EN

KOBE – RSSAC Work Session (8 of 8)
Wednesday, March 13, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

FRED BAKER: … this morning. Do you think we're in a position to start discussing your edits? Andrew, you holed all that up, right?

ANDREW MCONACHIE: I did. I did start merging some of the edits, but I only really got through the first page.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

WES HARDAKER: I'll answer no. We had a really good discussion last night, but the reality is we sort of decided a path forward for how we want it to be structured and stuff. But we haven't fleshed out anything other than of creating an outline for how we thought it ought to be structured.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So in that case – Jeff?

JESS ORSBORN: Do you think it's even premature to just look at the list?

WES HARDAKER: [inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN: I'm just saying it is something. It's not nothing. It's not fleshed out, but if that part is missing something, it would be good to have it, don't you think? I'm not trying to put words in your mouth.

WES HARDAKER: No, no. That's a perfectly valid thing to do and a perfectly valid point. If we were going to be go over the paragraphs, Andrew, you shouldn't even be merging because you're wasting your time at the moment.

ANDREW MCONACHIE: That's fine. So the document that you were probably working on I put to View only. So I should probably put it back to Comments Allowed because I created a new one. So I haven't actually touched the one that you guys are probably looking at.

WES HARDAKER: Okay. Jeff, if you want to go over the list or we want to go over the list – the list really started from [Canton], right? You were the—

FRED BAKER: No one between you. Go for it.

WES HARDAKER: Then we edited it quite a bit.

FRED BAKER: So here's my thinking. If we agree on that much, if we add thing to it, then it sounds like, over the next few weeks, you guys can come up with something and maybe we can include that in the discussion in the workshop.

JEFF OSBORN: That was the hope as I understood it. This thing doesn't have a head, but that's what I understood.

FRED BAKER: Okay. You want to talk about your list?

JEFF OSBORN: Ken, if you don't mind doing it, you were the one who was actually writing it. It make more sense.

KEN RENARD: I'm just trying to pull it up, find it. Is that something that can be shared in the chat room?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just give us a second.

KEN RENARD: While that's being pulled up, what I was thinking is that approach was … This question came out of people looking at 037 once that's opened up to the public for comment. We stress that we want to keep the RSOs independent. Having some idea of what that means and why is the reason for having this document. There's lots of good history and some ideas here, but processing just a list – "These are the ways we're independent and these are some ways we're not independent," and then a discussion of what it means and why and why it's important to maintain going forward.

So the list is, I think, in Section 3.2.

3.2.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What [color] [inaudible]?

KEN RENARD: Yeah. Where it starts to get ugly … Yeah, here we go. So roughly the major factors of independence, autonomy, and diversity – the bulleted list – the financial, organization, design, independence – there's a few more – operational independence, technical parameters. The idea here is these are the main things, what they mean, some explanation behind it. But each of these bullets here would be fleshed out more deeply and put into eloquent prose, like Jeff was doing, to more fully explain. So we'll just volunteers to pick a bullet and go turn it into something more eloquent.

But if we want to go through the top of this list and just say what we were thinking of – so financially independent. You can read the bullets there. Why this should continue. Yeah, we can look at PSINet as the precedent there for, "Here's a case where we had it, it worked, and we survived."

Organizational independence. Organizationally independent from each other as well as from ICANN, with the exception—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KEN RENARD: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KEN RENARD: Okay. The organizational independence, the existing different government and legal jurisdictions, and our different motivations. Our main motivation is to serve the root, but our organizations have research, academics, commercial companies. These how we're independent and also why: why it's important, why it's important to keep forward.

Maybe the best thing is to just read through some of the bullets and ask us what the heck we're thinking and give other ideas.

FRED BAKER: Well, now that Liman has walked in the room, let me ask the question that Patrik Faltstrom brought up to me yesterday, which said the European Union and specifically Sweden are apparently interesting from a jurisdictional perspective. So I see here "exist in diverse jurisdictions." Are there issues? I don't know the details or the issues that we was trying to raise. But are there issues in that diverse jurisdictions that are a problem in Europe?

[Daniel?]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was just going to ask for a bit more context.

FRED BAKER: What, just because you walk in the room when I started to talking to you?

Oh, okay. Well, literally we were talking about the [stuff] yesterday, and as he was on his way out the door, he stopped and he said, "Oh, by the way, in Sweden we have a regulator and we have to do something with the regulator." Somehow that affected the relationship with ICANN and the relationship with the other RSOs.

