
KOBE – At-Large: Understanding Compliance in ICANN
Wednesday, March 13, 2019 – 10:30 to 11:15 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

YESIM NAZLAR: Hello. Welcome all. My name is Yesim Nazlar. Before we start our next session, I would like to do a couple of reminders as usual. As we all know, we have English, French, and Spanish interpretation provided for this session. So when speaking, please don't forget to state your names before speaking. Also please don't forget to speak at a reasonable speed so our interpreters can follow you easily. And also when you would like to stand in the queue, please do use your tent cards, put them up on the table like this so we can note your names in the queue. This is what I have as reminders, so I would like to leave the floor back to you, John. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. Thank you, Yesim. Thank you, everyone, for coming to this session of the At-Large Working Group and today we're talking about compliance with Jamie Hedlund, Senior VP of Contractual Compliance & Consumer Safeguards with ICANN org. The reason for this session – I'll remind everyone this is a shorter session, it's 45 minutes. So for

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.

questions later on, we will be operating under a two-minute timer.

In At-Large, we have a lot of questions from end users about like how compliance work, and we heard from Brian Gutterman yesterday regarding complaints and how that works and I thought that bringing Jamie in to get a better sense of how ICANN org actually acts to work with Compliance and force compliance and work with the complaints that come in, would be a great idea. So, with that I'm going to hand things over to Jamie and he can take the show from here. Thank you.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, John, and thank you for having us at this session. I hope it will be an interactive session and folks will stop us along the way with any questions. I just thought it might be helpful to start off with a sort of philosophical approach for how we see Contractual Compliance. As everyone knows, the ICANN multistakeholder model results in bottom-up policy development and we also have contractual agreements with domain name registries and registrars and a lot of those agreements actually incorporate the policies developed by the community. As part of the implementation of those policies, Contractual Compliance plays an important role. We help ensure that these policies and the obligations that are targeted at preserving and securing the

DNS and Internet’s unique identifiers, that they are adhered to. If we don’t do that then the multistakeholder model and its legitimacy and credibility sort of falls away because it would mean that the community can go to great lengths to adopt recommendations that the board adopts and directs ICANN to implement, and then at the end of the day we don’t enforce them.

So, we see our role as a crucial one where we can, as Roger will go through shortly, we’re not the sheriff in the Old West. We want folks to comply and we will collaborate and try to focus on those issues that are of greatest importance. But at the end of the day, the remedies under the contracts include suspension and termination of the agreements which are obviously a rather extreme measure and something we try to avoid where possible.

So with that, I will turn it over to Roger who I think will go through a little bit more of what we do on a day-to-day basis. We’ll run through some scenarios that we run into and then we’ll talk at the end finally about some of the reporting that we post publicly. Thanks.

ROGER LIM:

Thank you, Jamie. My name is Roger Lim, based in the ICANN Singapore office. It’s a pleasure to be with you here today. Jamie asked me to share a bit more about what Compliance does on

the daily basis and share maybe about our process that we work with so that everybody here can understand us, what we do better. And also, share some common scenarios that we see from our complaints so that people here can also understand what we are seeing on a daily basis. Sometimes we do get misconceptions about what we can or cannot do, so I think it'd be good to share some of that.

At the end of that we will also share some of the reporting that we do. Some of it might be dashboard and things like that so that people know what to look for as well as where to look for them, the information that we have. We do publish a lot of information, so I think it'd be useful to have some of that as well. If you could go to the next slide please? Thank you.

This slide basically shows our compliance process. It's a bit small, I apologize for that, but it's basically what we do on a daily basis when we do receive complaints. I wanted to emphasize that we enforce the agreements with the registries and registrars that we have with them – the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and the Registry Agreement. These are the two main contracts that we have. We unfortunately do not have any jurisdiction over the country code TLDs which we do not have agreements with. And we're unable to resolve complaints that are outside of the Registry Agreement or the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. Okay.

Now, some of you may have heard of the Complaints Officer in ICANN and the Ombudsman. We are different departments and our roles do not overlap. So I just wanted to put some emphasis there so that people understand our role more clearly.

Just looking back at the slide that we have up here. If you look on the left, we have the word “intake” with an arrow there. That’s basically people going to the ICANN.org website and filing a complaint on one of our web forms. Our system will take the information collected in that complaint filing and create a ticket in our system. So at that point, our Compliance staff member will take that ticket and review it and then if it’s a valid complaint, we will process the complaint accordingly.

Okay, if you look on the left – it basically goes from left to right. On the left top corner you see Prevention, it’s our informal resolution process. If it’s a valid complaint, we’ll actually send the first notice or inquiry to the contracted party. That is done through e-mail via our complaint processing system. That goes out once we validated that it’s a valid complaint.

Now, if you look below, there is business days/turnaround time. So, it’s five business days in most cases unless it’s required by the contractor for different number of days. For example, the WHOIS inaccuracy complaints that we receive, those have a 15-business day turnaround, so you can see there’s a 5/15 there.

Now what happens if the registrar/registry does not respond within that five days? That’s basically where we move on to the second notice or inquiry. We will at that point send another e-mail which says second notice/or inquiry and we will also make a phone call to that contracted party. Basically, that is an opportunity for us to reach out to the contracted party to say, “Hey, have you received our second notice or inquiry? Have you seen any of them?” Because sometimes there maybe e-mail issues where they may not actually receive it, so we will actually ask that question. If they say, “Look, I’ve got e-mail issues this past week, can you please resend it?” so we’ll do that. It’s an opportunity for us to reach out and collaborate and to make sure that the contracted party actually knows that we are sending them complaint to review. So, that’s another five business days.

At the end of the five business days, if nothing happens or the contracted party still does not respond to us, we’ll actually send a third notice or inquiry. At that point, we will e-mail that, we will make the phone call again, and in addition we may actually send a fax if there is a fax number available. So basically we’re trying to exhaust all opportunities of collaboration and ensuring that they receive our compliance notices.

At the end of that, it’s basically another five days for them to respond. If they do not respond, we go into enforcement phase which is on the right side in the yellow arrow. So, we send a

breach notice. Now, the breach notice will be published on ICANN.org under the Compliance Notices page. That's public and it will stay there. It does not get removed. And that's 15 business days for the contracted party to respond to that breach notice.

After that there may be – possibly if the breach isn't [inaudible] there may be suspension, termination, non-renewal, but that's all in a case-by-case basis. That's basically our process on how we do complaint processing. Any questions?

JOHN LAPRISE:

Yeah. At this point, we'll take a pause and we'll take any questions from the floor. We'll be looking for cards. One question I have for the team is that when you look at all the complaints you receive, all the things that come into intake, can you assign a percentage to each of these groups? Like how many are resolved by first inquiry? How many are the remaining? How many go through? So, what does the funnel look like for –

ROGER LIM:

We actually publish that in our dashboard information, so later we can send – I'll show you guys the link to where all the information. It's summarized but we basically show how many are received, how many closed at first, how many are closed at second etc., etc.

JAMIE HEDLUND: And when we get to it, you'll see that the vast majority resolved I think with the first but definitely before going to breach. So there is 47,000 complaints generally and I think in a year and maybe 50 go to the enforcement phase.

JOHN LAPRISE: Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, John. This is Justine Chew for the record. I had two questions. One is administrative. The substantive question that I wanted to ask was, you've taken us through the steps how you deal with complaints. My question pertains to if you could tell us a little more about the proactive – this is reactive approach to complaints, so what I'm talking about is your audit. Can you tell us a bit about that please?

And the second administrative question is, I noticed that the slides are not on the ICANN schedule, so I was just wondering we would get a copy of it? Thank you.

ROGER LIM: I'll answer your second question. They will be published after the meeting.

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah. The slides are on the wiki.

JUSTINE CHEW: It's on the wiki but it's not on the public schedule.

ROGER LIM: For audit-wise, we have an Audit Team within the Compliance Team. So, they do conduct regular audits of the contracted parties as well. Currently we are undergoing a registry audit of over a thousand TLDs currently. That's in progress, scheduled to complete by June this year. After that, we are looking into another round of registrar audits but that's not been finalized yet. So, we do ask questions during audits that relate to the contracts. For example, currently the registry audits are focused on DNS abuse and how registries are monitoring and tracking and are they doing anything about these abusive domains that they may have? That's an example of one of the audits.

JOHN LAPRISE: Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I just quickly went through the website where you have the statistics published. So I just wanted to ask, do you do

any of these compliance? Because I saw that everything that has to do with compliance tracking has to do with not names. So do you do anything in terms of numbers as well?

ROGER LIM:

No. We do not process under IP addresses. Okay, if there aren't any more questions – but I just wanted to state one more thing before we move off this slide. I just wanted to clarify that once we receive complaints, if we are not clear what the complaint is about, we will follow up with the person filing the complaint before we process it because we do want to validate it and make sure that we understand the complaint thoroughly before we process it with the registrars or registries. That's something I wanted to share before we move off this slide. Okay. Next slide please.

I'm just going to go through a few common scenarios that we see in our daily processing. This was actually supposed to be a slide deck with – basically, I'm sharing all the answers already right now. The first scenario that we have is a kind of related to the Temporary Specification, which I'm sure most of you are familiar with right now.

