

---

HYDERABAD – IGO/INGO Implementation Review Team Meeting  
Monday, November 07, 2016 – 15:15 to 16:30 IST  
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

DENNIS CHANG: ...at ICANN 57 in Hyderabad and we have the following as the session agenda.

Number one, we talked briefly about what we're going to do here today. So this working group session is open to the public meeting, which is not how we do it normally. So the purpose here is that it gives us the opportunity to hear from the community, so you're all welcome to provide your input.

So we have the IRT as you're familiar with is the Implementation Review Team and you see the names here, and some of them are online. And the Implementation Project Team as we call it IPT consists of the ICANN staff who are working on the implementation itself.

So, to give you a brief background, the PDP was initiated to develop a policy recommendation for the provision of protection for identifiers of certain International Governmental Organization, IGOs, and International Non-Governmental Organization, INGOs. It was interesting to hear earlier that it was

---

*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.*

---

also pronounced INGO. So this also includes the Red Cross, Red Crescent Movement and the International Olympics Committee.

The PDP Working Group completed its work in November 2013 and provided a recommendation, which were adopted. The unique thing about this particular PDP and the Board resolution is that not all the recommendation that was provided was adopted. Only those parts that are not in consistent without GAC Advice and we'll talk more about this.

So then, the adopted recommendations relate to the top and second level of the specific Red Cross, IOC and IGO names with Exceptions Procedure to be designed for an effective organization and 90-day claims notification process at the second level for certain INGOs.

So here is a chart that you may recognize from earlier session today when we were having the IGO INGO Curative Rights PDP Working Group Session. As you saw there, the PDP Working Group Curative Rights Protection is the bottom bar that you see and that was the meeting pertaining to that line.

The top line is what we're doing here today and this is where we are actually implementing the policy that is approved. The middle line is the line that you may have been hearing when GNSO and GAC, and the Board was discussing and they were talking about two-way talks that has yet to be resolved.

---

So, this is a chart that lays out in one page what is and what is not within the scope of this project. So, with the Red Cross, we have the full names, top and second level in UN six languages with Exceptions Procedure or the specific names: Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Crystal, Red Lion and Sun, reservation of such.

What is not in the scope of implementation is the 189 National Red Cross Societies or any kind of claims system or any acronyms that needs to be clear.

IOC is the reservation of full names, top and second level in six UN languages, plus German, Greek and Korean with Exceptions Procedure for these two names only: Olympic and Olympiad.

For IGOs, again, full names for top and second level up to two languages with Exceptions Procedure and we have the GAC list that was provided. We will talk more about that list.

So what is not with the scope of this implementation now is acronyms or claims or the Access to Curative Rights, which is the PDP that we talked about earlier.

For INGOs, we have the full names top level with Exceptions Procedures for general list and is English only, and the 90-day claims for full names for second level for ECOSOC General and Special List, again, English only.

---

Now, before I go on, which reminds me the people around me who are working on implementation, let me take a moment and do some introduction. Why do we do that? We have a very small attendance here, so it's easy to do.

Can we start here? Do you want to introduce yourself? No?

VICKY FOLENS: Hello, I'm Vicky Folens from Deloitte, I am the Global Director of Operations for the Trademark Clearinghouse.

DENNIS CHANG: And Deloitte who's providing the TMCH service today, we're working together to build the claims systems for the INGOs.

My name is Dennis Chang. I am the Lead for this Policy Implementation Project.

AYSEGUL TEKCE: Aysegul Tekce, ICANN staff, Registry Services and Engagement.

EDUARDO ALVAREZ: Eduardo Alvarez, ICANN staff from the gTLD Technical Services Team.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I'm from Hyderabad, this place. My name is [Ganggar Daparde]. I run a NGO non-profit. The name is [inaudible] Society and we are using a .NGO domain. We spread awareness about environmental issues using ICT.

JENNIFER SCOTT: Jennifer Scott from ICANN Contractual Compliance staff.

ANJE GENGO: Hello, everyone. My name is Anje Gengo and I work for UN IGF, Internet Governance Forum.

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes from Verisign and I'm a guest, not on the Implementation Team but I was on the PDP Reserved Names Working Group PDP.

DENNIS CHANG: I didn't know that. I should have guessed you were.

Thank you everyone. So let's continue.

PETTER RINDFORTH: [Inaudible]. Petter Rindforth from IPC.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Petter.

Anyone else like to introduce themselves online?

If not, we'll continue. We see your names on the chat there, so feel free to chat us. If you like to speak, raise your hand.

So brief status and our implementation plan, so we have a draft that has been circulated to IRT. Actually, the latest one I've provided was 6.4, I believe, and we're going to review it today.

Let's see. The other things, we have the list for Red Cross IOC INGO, INGO contact list, we have IGO is incomplete. We're seeking up to two languages from the GAC. They are working on it and we were hoping to have it by this meeting but they weren't able to deliver just yet.

The other things are the full name reservation system, which we were handled at ICANN and claims system, which we will work with Deloitte here.

So this is the exact status with the identified list or this is the authoritative list that we have to work with.

Timeline-wise, we hope to publish our [inaudible] language by 1 February 2017. It doesn't have to be the 1<sup>st</sup> of February but I kind of think that's a reasonable target. We may do it earlier. And, 1 August is the likely date that we will publish the policy, the

---

finalized one, and announce the policy effective date for the 1 February 2018.

I have a question from Chuck. Go ahead.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Dennis. I am curious why you say “publish the draft policy,” and “Implementation Review Team can’t change policy.” Are you meaning to say there the draft implementation plan for public comment?

DENNIS CHANG: For this, a good point, Chuck, and probably a confusion in the community, too. I will show you what I mean by the policy because what the Policy Implementation Team receives is the policy recommendation. We were chartered to develop with the IRT to develop and produce the exact language that will be adopted.

CHUCK GOMES: So, I don’t think we’re communicating well. The IRT cannot change the policy. The policy has already been approved. You said that yourself, so you can’t change that. So, aren’t you publishing an implementation plan for the policy rather than the

---

policy? I mean, it's okay to repeat the policy but the IRT has no authority at all to change the policy.

DENNIS CHANG: Absolutely agree. The policy implementation plan does not change any policies or enter into any new policies. What I meant to hear is the language that we will use for that policy.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Dennis. So, I would just suggest so that there is no confusion on that that you add publish draft implementation plan for public comment. Because we don't want to confuse people to think that they can comment on the policy. That already happened several years ago.

DENNIS CHANG: Fair point. Thank you.

So, these are the key deliverables for that milestone and I don't think I need to go over this. They're fairly obvious items.

We will go to the next page. Draft 6.4 and this is what we mean, and Chuck is referring to it as the implementation plan.

So, what the 6.4 version features is a scope clarification right at the beginning because there are so many confusion about what INGO activities are going on here. We have simplified it to only



---

two sections: Section 1 and 2. Section 1 being Red Cross, IOC and IGO because what we realize is that policy is the same for those three. And then, Section 2 for INGO.

And then, no identified list in the document, meaning we've removed all the names from the policy itself to create another list and independent list that we refer to so that in the future when the new names are added or deleted, that we do not have to go back and change the language in the policy.

So, let's bring up the – Aysegul, if you can bring up the policy or put... the 6.4.

So, while that's being done, the IRT members have received the document. Petter has raised his hand. Go ahead Petter.

PETTER RINDFORTH:

Thanks. Yeah, while we're waiting for the slides. I have a question on the remaining identifiers topic. I presume that the final group to decide on the second language is GAC but that still has to be based on what the IGOs – what they inform about, which is second language they use.

So, my question is, could the delay be the problem that some IGOs doesn't really have an official two languages? And if so, we will have to wait sometimes more for this to be completed. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Good point, Petter. The important point is the second language is optional. So, they may provide it or they may not. And, the policy doesn't necessarily say when we have to receive it either. The original list we got was I think all in English and you said we should get the second language so we requested it, we haven't received it.

My thinking is we keep going and they said originally they thought they could deliver it in October, so maybe we'll get it this year. And, if we do, then there shouldn't be any problem. And, they know that it's optional, too. So, I know that some of them have delivered it and they are organizing and collecting it. So, whatever list they have when they feel comfortable and [is enough], they'll provide it to us and we'll just add it to our list.

So, until the policy is effective or at least – this is an important point, Petter, and I don't know how you feel about this. When you go to Public Comment, is it important that we have the exact list of all the names including the second name, second language already available and published. Or, is it okay knowing that it may come later but the concept is that they couldn't have their second language, and we can still perform the public comment? What do you think?

---

PETTER RINDFORTH: Thanks. I think that with – I said [with] some other related working group sections, the time flies and we have to keep them on the timelines. So, actually, it's better to go out in Public Comments with the list we have. At least we have full list of the first language and as I understand that the remainder it's in English.

And, maybe also once it's out for Public Comments, that will be in extra pushback to those IGOs that have not come out with the second language. So, yes, go on. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: You have an opinion?

CHUCK GOMES: Sure. I agree with Petter that I think it's wise for you to recommend – I mean, to go ahead and proceed with the plan. I guess the question that comes up if they're commenting on an incomplete list doesn't have the optional languages is a second comment period needed for those ones that's available. And I know you didn't want to hear that but I have a suggestion as a way to handle that because I would react the same way if I was you.

You may want it in your request for public comments, ask people to comment on that issue on any incomplete items, do you

---

believe that or would you like to have the opportunity to comment on those once they're submitted? This is kind of a new situation for me too, so I may be way off pace. But that is going to be an issue.

Normally, we have a complete implementation plan. This is going to be an incomplete one. So, it throws a curve that none of you wanted. So, that's just an idea. One way of handling that is to address that noting that it's incomplete. They can't comment on that obviously, would they like to be able to comment on that in the future?

That doesn't hold up the rest of your implementation but it might mean depending on the comments you get back, maybe they don't care and if you get that back, you might be able to just go ahead and once you get the names, do it. But probably it would be a good idea. That's one approach. There may be better approaches on that.

DENNIS CHANG:

We'll hope we don't have to make that decision but we are waiting on GAC.

So, here is the language as we call it now then. We call it the IGO INGO Identifier Protection Policy. This is the title of the

---

document. Chuck, so now you see why I'm calling this the policy, draft policy. I hope that explains.

So the first paragraph –

CHUCK GOMES: Sorry, Dennis. So, is this the policy that was approved by the Board? Then it's not the policy.

DENNIS CHANG: So, if you see the Board approval, they come in a table format, I don't know if you recall. So that's what we got. So we have to turn that into languages such as this. So that's what we've done. So, if that's a policy and policy recommendation is the policy, then we can call this something else. But when we post this on our ICANN website, this is what we intend to call it, the title [wise]. Do you have a comment on that?

CHUCK GOMES: I'm a little confused. Is this perfectly consistent with the policy that was approved by the Board? And if it is, there's probably not an issue. It's just a matter of cleaning up the wording and so forth. If it changes anything in the approved policy, then the IRT can't do that.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Absolutely. Yeah. So, we're well aware of that, the Implementation Team is keenly aware of following exactly what was in the recommendations and IRT's job is to ensuring that the language is completely in alignment with the recommendation. Petter was a part of the working group too, right, PDP original?

CHUCK GOMES: Yes, as I recall.

DENNIS CHANG: You too guys. So, as I said, the first paragraph as you see, it starts right out with the paragraph that says that this is the policy recommendation adopted by ICANN Board on 30 April 2014, which were not inconsistent with GAC Advice. That's the first paragraph. That clarifies.

The second paragraph is the standard terminologies we adopted on all our policy work in terms of implementation, the definition of must and must not. We adopted the ITF standard. And the effective date here, let's see, 1 August 2017, we probably need to change that.

AYSEGUL TEKCE: It was an [inaudible].

---

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. But Red Cross, IOC, IGO full name. The Section 1 is the Red Cross, IOC, IGO. Let me just quickly show you the layout of the document first. Section 2 covers the INGO claims and then we're going to appendixes.

So, it's a rather simple document and, believe me, when we started, it was very complex and it took some effort by the Implementation Team – and especially we have to thank Caitlin who kind of joined us late who took a brand new look and realize that it was much more complicated than it needed to be. So, it's simplified here.

So basically, if you can follow along here, see if it does follow the recommendation. It spells out all new, all gTLD registry operator shall either withhold from registration or allocate to registry operator, the second level DNS label corresponding to all identifier recorded on the Red Cross, IOC, IGO identifier list volunteer. So then, we will go through the list where those identifier listed but that's all it says. Go ahead and reserve the second level. Done.

Now, what do we do with the existing registration? If the domain name containing a matching label from the Red Cross, IOC, IGO identifier list is registered before the label is added to the list,

---

the registry operator shall permit renew or transfer of the domain name.

Now, this is the kind of thing that is not in the recommendation and we had to work together to think about what was the intent.

CHUCK GOMES:

I totally agree with you. It's just important though when you go out for a public comment that commenters are informed that they're not commenting on the policy recommendations. They're commenting on the implementation that this group has put forward. That's just a critical difference.

Now, I'm fully aware that the policy was approved before the Policy and Implementation Working Group recommendations were approved by the Board. Now, that's not a consensus policy but those recommendations were approved by the Board and clearly define the role of the IRT and the fact that if there are any changes in the policy, it has to go back to the GNSO, and you are aware of that.

So, all I'm suggesting here, it's just really important that it's clear they're not commenting on the policy recommendations. It's on the implementation plan including what you just said where you had to fill in some blanks like that. That's all I'm saying.



---

DENNIS CHANG: Absolutely agree.

So then, if a domain name containing a matching label is registered before the label is added to the list and it's subsequently deleted, then the registry shall without the domain name from the registration.

PETTER RINDFORTH: [Great].

DENNIS CHANG: Petter, did you want to speak?

So, when this policy gets effective if somebody already has a name, we felt it's unfair to take it away. But if they drop it, then we are going to require the registry operator to reserve it and not reissue it. I think that's fair, right? So that's the implementation –

CHUCK GOMES: And Dennis, there's precedent for that. We've had to do that in other situation with regard to Reserved Names and so forth. So, I think what you're saying there is very consistent with what has been done over the years with these kind of situations.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, Chuck. When we were working on this implementation, we did look at the current Reserved Name the way it's processed and the Trademark Clearinghouse, the way that's processed, so we adopted the same language and literally copy some of the words.

So then, if you are the Red Cross and IOC, IGO, then you may of course have a name. Now, this is where we need registry and registrars to maybe provide some input. My intention here is to say that registry operator and registrars must provide a method for registration of the Reserved Name by Red Cross, IOC and IGO organization and just leave it at that.

But I've heard some suggestions that maybe we should provide more details but my personal feeling is it's their business and I don't know whether we actually need to provide more details. So any inputs or any suggestions in this?

CHUCK GOMES: Sorry. I apologize for talking so much but why would you require that the registry and registrar provide the method? They have a requirement to fulfill. Isn't that sufficient? How they do it?

DENNIS CHANG: You're right. We initially didn't even that sentence but one of the team members pointed out it would be nice if we actually said

---

registry and registrar must do this, so it gets their attention that there's action for them. So, that's why we put it in.

Go ahead, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: So, it's probably okay to say something some kind of mechanisms and not specify that the registry somehow needs to see even if it's manually allow it but may not be appropriate the registrar level because not every registrar might want to deal with these customers, right? So, by saying that, you mean every registrars needs to have some way to register Red Cross and I don't think that that makes sense.

CHUCK GOMES: And to follow-up with Edmon, registries are going to have to flow down the requirement to registrars, so I think that's consistent with what you're saying there. So, they're going to have to modify their Registry-Registrar Agreement to add these requirements and then that will be flowed down from the registry.

EDMON CHUNG: But not every registrar needs to offer Red Cross for registration like this one says. So, I just want to clarify but every registry

---

needs to have some kind of mechanism but not every registrar needs to support that mechanism because maybe the registrar doesn't want to take registrations from INGOs or IGOs. Not every registrar needs to do that I think. That's part of the policies. They can go to every registrar to get those names.

CHUCK GOMES:

Just following up a little bit further, you're right with regard to providing registrations but there's another requirement here. There's a requirement to prevent certain registrations. That would apply to all.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you. Good input. We'll take note of that.

Continuing, the change list, so inevitably, there's going to be some sort of a change then. Since the GAC was the original source of this list, we are looking to GAC and working with them on any changes. And this is very consistent with the current reserve system. If such event happens, that 10-calendar day notice from ICANN that is consistent with the current reserve list.

Next topic is the INGO claims service. So, this was a confusing point but when we distilled it down, it was rather simple. What we have is a very long list of over 3,000, almost 4,000 list. And, what we have to do is provide a claims notice service and it's

---

very much like the TMCH except that it's not trademark-based. It's INGO-based and the authority here is of course UNDESA ECOSOC list.

I'm happy to report that we have a good working relationship and I just received an updated list and I told them that I was [inaudible] and she was able to provide me with an updated list very quickly.

The unfortunate thing about the ECOSOC list that they have is that it does not adapt to exactly our policy requirement, meaning that we can only provide these services for full names on English names only but they're not able to provide us with that list. So what they have done is they've done their best to filter out as best they can and provided us a list, which includes non-English names.

So, what we have to do – do some filtering at ICANN, which we didn't want to do but we had to I think because there was no other option and we'll show you the list. And the first step in that list process was running a script, an automated process where we'd eliminate anything that is recognized by computer as non-ASCII characters, so that was quick.

And we have Eduardo here, the engineer who wrote the script and run it for us, so thanks to Eduardo. Take your bow.

---

And the second process that we had to do is unfortunately the script is not smart enough to recognize a foreign language if it happens to be all in ASCII. Like Spanish, if it doesn't have an accent, the computer doesn't know. So then, we have to go to a manual process and we have [Shay] back at the office in LA who went through painstakingly over 4,000 list and deleted the non-English names. What I'll show you is the result of that effort.

The acronym I think is going to work out well. And then, there are some interesting points that I will show you later and it's kind of interesting. Anyway, let's continue with the policy language.

The scope-wise, as I said, is the ECOSOC list and it's an INGO identifier list, it's what we call it and it's on the same IRT wiki page. Now, this is all public right now. This document and the IRT is on the IRT wiki, and the list that I'm talking about is also on the IRT wiki page.

The 90-day claims notice service is [worse] much like what you would expect that when someone who wants to register, registrar must clearly and conspicuously display the claims notice, and this is where the registrar has an action. And then, when it guest register, the INGO is notified. Now, it doesn't stop anyone from registry. That's an important point.

Next, let's see...

---

So, the registrar notification and notification of the registered name to INGO, these two paragraphs have been there before. There was no change there. And the identifier list change as I said, we work with the UNDESA and we get their updates. And once we do, it will update our list and lets you know, and everybody who are affected has to adopt to the new list within 10 calendar days.

Now, these are appendixes on IGO claims notice and it's a template, and we are going to look for comments during public comment. This is the DNS label conversion rule, which is the same rule that we have used before. There is nothing different there and we have some background information here.

So, can you show your screen now with the IRT?

AYSEGUL TEKCE: [Inaudible]?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. So, what we're going to do is share a screen of the IRT wiki page and we try to download it as a PDF. It just didn't work. It's a very long list because of the INGO. And, we haven't yet determined exactly how we're going to treat it at the end but it was important for IRT to be able to view at least the content of

---

the list right away so they can familiarize with themselves and make sure they were on the right path.

CHUCK GOMES: Dennis, while we're waiting for that. I assume that ultimately in implementation, registries and registrars would be provided a machine readable version of this so that it's easy to implement it in their systems.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?

CHUCK GOMES: Sure. So, I understand the limitations of us looking at the list and the IRT and so forth is important, if that is. But really important when registries and registrars implement the policy, they're going to need to need a machine readable list that they can do the blocking or whatever they need to do on their side. We can't be unreasonable to expect registries and registrars to have to take some PDF file and then implement it. That would be a cost thing that would impact all of them. That's all I'm asking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. So, the output from that we are generating for this list is just a CSV. First of all, CSV without the list of valid DNS labels



---

that could be reserved as domain name registrations. Does that make sense? If it's CSV, it can be processed in an automated fashion or included in their systems into whatever form of reservations that they have.

CHUCK GOMES:

I think so. I'm not a technical guy so you are. But obviously, registries and registrars, it's happened in other Reserved Names. They get something that's usable. They don't have to go. You don't want registries and registrars having to manipulate that list. That would present too many opportunities for error. They should have something that can be used directly in their systems. That's all I'm getting at.

And there's several reasons for that. Number one, it's a cost issue for registries and registrars but even more importantly I think is the chance for error. If you have each one of them, for example, [inaudible] to go through with what you guys are doing in terms of filtering and getting it down and everything, if you have 2,000 registrars having to do steps like that, the chances of errors would be really high, but that's all I'm getting.

I think you've answered my question. And of course, that's something that registries and registrars can comment on when you put it out for public comment. But you probably should be

---

clear in what they're going to get so that they can determine that.

DENNIS CHANG: Absolutely. We have registries representative on the IRT too and we're getting feedback from them.

AYSEGUL TEKCE: [Inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: So, we think that we're having a little difficulty of sharing screen but I should go put up the link for the community wiki page that has the list. If you are online, you should be able to see that.

AYSEGUL TEKCE: [Inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: No?

AYSEGUL TEKCE: [Inaudible].

---

DENNIS CHANG: Anyway, so let me just talk you through it, those of you who do not have it. Those of you who have laptops open, you can click on the link that Aysegul provided and you should see the list.

So, first list is the IOC list and you can see the list of identifier and DNS labels. It's pretty simple. And it is exactly to the policy that has full name, UN six plus German, Greek and Korean. And the second list is the Red Cross and this is full names and UN six languages, and you can see that there.

You want me to control it?

AYSEGUL TEKCE: You cannot control from here.

DENNIS CHANG: From here?

AYSEGUL TEKCE: Yeah. [Inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. So, what you see is DNS label 1 and DNS label 2. So the reason that you only see one DNS label for the Olympic is simply because it's one word. When the DNS label one and two comes in is when it's multiple words, the DNS label 1 deletes the space

---

in between and DNS label 2 has a hyphen. And, of course, IDNs and such.

And, in the IGO list, you see here. Right now, you only have one language complete list all the way down. I will show you – let's get to the INGO. Let's see. Can you get to the INGO through there?

AYSEGUL TEKCE:

Mm-hmm.

DENNIS CHANG:

INGO starts when you start seeing the status especially in general. So, one thing I want to point your attention to is this. Look at the item name, the third on the list. So, when this organization, [Club of Madrid], submitted their name, official name to UNDESA for the ECOSOC to get their special status granted, they entered their name like this: (com) and then [Club of Madrid].

Now, we are going to convert exactly that and treat that as a name even though the com may look like an acronym, we're going to treat the whole name as a name.

And there's an important principle here that I want to point out. What we are going to do at ICANN, as I said, is when we get the

---

list from UNDESA, we will have to delete some names if it's obviously a non-English names. But acronym-wise when it's embedded into the name like this, we are not going to touch it. We're going to use the whole name as is. So, there's no manipulation of the name itself. Does that make sense?

Just so that you know, AARP is not an acronym. ADJMDR is also not an acronym. It's actually a name. So we have asked the UNDESA to remove the acronym as best they can and they've tried to.

Any comments on this?

So what happened with a claims system is this whole list will be loaded to the claims system at a batch and the claims system will handle it from their end. It will likely to be refreshed once a year, which is the UNDESA process.

Questions? Anybody online, comments, questions?

Go ahead, Petter.

PETTER RINDFORTH:

Just going back to what we discussed in our past meetings but I presume that you by now have all the contact details, the official contact details to all these INGOs to be sure that you got the information from the right [parts], so to speak. Thanks.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Petter, for asking that question. And the answer is yes, we do. They have provided everything that we ask for.

If there is no more questions on the list, we can go back to the PowerPoint slide.

So, let's see. Next steps, so we're going to be working on the claims systems and we'll further define the update process and we'll finalize this document of any comments we receive from IRT. We have not received any comments but we did receive one today from Edmon, which we will incorporate. That's a good comment.

Next IRT Meeting, I'm thinking monthly calls, so we'll coordinate that and based on how it goes, we can make it more frequent and that's the IRT community wiki page link that Aysegul already provided.

That's it. Go ahead, Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: So, I just want to end by thanking the IRT for the great work and I know it hasn't been easy. But I'm very, very pleased with what you guys have done and thank you for it.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Chuck.

Any Other Business or comments before we close? If not, thank you very much and we will conclude this session.

AYSEGUL TEKCE: [Inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: I'm sorry.

AYSEGUL TEKCE: Petter is [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, Petter, go ahead. Petter, did you want to say something?

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yeah, I just wanted to add though that you have done a fantastic work with all these details and to come up with the support. So, thanks to you all.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Petter.

We will conclude this session. Thank you everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**