
ICANN81 | AGM – GNSO: RySG Wrap Up Session
Thursday, November 14, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:00 TRT

SUE SCHULER: Hello and welcome to the session of the Registry Stakeholder Group Wrap Up Session. My name is Sue, and I am the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom, onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now, for the last time, hand the floor over to Samantha Demetriou.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Hi, everyone. Good morning. Thank you for being here at the wrap up session. Hey, to everyone who's on the Zoom room, thanks for joining us remotely. As you said, for the last time, this is Samantha Demetriou, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group, but certainly not the last time you're gonna be hearing this voice, so no one gets too excited.

We have an hour for our wrap up today. We'll use, as you know, as much of that 60 minutes as we need to. We're gonna start off with a discussion on all the various DNS abuse activities that have been going on since, I

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.

would say like a couple weeks before this ICANN81 meeting, and then the things that have taken place here at ICANN81. We'll briefly touch on the takeaways document for this meeting. Beth will lead that one. And then the last thing we'll do today is we'll do our Excom transition.

I think with that, does anyone have anything they want to add or any questions before we dive in on abuse? Great. So maybe I'll hand over to Dennis, Brian, folks who have been kind of leading this conversation. I don't know that everyone here was able to make the session that ICANN posted yesterday. And so maybe just start us off on this discussion, were there any interesting takeaways for the registries from the presentations that ICANN did?

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Sam. This is Dennis, Verisign. So key takeaways. So for those who did were not able to join yesterday's DNS abuse updates from OCTO, they touch on Domain Metrica and INFERMAL report. Domain Metrica is the measurement platform of anything DNS. They are starting with this module on DNS abuse, which is basically the continuation or evolution of DAAR. They quickly acknowledge and also reinforce that they're gonna be removing a spam because it's a broad category spam and not just specifically the one that is used as a delivery mechanism.

As you may know, OCTO did a study and research and a prototype or a method to classify a spam into the different granular categories. So they're trying to make that into a product, and once that's ready, they're gonna introduce it again in Domain Metrica. And they took on

the suggestion that they will roll out that in a phase approach, meaning beta testers, and then roll out to the wider public the same way they did with the first module. I think I want to pause here on Domain Metrica.

I think nothing new really. Brian, any? I think it was basically what we were presented two weeks ago, I think. So nothing new. Yeah. And then Maciej Korczyński from KOR Labs, they're responsible for conducting the INFERMAL study, so INFERMAL, the Inferential Analysis of malicious registration. So they were looking at the factors that may contribute in the decision making for bad actors to choose Registrar TLDs and what have you, in order to launch malicious registrations, meaning domains that are register with a purpose to conduct DNS abuse and not just compromise Ones.

So it is an interesting study, so I will encourage you to read it. I myself have read it once and still, I will go for second time and third time potentially. The insurance team bits are the abstract and the conclusions, but don't miss the middle part because that's where you really get into understand what was the drivers and the methodology and the rationale behind all the data.

That said, I'm sure those two parts, like the first one at the beginning, at the end, where people are gonna stop reading that. And so I'm not gonna go into details, I just want to note that we anticipated the INFERMAL study. Other parts of the community also anticipated this study, and they are also now, for example, during the GAC, ALAC meeting earlier this week, some ALAC member called for this is the

information basically that we were looking for emphasizes and proves our points that we did not have the hard data.

Now, INFERMAL brings the hard data into bulk registrations, pricing, and whatnot, verification as well, that's one of the other factors. So they're gonna be moving quickly into pushing a PDP. And as you know, the advisory committees have the right to start an issues report, which is the first step for A PDP. So I would not be surprised that that's gonna be coming in the maybe next month. So I think from our standpoint as well with our colleagues in the registrar side, we need to start working on how do we want to position ourselves in that sense.

We want to work with the community, and I think that was very clear from the beginning of starting the DNS abuse amendments that we would want to raise the floor first, but then work with the community in finding ways to evolve the DNS abuse amendments. So yeah, I think I want to stop there. That's gonna come, so we just need to prepare ourselves in order to how to work with them. And I see your hand, Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, and it's morning everybody. I've read it once. Can you just go back a second? Say what is the At-Large saying it shows that they write about?

DENNIS TAN:

Yeah, so basically, I don't remember the words word by word, but basically, the attributes that increase the likelihood of malicious

registrations are pricing one, verification features, and bulk registrations, which is basically giving API access for bulk searches and bulk creation of accounts.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

It may say bulk, but the quote I've got here is other variables such as registration price, average domain uptime, and payment types are not statistically significant. Suggesting that they do not have a consistent impact on malicious purposes.

DENNIS TAN:

Up times, yes, but you go to the conclusions that that's where you are gonna find the remarks that they're using.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Brian?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Getting all choked up last meeting. Thanks, Sam. Thanks, Dennis. I think that was a great summary, Dennis, I really please everyone, you should read this report, even just read the executive summary. It is going to be spicy document du jour for a while, I think. And please especially read the takeaways.

One of the things that's interesting about the API creation, having, I think it was a 401% increase in the likelihood of malicious creates, that's it's almost an interesting opportunity because for us as the community,

we've been talking about like, well, what's bulk registrations? Is that 10? Is that 20? Is it a hundred? That might be a good definition is that if we're talking about bulk registrations, we're really talking about API access for create in large volumes. And so like, that might be the first time that we can really have a definition that isn't just some random number, but it's a key feature that domains created that way, maybe that's a reasonable, you know, definition of bulk creates.

DENNIS TAN:

Oh yeah, thank you, Brian. Dennis for the record. Yeah, and that's the kind of conversation that we need to start having. I think what is not in the report, but match it, I think was good that he pointed out, we need to be careful about how we ingest and consume this information. And we have to be very careful as to how we apply it for policy making or other actions. It's not just the one attribute, it explains everything, every malicious registration thing. It's a combination of factors, attributes that might exist at that register level, because registries offer different services. It's just a combination of it that creates a likelihood more. So it's not just one single factor, but other thing.

So in that sense, that's where we really need to understand what this study conveys so that we can also help our other parts of the community understand that it's not just one single thing, right? Also, understand that this study focuses on malicious registration, but it doesn't touch on if you increase the restrictions or controls in certain actions that the registrars do, how does that impact, you know, good registrants?

And so we need to be cautious and responsible and elevate that conversation in that way and not just be quickly and say, yes, put some restrictions onto bulk registrations and whatnot, because what does that impact to the other parts of the ecosystem. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. I've got Keith and then Catherine in the queue.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much, Dennis, for the readout. Thanks, Sam. Just a quick follow up and to reinforce the point Dennis made about possible PDP. I think we've been, you know, clear and consistent from the beginning of our conversations together and with ICANN of the bilateral contract negotiations on DNS abuse mitigation were the first step, and that we were always going to be open to a follow-on policy development process or some other community type of work. And so I don't think we should be you know, afraid of this or I think we should be embracing it.

But I think we do need to be preparing ourselves for, you know, what that issues report might be, what it might look like. And Dennis, I just had a follow up question for you. I heard you mention that you thought that it could be, you know, the request for an issues report could be imminent and I didn't catch who you said you thought it might come from. So if you could just go back to that, I'd appreciate it. Thanks.

-
- DENNIS TAN: Yeah, thank you. Well, it was one member at the At-Large that mentioned that, that reminded the GAC and those in the room that the GAC specifically or the ALAC can start the PDP with an issues report. So it might be just one of those ALAC perhaps because they have been waiting for this study in order to support their claims. So I don't think GAC is ready yet, but the ALAC looks more ready?
- KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Dennis. Just a quick follow up. This is Keith. So, okay, that's helpful. I think one of the questions that we will want to have clarified is, is this appropriate for an issue reported on a PDP? Is it something that we should tackle in isolation? Is it something that should be part of a broader conversation? You know, how would we want to see a PDP structured in terms of the topic and subject matter and all that? So I think there's a lot more conversation that we need to have about this, but that we should be prepared for that. Thanks.
- SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: It seems like Jeff wants to respond on that point specifically, and then we'll go to Catherine.
- JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, just to clarify. So they can request an issue report, they cannot commence the PDP. So just the, just to be clear. So of course, once they have the issue report and it's sent to the GNSO, it's gonna be very difficult if there's a recommendation in there to start a PDP to not. But I agree that we need to kind of start thinking about it, but there's

nothing we could do to prevent the issue report. If they ask for it, it will happen.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jeff. I have Beth, and then Chris.

BETH BACON: Thank you. And I'm sorry that I sound absolutely disgusting. I think we've talked a lot about making sure that our PDPs going forward are very precise and targeted. So I think that that is, apart from the nexus of the source of it all, whoever the party may be, I think we do need to be ready with our counselors to really stick to our principles on having narrow digestible PDPs so that this is something that we can see action on and not be doing it for the next five years.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Sam. This is Chris. We can instigate our own issues report. Why wouldn't we do that and control the narrative rather than waiting for somebody else to do that? Keith quite rightly says, we all said, well, most of us said we will follow this up with more work, and we talked about micro, whatever the hell we called them, baby PDPs, PDP lets, and so why not just grasp it and run and create our own issues report? Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. I will just kind of throw out one more tidbit for this conversation, which is that towards the end of the council meeting

yesterday, Justine Chew, who is the ALAC liaison to council made a request to kind of reinstate the council small team on DNS abuse. I have to assume that all these developments are somewhat linked, right? So if there is appetite for us to kind of get in line first and go in with a request for an issues report that is very specific to something, I certainly think that that is something that we should explore. I think doing our best to coordinate that with the registrars, I mean these are all pretty obvious statements, right?

But like especially given some of the registrar's statements that Brian alluded to of having concerns about being able to define bulk registration, I think having those conversations and, you know, using the report as a jumping off point that like, hey, maybe this does provide an avenue for us to address the concern in a way that does make sense for our businesses.

So I certainly think we should explore it. I think probably getting a conversation with the registrars as soon as possible. So on the council level, you know, we can take that back and talk to the registrar counselors, but I would say probably get the memberships and the Excoms together pretty soon to start to get that done. Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Sam. I think that's a great idea. I also just wanted to just remind us, but really remind us so that we can remind our friends across the various constituencies that in the feral report, again, very interesting, but so much of it does not lend itself to a PDP within the picket fence. You know, so much of this revolves around pricing, which

we obviously as registries need to be careful about discussing together, but it's in the report so we can reference that. But more to the point, that can't be subject to a PDP. So we can have these discussions.

And then, you know, to Dennis's point, and I've had a conversation with Maciej too, the INFERMAL report isn't, well, if you do this one thing, it fixes it. It was all how these different levers blend together to create a threat landscape that an actor can exploit. So we have to be careful in how we scope this, that it's not just a total reaction to individual elements of the INFERMAL report, because again, that wouldn't really paint a sufficient picture. But at the same time, again, reminding our friends across ICANN, that price is obviously not going to be part of that PDP because it's outside the picket fence.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Brian, I think that's absolutely right, and I also think that the messaging around whatever policy work we pursue becomes really important, where like, again, not everything is going to solve every problem. And I think as long as we keep hammering that and we point to this piece of policy work is going to achieve, we think is gonna achieve X, which is gonna make a difference in this larger play, I think we're gonna really need to continue to stick to that messaging that has been in place since we started the abuse amendments, for example. Catherine.

CATHERINE PALETTA: Thanks. I think as we look at the INFERMAL report, part of that also says to me, does it have to be a policy, what will come out of the PDP? And I

think not that we would then make recommendations about pricing, but it doesn't have to be a policy that's binding on all of us. And so there may be pieces of that that are more appropriate to touch on in whatever other output we have from a PDP. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Good point, Catherine. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Sam. Just listening to Brian, and I agree with all of those points and it occurs to me that maybe we could very quickly produce a registry statement on the report that makes those points publicly in the sense that, because yes, of course we should talk to our friends across community, but actually some sort of formal statement that says we've read it, these are our initial thoughts, we're still thinking, but everyone needs to know the following things. I think that might be a valuable exercise. I don't know how we do that, but it just seems to me to be a sensible thing to consider. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, thanks Chris. I mean, I think leveraging the existing infrastructure of having the DNS abuse working group in our team, kind of pulling that group together on its next call sharing, you know, asking everyone who's gonna attend that call to please do the homework of making sure you read through the report and understand it as much as you're capable of. I see statistical reports like that and absolutely lose my mind.

But read through the report, understand the conclusions of it, and come to that first conversation with your kind of reactions and thoughts of what could go into a statement, and then you start doing the work right, throw together a Google doc, and start plugging away. So great suggestion. Okay, let me go back to the queue. Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Sam. One very brief comment. I'm listening, I haven't read the report, but I thought I heard someone say something about bulk account creation as well. So Brian talked about bulk registration, but if bulk account creation comes ahead of that, I would think, in the scheme of things. So just to flag that if that is an issue, it's worth looking at that and thinking about that carefully. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jonathan. Good point. Does anyone else want to get in the queue on this topic? And anything else on DNS abuse generally that we need to cover while we're here today? Okay. Then Beth, I'll hand it over to you for the takeaways document.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Sam. I'm sorry that you guys have to listen to this. I just wanted to flag that we do have another takeaways document in the works for this go-round. If you are a funded traveler and have not yet looked at that document, you really should do that. It is a requirement for funded travelers to contribute.

We went over in our comment drafting session a little bit of how we can make this better if we need this to continue, how it may evolve into perhaps something that perhaps doesn't live on the public portion of our website, but evolves more into a more detailed notes document, but that could still be a resource to newer folks that are joining the registries. We had started this takeaways document, kind of an experiment to see if having a public facing position paper was helpful or not.

So we're open to any and all input, but this one will be published. If you could scroll down just so folks can see, we have the topics that we have or SOIs accuracy, WSIS+20. You can see Karen has already started on the SOI portion, I've put my hand up to cover some WSIS things.

We also, if you scroll down, we added some specific items. If some of our funded travelers are following community work like the PPSI and other things, they can contribute in that way, this is not meant to be incredibly long, it's meant to be a snippet. So if you have not put your hand up to contribute to the document, please do. And remember, Catherine is gonna be the one who's gonna be following up with you going forward, and no one wants that. I hear she's mean, so do it. Thanks guys.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks Beth. And I just saw a question from Jen in the chat. If we have a link to the takeaways doc, we'll make sure we get that circulated for sure. It's awesome. Go ahead.

BETH BACON: Sorry, it's also on our, if you go to our comments page, it's right underneath the draft comments. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. Any other questions on that? All right. Jeff wants to get in with a quick AOB. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I brought this up at the council meeting, and I thought I'd bring it up here. So the council's been putting off the review on the UDRP, so RPM phase two, for about six years, I guess. In the meantime, what's going on in the community is that WIPO and the Internet Commerce Association now are doing their own review. Whether we think that's good or bad, what I think is that essentially, the community is saying, we wanted to do a review, you guys haven't done it, so we're gonna do it. So right now, the way I see it is the GNSO is responsible for the development of gTLD policy, but because we've delayed and delayed and delayed, that's now being taken out from the multi-stakeholder model and is now being done by someone else.

Now, true, they have to feed it into the multi-stakeholder model, but I see this as a big loss for the multi-stakeholder model. I see this as this is the number one, the first consensus policy, and the fact that one constituency or stakeholder group wants to keep kicking it down the road because they're afraid of what will happen means that control of

it was taken out from us. And so that bothers me, it should bother others that we have to resort to outside organizations doing our work.

So I think it's a loss for the multi-stakeholder model, and I just wanted to bring that up. I think right now, it's too late, so what I would recommend is that we take the output of WIPO and the Internet Commerce Association and immediately try to feed that into a PDP so we can sort of take control back. So I don't know if anyone else has thoughts on that, but I thought it was not great.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, thanks, Sam. And thanks, Jeff, for bringing that up. I do recall conversations a couple of years ago maybe more, but certainly about a couple years ago where, sorry, WIPO had conversations with Brian Beckham, probably back in the Hague about this topic. And I thought at that time the concept was that they were doing some pre-work to help essentially kickstart and provide some starting point for the PDP and that it wasn't its own sort of formal review of any kind. So that may have evolved, it may be a different approach at this stage.

But I do remember them talking about forming some sort of an experts group to basically jumpstart or kickstart that effort with a starting point. So I understand your procedural concerns. I guess my question is on substance. Do we feel like we as contracted parties, registries in this room, do we feel like we might have a significant difference or a

substantive difference of opinion with what they might think as it relates to UDRP?

I mean, I feel like we all benefit from the UDRP. It's actually been one of the most successful PDPs we've had. It's got 20 years of history behind it, and I don't think anybody wants to significantly or substantially change it. I guess the question is, are there tweaks that would be helpful where we and the intellectual property interests actually could find some alignment? I don't have the answer to that question, but I'm curious if you have any thoughts about that.

JEFF NEUMAN:

This is Jeff Neuman, sorry. I think this report's gonna be extremely beneficial. I'm part of groups outside of this that talk about this every day or at least every week. So absolutely, but let's not kid ourselves, this is not gonna be a document that's like a kickoff point. This is gonna be with concrete recommendations that we're not gonna be able to start from square one, which is fine because I actually think this output's gonna be fantastic. And I may be weighing in on it, but the whole concept of because we keep kicking it down the road for whatever reasons, the work is being done outside of us.

So this is not just gonna be like, hey, you should look at this, or you should look at that. This is going to be concrete recommendations. Things like you need to-- there's a whole bunch of issues, right? Whether pay per clicks offered by a registrar should count against bad faith assessments of a registrant, right? They're gonna be very detailed because that's the issues that as panelists, a lot of us are having. So yes,

it's gonna feed into a PDP, but it's not gonna be one of those like overarching issue reports. It's gonna be very concrete.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I have a little queue. Maxim, over to you.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, the start of this review wasn't very good idea before the finish of IDN's PDP. And its idea of one entity got all variance because it's possible to have a situation where two parties have rights for different strings in the same variance set. And the idea is that all domains should fall in one hands was something which should be looked at. So maybe it's time for that review, I don't know. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Maxim. Anyone else want to get in the queue on this one? Okay. All right. I think that brings us to the crowning of the new Excom. Okay. This is also maybe the part where I want to just say if you guys will indulge me, just like a few words of thanks to everyone.

So when I started my term as chair, it was still right in the middle of the Covid pandemic, and we didn't actually know when we would be coming back to meeting in person. I guess some people would say when or if, I was pretty convinced we'd eventually make our way back here together, guys. And in spite of that, I had this goal where I wanted to do what I could in the chair position to make the Registry Stakeholder

Group a group within ICANN that other community groups felt really good about working with.

Like, so that we would be reliable partners in doing work, that we were honest and open communicators about stuff, that they would know where we stand on issues even when that meant we didn't agree with them, but that we could have those conversations openly and constructively. And I think the things that we've been able to achieve over the last couple years, finishing the RDAP amendment, getting the new DNS abuse amendment in place, in what for ICANN world is record time.

The way we communicated that out, the way we communicated our intentions and our willingness to do more work on this, and everything else that we've been able to achieve, and enhancing our relationships with friends on ICANN staff, our communications with the Board, we wrapped up the Board session a couple days ago with an acknowledgement that like these conversations go a lot better than they used to, they go really smoothly and everyone kind of enjoys them.

I take a lot of pride in that, but it's not certainly through an individual effort in any sense of the word. It's really you guys, as the members of this group who make it possible to take our messaging and like kind of take our positions and the role of gTLD registries and kind of put that out into the broader community in a very successful way.

It really absolutely is attributed to all the work you do, all the effort you put into the things we talk about here at ICANN meetings, the positions we develop, the statements we make and things like that. So I just really

want to express my appreciation for all the support that you've given me and the opportunity that you've given me to like, learn so much about you as people, you as your businesses. It's just been an incredible ride, and I also have to take the time to really thank Sue because she does so much.

You guys know how much she does. You have no idea how much she does behind the scenes to make all of this work, and it's an incredible effort. I also want to thank Wim for everything he does to get the comments going. He is an absolute professional.

The way we are able to like put out comments has been just fantastic. We used to work together a lot more closely when I was VC policy. But yeah, he's just been a real rock for the stakeholder group as well. So I'm gonna leave it there because I'm probably gonna start to cry. But really thank you guys so much. So we don't have a crown like the registrars do, but we do have this very official name card welcoming Beth Bacon as the new chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

BETH BACON:

I think we should keep clapping until Sam cries. But I think that any words that we say are going to fall woefully short because Sam has been such a fantastic, steady, intelligent, calm voice, and really has driven us to, I think a next level of being an effective collaborative partner in the ICANN space, and really an absolute pleasure to work with. We've worked very closely, Karen and Alan a little bit from the peanut gallery, can let you know that that the Excom has been a real delight, that we have felt effective and collaborative, so I think that has really bled in.

I do hope that we can continue to build on your wonderful work. We've established some really excellent cadences with our ICANN leadership, especially Sally and the incoming CEO and Tripti. We have a really effective relationship with ICANN staff, and I do hope that we can continue to build on that. So not only the community, but the staff comes to us and knows that registries are a group that gets things done, are a group that is our genuine partners, and we really do want to move forward the multi-stakeholder model, but also the issues for the folks in this group.

And I think those are things that Sam has done with, again, grace and intelligence and a little smatter of humor every now and then, and has just made this a real joy. So we have a little gift, but it's just a token. So we'll miss you. Please cry. It's my goal. It's my goal. It's my goal.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you.

BETH BACON: So this is from us, but it is made with love by the very creative hands of Sue.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Probably for the folks to come. This is incredible, Sue, thank you so much. I'm gonna keep it in my office for all our calls.

BETH BACON:

So we have a few other changes. We also have more gifts for Sam. Look, it's a new placard. Also handmade by Sue. So we are not getting rid of Sam, we would never want to. Sam is gonna be our GNSO council representative joining Jen and Nacho on the dream team, who have been fantastic.

We thank Kurt for all of his time and service. He's done such a wonderful job, and I'm sure he's pretty happy to not be on calls and just absolute horrible hours from Australia. So I'm sure after he catches up on sleep, he'll miss that. And then we also have-- oh, yep, I'm gonna say Joseph's not here. He also has a shiny new badge.

Also Catherine with her very first placard, baby's first placard, Catherine will be very ably picking up the tasks, working with Wim, who I'm jealous that my time with Wim is over. He's spectacular. Can't say enough words about how he has contributed.

We've said we're an active and effective part of the community, and a huge part of that is because we have really upped the game on comments, and that is all because of Wim. So you get to work with Wim, Wim gets to work with you, it's gonna be a dream team, and I know that you'll knock it out of the park.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

That's the plan.

BETH BACON: Vice chair already is snuck in early, so he's already taken care of. Yeah. So I think as we make some shifts, we also have the return and continuation of our stalwart treasurer Karen Day, and we couldn't be happier. So this is the new team, we're really excited. I think we've got some energy and a lot of really important things to handle. And frankly, I think as Sam said, we work for you. So we're just a reflection of all of the intelligence and hard work that is in this room and on this stakeholder group. So we're really excited to represent you well. And with that, we're out.

SUE SCHULER: We can please end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]