Complaint #1. Basically, the complainant claims that telephone numbers in the public WHOIS information let's say for North American company, they're being redacted and the complaint is

saying they should be redacted. Basically, I wanted to ask if you think it's a compliance issue, not an issue, or it depends. But in this case, it's likely not a compliance issue because the Temporary Specification for gTLD registration data Appendix A Section 3 actually permits registrars that are not required to redact the information. They can do it optionally. If it's technically infeasible to treat data, that is required to be redacted differently. So that basically means sometimes technically it's difficult to separate the ones that need to be redacted. These are the ones that do not need to be redacted and this allows for them to do that because technically it's not possible for them.

Okay. That's one of the common ones that we see and sometimes we do have to educate some of the reporters who send in such complaints to us. So we do send some educational material to the reporters for such situations. Okay, next slide please.

This is a very common WHOIS inaccuracy complaint. The person filing the complaint says, "I e-mailed the registrant e-mail address and no one responded." We have to distinguish non-response and inaccuracy in this case because the e-mail address may be able to receive e-mails but there's no requirement for the registrant to reply to every e-mail that they receive. So, that's something that we do receive quite commonly as well because people do not receive ... If they receive a bounce back e-mail, for

example, yes, you can send that off to Compliance. We will take care of that. But if it's because there's no response, that doesn't mean that the e-mail address is inaccurate. So something to keep in mind.

JOHN LAPRISE: Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Just to quickly pick on that, what you just mentioned, what's the purpose of sending a complaint to an e-mail and not get any response? If there's no response to the registrant, I thought that should be a compliance issue.

ROGER LIM: If the e-mail does not work, you receive a bounce back. Say for example, your e-mail has been rejected then, yes, you can send a complaint to us. But if there's no bounce back then it does not necessarily mean that the e-mail address is failing, so that may not be grounds for a compliance action.

SEUN OJEDEJI: So what do you check in terms of compliance is just the delivery of the mail and not necessarily whether the registry is actually [inaudible] the registrants per se.

ROGER LIM: Yeah, because the e-mail address that's published could be a personal e-mail address and there's no requirement for registrant to say, "You have to respond to all e-mails that come into your mailbox." But if it fails then you receive a bounce back, and when you file the complaint to ICANN, we will ask you for evidence of the e-mail failing. You can provide that to us. We will review that and we will properly process that as a valid complaint but if you receive a bounce back e-mail from that e-mail address.

SEUN OJEDEJI: It sounds to me like you're not doing compliance. You actually are just checking accuracy of e-mail addresses. Am I correct?

JOHN LAPRISE: The folks over here can correct me. They're checking for compliance in terms of the contract but the fact that the registrar is not being a very good registrar in terms of serving its customers (the registrants) very well, I think that's beyond the scope of Contractual Compliance.

JAMIE HEDLUND: That’s right. We also don’t have authority over registrants. We don’t have an agreement with the registrants so we have no way of compelling a registrant to respond to an e-mail.

ROGER LIM: I just wanted to add that if you're trying to contact the registrar, for example, you're sending an abuse report to a registrar at the published abuse contact e-mail address, that’s a different story because there is a requirement to respond to that e-mail. So, in the WHOIS information for every domain name, there should be a registrar abuse contact e-mail address. Now, if you send an e-mail to that abuse report, for example, to that registrar contact and they do not respond then, yes, definitely send a complaint to ICANN. We will follow up with the registrar because that’s a different requirement in the RAA.

Thank you. Any other questions? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I’m not sure how old the slide deck is, but in light of the EPDP and of the redaction of the e-mail addresses, is this relevant?

ROGER LIM: As of now it still is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, it isn't because at the moment the Temporary Spec has actually taken everything out of the WHOIS so there's no e-mail addresses at the moment listed as far as I know.

ROGER LIM: The e-mail addresses are still there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Of registrants? I haven't seen them.

ROGER LIM: They can be proxy.

JENNIFER SCOTT: This is Jennifer Scott from Compliance. The Temporary Specification only requires redactions of certain information is subject to the General Data Protection Regulations. So for instance, the North American registrar who's got a North American registrant might not be redacting that information, and we are seeing quite a few registrars still in the space who are providing full WHOIS.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, John. Are you currently on the case of those that have redacted absolutely everything? Because there's quite a few registrars that have redacted everything, even the country doesn't exist. I mean it's just like stars basically, or redacted because of GDPR. Are you on their case? Are you just – at the moment it's like a gray area so you let them do as they wish?

JENNIFER SCOTT: Yeah. When the Temporary Specification first became effective on 25 May, we started reaching out in a holistic approach to registrars that we were getting complaints about or observing a non-compliance with the Specification on. Now that we're farther down the road and we've got the EPDP's recommendations, we're taking some time to align internally and make sure any enforcement efforts that we're doing makes sense in line with those recommendations.

ROGER LIM: Okay. Move on because we're running out of time. Next slide please.

This one is a question from a domain holder that says, "I want to transfer to a different web hosting company, and the web hosting company is not responding to me." So this would not be a compliance issue because we only work on the inter-registrar

transfer that's within the scope of the transfer policy. And non-contracted parties such as web hosting companies and some other service providers like e-mail, they're out of scope for us. I just wanted to clarify that because we do receive quite a few of such complaints as well. Next slide please.

The complainant's domain name registration was transferred to a different registrar after an unauthorized access to their control panel. Sometimes that's called hijacking. It may not be a compliance issue. So basically domain name hijacking and return of the domain name to a complainant is outside of our scope. What we will do is to review whether the transfer was actually conducted per the transfer policy and Temporary Specification because there are requirements on what a registrar must do when there's a transfer request. So we will make sure that the transfer is conducted accordingly during our investigations. So if you are saying, "Someone hijacked my e-mail," we can't really do much about that because that's more of a law enforcement issue. So I just wanted to inform on that because there's something else that we usually see. Next slide please.

Okay, this is regarding resellers. The domain name holder is trying to renew a domain name but the reseller is not responding. So this is likely to be a compliance issue. Registrars are accountable for their reseller's actions that are within scope

of the ICANN agreement. So in this case, this would be something that we can work with the person filing the complaint with and the registrar. Usually we try and ask, “Have you actually tried contacting the registrar as well?” because sometimes the registrants already know who the registrar is and they may actually get help directly from the registrar. So that’s something that we can help with registrants.

I’m going to the next slide which is actually on reporting. Sorry, the background is a bit gray and it’s a little bit hard to see because when we converted this to PDF, it changed the background color.

I’ve got three links here. One is the Performance Reports, one is the Other Reports and Blogs, and Compliance Outreach Activities. These are some of the things that we published and I wanted to run through some of the examples quickly with everyone here if you don’t mind. Next slide please.

Okay, if you go to the first link on that previous slide, this is what you will see. Basically, it’s a whole bunch of data that we published and we’ve got all kinds of information that we published. A lot of the data is a rolling 13-month period. Basically, right now it’s up to February 2018 data. We haven’t published March yet. We’ve got things like percentage of registrars with complaints, complaints per cycle, by region –

that’s something that John had asked earlier. We’ve also got informal complaints by region, for example, APAC region, North America region, how many complaints we received. We also published the information on the formal complaints that go into enforcement as well as by type and by region as well. I think we have one question.

JOHN LAPRISE: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Many of these metrics on the dashboard are interesting from an overall trend’s perspective and almost an academic interest about how things are going around the world, but are there any tools for someone to get a better understanding of which registrars they should do business with or which registries or issues associated with the domain that might affect an end user that’s a potential registrant that’s looking to decide whether to do business with a particular registrar or registry?

ROGER LIM: We talked about the enforcement that we do with registrars or registries that fail to come into compliance, and those that are breached are published on our enforcement page and everything is listed there. Basically, it does not come off that

page. Every registrar or registry that has been breached stays there permanently. The Breach Report stays there. So if anyone would be interested to say, “Are there bad actors?” – for lack of a better word – maybe they could check out this enforcement page. These are the ones that have been breached by ICANN Compliance before. Those would be opportunities for the registrant to just take a look at before they register their domains with a registrar.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry, just a quick follow-up. A lot of these are dealing with complaints. Is there any thought to publishing complaints by registry or registrar or anything like that? Because that process is somewhat opaque I guess in a way that you reach out as a result of the complaint, you get some response back. How do we get a sense about whether that response was a good one? Do you know what I mean? In terms of understanding prior to a breach which is a pretty significant thing, it feels like there’s still a lot of information that could be shared with the community.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Jonathan, that’s an excellent question. As you know, as Chair of the CCT Review Team, over the past several years Compliance has increased the amount of transparency around complaint handling and resolution, and that’s good. But historically, our

approach has been really aimed at encouraging compliance, encouraging collaboration so that we don't get to a breach thing and an issue was that maybe there is result sooner rather than later. The trade-off for that is confidentiality.

So the view traditionally has been that we keep that information confidential and so long as there's collaboration, there's actual effort to work on whatever issue there is. That's been a trade-off until today that has been sort of worthwhile or had been something that we thought internally is a legitimate one. Then we bring in transparency once it gets the enforcement provision. But I recognize that there are other views and that there could be added value to increasing transparency even at the informal stage but that's not our current practice.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Jamie. It's like YouTube had a lot of content that was infringing content – TV shows and things like that – and Google would regularly say, “Oh, thank you for the report. We'll make sure that's down within a week.” