello, for posterity.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you very much. If there is anything that requires clarification, or if I miss anything out as we end this Ken, I'll look to you to help me out and point out some various points for us. Can you do that?

Ken Bauer: Yes, sir, happy to.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thanks very much. So in general, again the overall message in terms of concerns that we had was that from a response rate perspective, we were only in the 3.5% range. And this raises some various issues for us in terms of this survey being a learning experience, how can we get more people to participate, what sort of factors may have contributed to a lower response rate.

An important thing to note is, one of the things that the Question Pro infrastructure gave us the capability to do was to see when people clicked into

the survey, not by any means of identification, but to at least be able to track the amount of participation. And there were actually 429 survey link views. If all those people who had viewed survey had completed it, then the response rate would have been in the 25% range. So as you can imagine one of the questions that we have going forward that's going to need additional investigation is why did people click in and then not complete the survey. And there are any number of factors that could play into that, the length of the survey, the time, the connectivity, and a number of other factors. And so that's something that we're going to be looking at before we try to do this again.

I think the other important point of this is that it is a learning experience and we'll find out over time how to play through these things, but an important factor of the survey approach, the survey logistics was the survey did ask for individuals to identify themselves and to share an email address. And another factor that we're considering is do people have some concerns from a privacy perspective. Question from the audience, Mr. Olof.

Olof Nordling:

Thanks Rob, it would be good to clarify in terms of that information of the third party administrator Ken Bauer had access to that, but we did not, and that is how we protected the privacy concerns of those who clicked. So if you want to add to that, or have Ken add that would be great.

Rob Hoggarth:

Yes, thanks for mentioning that. I think that's a critical component. No one from ICANN staff had access to any of the responses, there's a voluminous 116 page report of the survey materials and all of the results on our community Wiki site that was solely Ken's responsibility.

None of us had any access to or sought to find out anything in terms of the background of the information. And clearly if we're going to move forward and use this type of tool as a benchmark going forward, it's very critical that potential respondents realize that we're being very careful about their privacy.

---

So there's a level of trust here, and no one fears that they're going to be called out for a particularly critical response.

The real key of the survey of course is to make sure that ICANN had some very useful and regular data to gauge where there need to be improvements, where we can do better, and also where additional resources may need to go.

On our next slide, just very briefly, a sense of participation. Again, part of our learning experience. There were two waves of responses. We got over 50% the first week right after the initial invitations went out from the community leaders. In terms of then there was just a long tail in which there was a bump around the time of the reminder email, as you would expect, some human nature in play there, when people were reminded, pinged about the availability of the survey, there was an uptick in participation, and that's something that we'll look at in terms of a program for future surveys.

In terms of the time spent on the survey, we thought this was an important statistic, because it reflected the fact that for the most part people could complete the survey under 30 minutes, and that was sort of our benchmark tag feeling that if it would take anyone any longer than that period of time, they'd be very reluctant to either take this survey or take it again.

And almost 70% of the respondents completed the survey in less than 20 minutes, but of course the challenge there is that the people who took the time to actually complete comments to explain more of their answers, when we compared those statistics, it took them longer than 30 minutes. So there is some balancing that we may need to do there in the future as well.

Now, let's look a little bit at the results, and let me talk a little bit about the survey instrument itself. We asked about the interest in ICANN's structures and services in ten primary areas. And let me read them though just briefly for you. They were SO and AC supports, that's Supporting Organization and Advisory Committees, DNS Policy Development, DNS Policy Implementation Services, Contractual Compliance, we also asked about DNS Stability and Security, IANA Operations, we asked about Communications, Public Meetings, and there

were sections also on Strategic Planning and ICANN Leadership. So those were the ten categories.

And then what we did within the survey instrument was ask anywhere from two to three key metrics questions within that. An important element that we focused on and you see on this slide, number six, we called it Performance Effectiveness.

The title of the survey was Stakeholder Satisfaction, but as we learned more about the approach to surveys particularly one like this, satisfaction was very difficult to quantify and very difficult once we played around with it a bit to determine how you could actually find anything actionable. Maybe you were just asking are you satisfied.

And so we settled on this concept of Performance Effectiveness, the survey itself provided a definition of that and just for some broader sense for all of you, we defined Performance Effectiveness as basically it meant that the services produced at the optimum amount or level and is delivered competently, transparently, and when most needed that it adapts rapidly to community needs, optimizes community resource utilization, is easy to access and consume and achieves its purposes, goals and objectives. And so that was really the measuring stick that we took in those ten service categories.

And then when you calculate the fact that we were asking two or three questions about each of those categories, we came up with a total of 37 sub-elements. Now what you see on slide six here as we just for purposes of this general overview, we took the top five and the bottom five in terms of scoring, and this is where it's also to talk about the fact that there were 60 respondents out of that field of about 1,700. We had some concerns about the statistical significance of that.

And Ken, if you can just talk for 30 seconds, a minute about our level of concern or confidence about that low number, and what that can mean for us in terms of interpreting the results generally. Can you touch on that for a second?

Ken Bauer:

Sure, Rob. Of the number 60, out of 1,600 is actually a statistically significant number at this 95% competence level, if you draw those 60 names randomly from the population.

And so in this case, what makes this a little bit troubling is that those 60 names were volunteers rather than being drawn randomly. And so that statistical comment I made does really hold. So yes, this is another one of those areas we just have to look at in terms of whether the results are reasonable, and I did some other statistical tests, [Kisquare] and things of that type to determine whether or not the population of respondents fit the model of the general population because we collected that data. And it does not. So we do have some groups that participated more heavily than other groups than would be indicated if you were doing this on a random basis.

That doesn't mean the results are not valid. What it means is we can't demonstrate that they are. I'll stop there.

Rob Hogarth:

Thank you. And that's one of the things that we're going to be looking as we proceed with this concept and that is if we identify particular areas where maybe individual communities or responses from regions weren't consistent with others, maybe to see that are areas that we could improve there. Thanks Ken.

Let's look at this slide and just very quickly identify, you'll see here that three of the four questions in the SO/AC support category were rated among the top five. As you look at the bottom five, a general observation, three of the four questions on leadership were rated in the bottom five of all 37 elements.

And you'll see over on the side the administrator's report provides mean, median and mode statistics there as well. Can you talk very briefly Ken about the spread between the high of 3.74 and the low of 2.28 just to give us a sense as to how things seem to work in terms of community responses there?



Ken Bauer:

Yes, sure. The scale was a five point scale from one being least satisfaction to five being highest satisfaction. As is true in all surveys there this concept called central tendencies. The more people you ask a question, the tendency for those numbers to approach the midpoint, which would be three.

So when you see a result like 3.74, which was the number one that's generally pretty significant. That means that there were a fair number of people who rated that high to overcome that sort of central tendency. And then the same thing could be said for the one at the very bottom, you know the 2.28, that's a fairly low score.

And one of the things that's helpful to do in looking at these means and other statistics is to look at the individual – if you go to the survey report, the detailed report, you see all the raw data, and you can actually see the spread based on the four categories of respondents that we put them in. And then you get a much better sense for the numbers and how that mean is made up of individual components. Plus there is a whole set of write in comments that Rob I'm sure will be talking about in a few minutes.

Rob Hogarth:

Great thanks very much Ken. Let's move to the next slide and talk about a little bit of a more general view of things. And Ken I'd like you to talk to us for a second too, you know we asked about very specific service elements, we broke things down into 37 areas, what we also wanted to look at is whether there was any link to an overall sense of Performance Effectiveness in INCANN. And you did some number crunching here. Can you talk about that for a moment?

Ken Bauer:

Sure. It's important to note that we never ask the survey respondents, what do you think about ICANN's overall Performance Effectiveness. That was not asked. We asked about individual elements within ten major categories or services. However, it is possible to take all the ones, right, all the highly

dissatisfied and all the fives, and add them all up across all of the elements which is exactly what we did here, and you can see that the 29% of the respondents rated – used the number “3” for all 37 questions.

So clearly if you think that the services and the breadth of the things that were asked about in this survey covers the spectrum of ICANN and what it does, then it’s not unreasonable to say that most people think ICANN is right around the midpoint in terms of satisfaction or effectiveness across the wide range of services. So that’s what this slide says.

Now you’ll also note that there were 15% of the questions that were skipped, and when you get into the detail of the report, you’ll see that those tended to be in the technical questions around DNS stability, and IANA services, which had the highest percentage of skip responses.

And the last item and by the way this format that you see on this slide is the same one that’s used for all the questions in the detailed survey report and the last line of this left column shows a competence interval. And we calculated a 95% competence interval on every mean, on every question. And so in this case, you can see that it’s a very tight distribution between 3.0 and 3.1. And so that tells us that you know in the population at large we were pretty confident about this spread of numbers.

Rob Hogarth:

Great thanks. What we also did in terms of taking a slice here is that we just looked at each of the 10 categories and essentially ranked those as well, again using the same elements, mean, median and mode. And as you’ll see on slide number eight, generally the highest ranked service category was public meetings. The lowest category was leadership.

And just to talk a little bit, we’ll touch a little bit at the end of the presentation about what we’re going to do with this, but as you can see harkening back to the original purpose of the survey, we’re going to be concentrating, or the expectation was that we would begin to concentrate on those areas where we

---

were getting the low scores, because the survey would help us identify areas where potentially additional resources or focus could go, and this tool is likely to be used for that.

In terms of engagement statistics, it was very interesting to see the types of responses that we got from the various individual and sort of the general sense as to what their experience or engagement level was with ICANN. You'll see on this slide, just a couple of highlights. For example, if you look at the pie chart in the upper left-hand corner, figure five; see that 60% of respondents indicated that they had been actively involved in ICANN for more than four years.

If you look at the bottom left pie chart, you'll see that 32% of the respondents spend generally in the two to five hour range a week on ICANN activities and another almost third devote more than 11 hours a week. This gave us a sense that the initial survey respondents, the people who participated in this first effort have really got a lot of experience and really participate on a regular basis within ICANN.

That might be a suggestion for us as we look to future surveys, how we can reach out to folks who are not as connected, to get some more general perceptions. But at the same time, you want the people who are most familiar with the surveys, being the ones who are assessing them.

Finally, in terms of engagement, one of the things that we provided for in terms of a demographic in the survey was this concept of scanners at one end of the spectrum up to evangelist on the other end of the spectrum. And from that perspective, a full 75% of survey respondents placed themselves in the solid constituent or contributor category, which again gives us a good sense as to who responds and gets involved, at least in this first survey attempt.

Now looking ahead, what are we going to do with all of this? Well, the first step was to share the results of the survey with the broader community, and we're doing that today via not only a public session, remote participation and of course recording this presentation for future posterity for those who weren't able to join

our activities. We've set up a community Wiki page for the community to provide input, to provide reactions to the survey, whether that's to the process, whether that's to the results, that's all going to be very helpful input from folks.

The other part of it is in terms of next steps by ICANN staff is that the plan is to share these results with each of the departments and to ask them for feedback, potential action plans as to how they might approach or react to some of the survey responses. The real critical element from our perspective to the extent that our team will be assisting us in moving forward is to evaluate the process recommendations that our administrator prepared. And Ken I'll have you talk about that in a moment or two.

And then of course determine from a subsequent survey perspective, what's the right time frame for doing this? How often will we do it? What will be sort of the scope and the overall arc of how we look at results, interpret them, act on them, and then ask folks for additional feedback? So Ken could you touch very briefly on some of the process recommendations that we might look to for improving things in the next round.

Ken Bauer: Sure, let me get down to that section of the report and use that as a guide.

Rob Hoggarth: Ken, I don't know if we're have a failure in the –

Ken Bauer: No, I wasn't anticipating the question and I didn't get to this section, okay. So the things that I guess I brought up in the observations and recommendations section of the administrator's report; one dealt with the participation rate and you did – we've already talked a little bit about that.

I make the argument in there that the number 60, although it's small and way below what we had hoped for isn't by itself an indicator that the results are not

useful and not statistically valid. It's indeterminate. It would have been better if we had drawn 60 names at random from the population, then we would be sure about that. But in any event there is some discussion in there about that. So clearly some work needs to be done, and my recommendations are to try to really understand why the participation rate was as low as it was.

Most people that do surveys even randomly in the population get 20% to 30% participation out of their populations and this was down under 4. I think you might have mentioned a couple of things Rob like these are just some thoughts that we had in trying to figure out what might have discouraged people. Maybe the survey was too long, people opened up the first page and said wow, there's ten sections in here, I don't have to do ten sections. We estimated 30 minutes, maybe people didn't want to spend 30 minutes on the survey.

There could be some trust issues around whether the personal information that was being asked for would be protected from disclosure. We tried to deal with that in the survey introduction, but maybe people didn't get it, or didn't read it and so forth. And there are about five or six, or seven different possibilities including the fact that some people just don't like to do surveys.

Then there was the second sort of section that I got into was the rating scale itself. We used that five point behaviorally anchored Likert scale as has already been discussed, but that – because people have a tendency not to rate on the extremes, likes the ones and fives. In fact one of the respondents actually wrote this in a feedback comment. The person wrote: “You know I don't like to give ones or fives anytime ever.”

And so if other people had that same view, then what it becomes is a three point scale, right, from two, three and four, and the ones and fives don't get used very often. Now I don't think that held up generally, but if enough people feel that way, then you get too much compression around the center, and you don't get the full variety of opinions expressed at least in the rating scale. So one recommendation I'm making here is that we might want to consider a seven or an eight point scale for a future survey.

Then the third one was survey length. Rob already talk about the distribution of the time people spent on the survey, and we noted that if people wrote comments which ICANN clearly wants to see, right, because the comments are very rich and very helpful in terms of understanding the numbers, what's behind the numbers.

And when people wrote the questions and answered them with written comments, it took well over 20 minutes, the great majority of people who wrote comments in spent more than 20 minutes or 30 minutes on the survey. So we're going to have to adjust the survey length, if we want people to write comments in.

Again, I also make the point in the administrator's report that we should probably think hard about not including both technical materials like the DNS Stability and the IANA sections. Those maybe would be better placed in a separate survey, and then given to perhaps a different audience. So if you look at those two particular questions, there were over 25% of the questions that were skipped. 25% of the respondents skipped those two questions, and that's a very high percentage.

In terms of the online survey tool, we had been using Question Pro, and it works pretty well. There are some quirks to a few things here and there, but I expect that's true in every online survey tool, it's relatively inexpensive to use for the corporate edition. And I make some recommendations in here in terms of if we continue to use Question Pro as the online survey tool. And that's pretty much the sum of it Rob.

Rob Hogarth:

Great thanks a lot Ken. I had a couple hands go up here in the room. Can I recognize Marilyn Cade with a question?

Marilyn Cade:

I think it's going to start with a statement.

Rob Hoggarth: A statement would be fantastic, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: At this point, my name is Marilyn Cade, and I'm the Chair of the Business Constituency. And I trust that this meeting is being recorded and transcribed so that my comments will be available for everyone to read.

Rob Hoggarth: That is correct.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. In my long history of employment, I've had the benefit of working for a multi-national corporation. I have a background of training in organizational development. I have run a small business unit for AT&T computer systems, and in my career I have hired and fired many, many, many consultants who have worked with me to do survey instruments. I have also worked with Pollsters to design effective survey mechanisms. I am very cautious about extrapolating anything from what should have been a pilot, and is not.

Pilots allow us to learn about the characteristics of the audience that we are then going to survey. All instruments are not created equal in their effectiveness with different populations. Just as we have learned, or should have learned, that many of the cultures that our stakeholders come from do not support different kinds of tools as an effective mechanism of taking input. Confidentiality promises to people who come from North America and Europe may be taken quite seriously, and not so seriously if you come from other parts of the world.

Explaining that you're using an outside party does not answer those concerns. Asking people who today are struggling to deal with the complexity of the environment we ask them to swim in at ICANN, this kind of questions to me

---

does not work. I am noting that in fact that you had a resource available to you, to sit down and talk to about what effective mechanisms might work to reach the different communities, because each of those communities, many of those communities have a Chair.

Qualitative analysis in gathering initial information is often the best approach to understanding how to design effective data gathering. I do not understand, and I completed the survey, and I made phone calls to my members and sent emails to my members and asked them to complete the survey. Even at that, the turnout I generated for you is quite low.

Now, I would take a very different kind of learning out of this than I've heard you guys talk about, and then I read in the report, and I'm quite disappointed. So I can only assume that elsewhere in the organization, perhaps at a higher level, there is some irrational enthusiasm about the use of surveys. And I would caution against that because in fact it does not speak to me when I look at the results; I don't think we are that dissatisfied. I think we may be disappointed about many individual things, but what the survey conveys is not helpful to us in how we improve ourselves.

To Ken's point, you know Ken you're right, had you done a statistical sampling, then we might say we've learned something, but that's not what we did. So I am happy to continue to dialogue in the short time that we have ahead of us on what was said, I question that we take any learning out of it, other than this is not the right mechanism. Maybe it's just not the right instrument. But I think that was where you were heading to say well it wasn't the right instrument, need a different scale, our questions were too complex. Don't take – I do not take that learning out of it.

I will also say in my career, I have hired Pollsters. There's never been a pole that I created that I didn't know already what the answer was going to be, because I did surveys, I went out and did qualitative analysis first to see if in fact when you pay a lot of money for a survey, you do your homework first.



---

Poling is very risky in an environment like this. We are not doing man on the street, woman on the street, woman on the street corner surveys. We're trying to learn how to improve an organization.

You touched on the fact that you wanted written comments; well that's what qualitative analysis starts with. And you design an instrument differently. I understand that there are other plans in the works supported perhaps by Board Committees to continue to do surveys. I strongly caution against that at this point.

If the question is that the Board members on the committees, or that the staff feel they do not know what is on the minds of the community, there is another way to get at there, isn't there, that's called conversation. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth:

Thank you very much, Marilyn, those are very good comments and much appreciated. I think that is one of the issues that organizationally folks will have to look at is the types of tools and instruments, there are a variety of them, and that's something that others will check on and report on.

But thank you very much and most importantly, we do have this recorded and transcribed. Are there any other questions or observations that folks would like to make about the documents themselves? The general report? Anything from the remote participation community, Brian?

Well what I'd like to do is invite everybody to continue the dialogue; again, as I've pointed out, we do have the administrator's report and executive summary of the report, all the raw data on the community Wiki under the special project section. It's the projects tab, and then it says ICANN's Stakeholder Survey, 2011.

So we invite people to take a look at that, and as Marilyn has done today to provide us not only with comments about this particular instrument, but the general approach that we're taking as an organization to these types of efforts. And I'm going to look one last time for any comments.

Male: Yes, there is one comment from the remote participation, from Mr. Chris Chaplow, just saying that he thinks we do need to work on the process. He thought the report and presentation was interesting and easy to scan and understand.

Rob Hoggarth: Great thank you. And one last look around. Marilyn, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Given where we are, what should I expect is going to happen? Given where we are what should I expect is going to happen. Let me see if I can summarize where we are.

There was a survey that was published somehow not visible or aware broadly in the community but came via email, even to me not visible before it was coming, but came via email.

There was extremely low turnout. There is no representative participation on a geographic basis. The participation in the briefing meeting this morning is as far as I can see and perhaps there are other remote participants, the business constituency at ICANN.

So apparently this is scheduled at a time when there are so many other conflicts that people are unable to be here, or it is so obscure on the schedule because of the lateness of the delivery of the schedule, and the lateness of the agenda of the schedule that the Chairs have not been able to properly promote it. So we have low participation in a survey. We have low participation in a briefing. My proposal to the staff is no decisions can be taken, since there has not been an opportunity for effective feedback. And my personal recommendation, my individual recommendation is that I think we would need to schedule at least a webinar on this. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth:

Great, thank you very much. Any other final comments or questions? Seeing none, we will adjourn a full 20 minutes early, and again I invite everybody, and anyone who is listening to this recording later to please join the community Wiki and provide your feedback from that perspective. Thank you very much. We're adjourned.

[End of Transcript]