[LARS-JOHAN LIMAN]: [What?]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: Well, okay. It's not a fair questions. If you can't figure out what he was thinking of—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, I think it's a fair question, but I think it really highlights why we need to have then jurisdictional diversity; so that, when you do have a situation like that where there is governmental

oversight over the company that happens to be an RSO in that country or based in that country, we don't all fall into the same bucket. So what might impact Netnod should not impact ICANN, should not impact ISI, and so on. So that's inherently a feature of the mechanism.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: What he might have been referring to is the European Union and the security-of-infrastructure directives coming from there, which don't collide but interact with the national law regarding electronic communication. It puts Netnod in the situation that we have to report major incidents. There are requirements in both of these to report major incidents, but there there are different bases and foundations for these. So we're in a tricky situation that we have to choose whom to report to. In our case, we haven't chosen to report to the Swedish regulator actually that regulation is better in this specific case.

But the thing I didn't catch onto was how that would affect our relationships with the other root server operators that [inaudible]. So I think we should invite Patrik to actually explain what he was thinking.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Well, I did, but whatever.

[ANDREW MCONACHIE]:   Oh, I'll just point out that Patrik just sent a mail on this yesterday to the RSSAC at 11:30 A.M.

BRAD VERD: Terry, your comment on the jurisdictional diversity – I think that was the term you used … How does that fit into RSO independence? I think diversity and RSO independence are two different things. I think the nature of RSO independence leads to diversity and has led to diversity. But I'm not sure that jurisdictional – I forget the term you used – is a part of RSO independence. Maybe I'm thinking about it wrong. I'm just thinking through the different pieces of it.

[TERRY MANDERSON]:   Still thinking.

BRAD VERD: Yes.

WES HARDAKER: I can try.

BRAD VERD:	And if it's a requirement, than that's something different than what we're doing here, right? Maybe it's a future requirement. I don't know.

WES HARDARKER:	There's two aspects, right? There's what we have been in the past and what we think is important to keep in the future. We tried to come up with the ways that are true in the past that we want to keep in the future.

So right now, RSOs exist under different jurisdictions. We are independent in that way, and we believe it's important that we keep that going into the future in order to prevent capture, prevent influence, by a single government organization finance source or whatever.

Jurisdiction falls into that, too, so that one – and jurisdiction pretty much is always government related – cannot control the entire system and make a chance laterally because it's impossible.

BRAD VERD:	I understand. I just think that the way you think about this can be – again, to me you're defining a requirement on the system which should be jurisdictional independence, which so far has been a by-product of RSO independence. It's not to say that Netnod

could be acquired, WIDE could be acquired. I'm not saying that somebody could go out and just – that's not something that would happen. I'm just saying that, as a crazy scenario, it could go under one government, right? But if that's a requirement, then we should state that somewhere. I don't know if it's a requirement here. That's all I'm trying to understand. And if it is, I'm trying to understand how it fits in. That's all.

WES HARDAKER: It sounds like there's somewhat of a slight disconnect between the framing of the document, fundamentally. Maybe we should go back to the beginning to figure out –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

WES HARDAKER: No, no, no. I mean back to the beginning to discuss what are we trying to document as independence. Are we trying to document … There's a huge number of things, I think, that is in this list and I believe will put into the document that are – I think the word you used was "perfect," which is it's a by-product, right? I would say there are technical diversities as a by-product. Nobody went out and said, "No, I need to be different from Brad. It happened." It happened.

That's still a feature of independence, I think.

BRAD VERD: Yes.

WES HARDAKER: So I think jurisdiction falls into that, too. We didn't plan it that way. Well, actually, [John] possibly did plan it that way.

BRAD VERD: Maybe he did.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: I guess scope the answer [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible], I have a question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So I think Suzanne and I are thinking in the same direction: independence from what? I think that's where it drives from. Are we independent from each other? Are we independent from

governments? Are we independent from ICANN? Are we independent from – insert whatever word you want to put there – after independence for X?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: First, I quickly read Patrik's e-mail and it was the thing that I tried to [inaudible] these two regulations. That's the thing that's in the mail, at least.

The second one is the independence. I believe that this document should focus on independence from ICANN because that's why we are writing this document, I think. I'm not sure. At least the main part. That's where the scales tip down for me.

Again, as I said yesterday, we must distinguish independence between the root server operators from independence from ICANN. These are two things.

You can contract with independent providers, and you can mandate that they should behave so that they are different and create diversity that way. But that's top-down diversity. What you gave examples of are of bottom-up diversity, which I think is better. But I think we should focus on independence from a single organization the single hub, the system.

But I'm open to discussion. I'm just putting chips on the table.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for your comments, Liman. So I'm on the opposite of the spectrum of painting an entire picture, showing autonomy, independence, and diversity, morphing them all together because of the fact that one leads to the other leads to the other. This paints the entire picture to show how RSOs are independent not only from ICANN but also amongst each other and so forth.

That's about it. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: I love this, by the way. I like it. Don't misinterpret what I'm messaging here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

BRAD VERD: But to me, I think putting it all on the fence and seeing on the wall what sticks – then I think it just naturally you start putting it in categories. May I make a suggestion? Maybe it's multiple different kinds of independence? So RSO independence is made up of X, Y, and Z, right? Which is technically jurisdictional independence. Then there's bullets under each of those that you can explain and make it up. I'm kind of just making this up as I go here.

Originally, my first point before I came up with that while I was waiting in the queue was – I'll channel Goran; he said it today in the meeting with the Board – that RSO independence was to basically put guardrails around the community in this 037 concept paper implementation to basically say this is out of scope of what you can touch and talk about. So maybe that helps frame the conversation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My understanding of this independence is very similar to Liman's, which is why the group of RSOs should have a kind of peer-to-peer structure and not have a central head that orchestrates all of them. So I think that's the main questions we should … and the comment from Goran is a good indicator to me that we really need to address that.

FRED BAKER:

So I stuck myself in the queue here. When I went through the different documents that we've written and different places that it talked about RSO independence, I can't say that any of them particularly talked about a country or a company or a something. It just said we need to be independent. So I would be surprised to find that it's specifically about independence from ICANN.

Not being controlled by a central whatever, ICANN being an example, I think is part of that, but it's not limited to that.

Okay. So Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes, I agree. It's part of it. But it is one part. And I think it's the hard point. That's why I wanted to say to focus on that.

I have also experimented with thinking about this as we list here a number of properties where we want to be diverse. One way of viewing this is, since we want to have diversity on this and this and this and this and this and this, the conclusion is that we have just written the definition of being independent. When you have ties, when you don't have diversity, that's when you start to create the dependence between things.

But when you have bottom-up diversity in all these fields, then more or less written that means that they have to be independent.

[SUZANNE WOOLF]: I think my head just exploded because I understand what you're saying but there are a lot of sense in which diversity is just a diversity of failure modes and dependencies and limits to independence.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Now my head exploded.

[SUZANNE WOOLF]: Right. So I'm going to go back quietly. Carry on. I will try to think of an example that will clarify that I mean because I see where you want to go and I'm trying to support you going there and not somewhere else.

FRED BAKER: Well, I think my sense at the moment is I just wanted to take a brief opportunity to see what page we were on and hopefully get on a similar page.

You guys tell me that you got a lot more work you want to do, and that's fine. So let's—

BRAD VERD: [inaudible] before we close it?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

BRAD VERD: Sorry. Before you close it, since we talked about the things we're independent on, can you scroll down? This is interesting. I think maybe we should discuss, maybe just spend five minutes on the things that we're not independent on. I thought that was an interesting thing in the document.

                          So can you guy give us what the conversation was and how you got here?

[WES HARDAKER]:   Most of these things should be pretty obvious but they're worth stating. But we're not serving independent zone data or doing different protocols. We have the same goal of providing a root zone. Just looking at 037 and the executive summary, the eleven principles, RSOs will remain independent. If the community is going to get feedback on 037 or the concept paper, they're going to read that and what does independence mean? What does it not mean?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: To add to that and build on it just a little bit, it's really making sure that someone doesn't come along and say, "Oh, you're independent. That means you can go and do what you like to the entire root server system. So—

BRAD VERD: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You got it? Yeah.

BRAD VERD: I totally get it. I think it's really valuable. I think in a document like this we need to be cautious to not imply that we've iterated everything. Does that make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. I understand.

BRAD VERD: But again, I think this is really valuable.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think it's worth pointing those out. Maybe as you say, don't enumerate everything but highlight that these are some situations and these are in place for the root server system.

BRAD VERD: I don't know who's typing, but on the last one, somebody's typing, "Keep design and implementation choices private." I don't know if I'd use the word "private."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: Yeah, no. I think I know what you're trying to say there but … I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So I added that. I was getting at the operators' desire to share their design choices with each other so that we know so we don't—

BRAD VERD: Get [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: To me, keeping design and implementation choice closed is something that is up to each RSO. If they want to share it, they can share. But it's not something we require them to share. That's at least what I understand.

What I think in the text – what I'm reading seems to be the opposite.

BRAD VERD: I think what we're suffering here from is I think we all understand the intent but it's the choice of words that maybe we just need to work on. That's all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Yeah].

FRED BAKER: Yeah. I think the problem here is we're trying to state it in the negative.

BRAD VERD: Right.

FRED BAKER: What we're trying to state is actually a positive statement that we want to have diverse design choices.

So okay. Let's close this subject for now. I'll let you guys continue doing what you do. You wanted to go into, or we wanted to go into, the workshop planning.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

FRED BAKER: What do we need to discuss there?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So the workshop the 23rd to the 25th. We are expecting 32 participants, so we have all the RSOs represented and all the liaisons are attending. Four Caucus members and five staff. So that's high-level logistics.

One thing is, perhaps from –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm sorry?

BRAD VERD: Oh, sorry. I just wanted to [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh.[I don't know what I did with that]. So [for this], usually a Monday. The workshop is Tuesday through Thursday, but usually on Monday evenings there is a welcome reception. On Tuesdays for the last workshop, ICANN holds the dinner. Wednesday is the – I don't know if Versign is hosting the dinner.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Verisign is hosting the dinner. It's all set up. It's at Morton's within Reston Town Center.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So that's the logistics. In terms of the agenda planning, there's a plan in place for a formal RSSAC meeting on Thursday. That's

what we did last time as well. Obviously … I don't know. We're talking about the independence document. Perhaps there will be a portion of the agenda dedicated to that. And the RSS metrics. So those are the high-level parameters. But with the input from the RSSA, we can help build a more detailed schedule. So that's a high-level view [for it.]

Questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] Monday. Reston Town Center.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We have to—

BRAD VERD: The schedule will come out at a later date. How about that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right now it's just that the buckets have to – sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: It's a month way. I couldn't tell you the exact time right now. I think, again, just to talk through the workshop and to say it again, this is not mean to happen in place of the Metrics Work Party. I think all the work that happens around the metrics topic would be fed into the work party at the conclusion of the workshop. It would be up to them to choose what to do with it as they see fit.

But I think there's certainly an amount of time that we will talk about measurements, the discussion that's started. What to measure. I think there is another part that we need to spend time on, which maybe is a larger portion of what the thresholds are for those types of measurements.

I'm not sure we spend a lot of time on – well, actually, let me rephrase that. I think there's probably another section that we could talk about on how to measure. But I don't want to engineer a solution, if that makes sense. That's where my hesitation comes in because we tend to engineer.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD:	So I see those three big categories for the metrics. If I'm missing one, please let us know. And then I think that we probably need two sessions for RSO independence. What I mean by that is we probably open, depending on where the document is, with a session on RSO independence, and then we close with a session of RSO independence to finalize the document.
	Then are we having our meeting at the workshop? Our official meeting? We've done that last time.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Yeah. That's what we did last time.
BRAD VERD:	So we close the meeting with the formal RSSAC meeting and then maybe it's then we approve on the RSO document, should we reach that point. That's all speculation right now. So those are five big-time sessions that I can think of.
	Is there something else that we should put on there? Because I know for the – I don't know – six months, I keep hearing, "Oh, we should take about that at the workshop." So what else?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	So from earlier this week, I remember Wes mentioned about maybe – and this may have come and gone already – old news about a list of what 037 may be missing. But we may be well past that point already. So that's cool.
BRAD VERD:	We could certainly do a time slot on 037 updates and 037 thoughts and run through – maybe I wouldn't say what 037 is missing but maybe there are things that we've thought of since 037 to say, "These things through the process need to be addressed." Right?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Sorry. So since the root ops is coming up at Prague, what I was thinking about was, because we were discussing about RSO communication with IANA and ICANN, if there was anything limiting at the root ops discussion in Prague, if there's anything that maybe RSSAC can move forward with that discussion. Just thinking from discussions this week.
BRAD VERD:	Certainly. The [challenge is to have theirs.] IANA is not there. So that becomes a bit of a challenge, having to complete the discussion. I think you could put together a request and provide

that to IANA. But then there's time for them to ruminate on it and go through it. But, yeah, we can certainly add that.

Anything else?

Steve?

STEVE: I remember there was a mention in passing to talk about the Empowered Community and how [that would work] to have Mary Wong from policy staff to give a tutorial. So I don't know if that's still relevant.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. So I've shared these thoughts with the Admin Committee. I've talked in here a number of times about it. I think it was in Dubai that we had ICANN staff come in and give us a tutorial on the Empowered Community and how that worked. I think maybe we want to do that again so that we can understand, if RSSAC were to evolve, what are the options it could evolve to and what does that really mean so that we can have a good conversation about that type of thing. I think that's worth looking into. Certainly talk about it. I don't know if we could have that as part of the workshop as far as a tutorial, but maybe. We'll talk to staff about that. That's a great idea.

Any objection to that? I assume not, but I – all right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just have a question about the independence document. By the time we get to the workshop, which is about a month, are expecting to be almost final? Still ongoing work? What's your plan for driving that? Because I'm trying to anticipate the level [of effort] at the workshop.

WES HARDAKER: Why does everybody keep looking at me? We didn't actually select the leadership—

BRAD VERD: Because you look so good.

FRED BAKER: Everybody look at Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Now you're just lying. I think our goal was – what we stated the other day was still true, if I can speak for the group without a leader, that we'd hoped to have it mostly done. So I would hope that, at the workshop, we would see that we were on target and could do the wordsmithing and stuff.

I believe that we should circulate it through – as we tinker with it, at some point it will come to a stable point where we need feedback. That's got to go to the RSSAC list long before the workshop to get—

BRAD VERD: Do we want to talk about a timeline right now and try to – what I mean by that is just a timeline to where admin can hold the group accountable and then say, "Okay" – kind of back into it. If we're not going to follow our seven-day guideline because I assume there'll probably be some edits within the workshop—

WES HARDAKER: What's the—

BRAD VERD: Yeah, it is a guideline. I actually appreciated that clarification this week. Do we have a status of what membership we're going to have at the workshop. Is it going to be a full house?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just mentioned … yeah, we have 32 participants.

BRAD VERD: But is every RSO represented?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, all RSOs are represented. All the [ASOs] are coming.

WES HARDAKER: Okay. So I think that that nullifies the seven-day thing to a large extent, right?

BRAD VERD: But I think it would be nice to have some checkpoints between now and then where we're coming from Admin saying, "Hey, guys. This is what's going on within the document. Please review it. We're making progress. Please provide input," so that people with a pen can be making their edits so we can limit the surprises when we walk in the room together in Virginia.

Is that reasonable? So if – I like looking …

WES HARDAKER: Jeff's down there.

BRAD VERD: If everybody is okay with that, then we'll take that as an action item. We'll send out, if not weekly, bi-weekly notifications to the list to remind everybody to spend time on this. So can we make note of that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Sure we can.]. So, just to confirm, is the plan to approve that document at the RSSAC meeting at the workshop?

BRAD VERD: Yes. That's what I stated earlier. That is the goal. It doesn't mean we will achieve it, but that is the goal. I've said it here numerous times. You've said it now once. Nobody has objected. Everybody says it looks like it's attainable.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So if we're talking about what we would like to discuss during the workshop, is the hyperlocal going to be one of the topics we're going to discuss?

BRAD VERD: No, it wasn't going to be. If the team wants it to or thinks that's the right venue, I think there are other priorities we have over that discussion.

I know that – and you guys all saw – SSAC is working on a document around that. I know that we've asked – I don't see Russ here – Russ that we certainly want to have input to that document.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think we have enough guidance to build the initial schedule [to be reviewed] by the Admin Committee and then for the full RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad agrees we're done. This is good.

Okay. So I'll give you another hour back. We do have a meeting – when is this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's a formal meeting.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. A formal meeting, and it's at 15:15. So 3:15.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. So 3:15 is the formal RSSAC meeting. In there, we will be approving a couple of things: the work plan … it was all in my head this morning. Minutes, obviously. There's the work plan and then the—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Triple Zero.

BRAD VERD: Triple Zero. Thank you. The procedures document.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: Right? Yes, right here. So please – 3:15 – be here for that meeting. The agenda has been sent out. My guess is that that will not be a long meeting. So please to try to show up early and not late. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: Please overcompensate because, again, we will be voting. So we want to make sure we have quorum.

WES HARDAKER: Just for the record, if anybody is bored, the KSK rollover future plan stuff is going to happen right now in the DNSSEC Workshop [2]. So it's 15 minutes to get over there and 15 to get back. It's a ways away.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. It's over in the [Kick] building, which is through the main lobby, out the walkways, around the corner, down the stairs, around another corner, and—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: Thank you, all. We are adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]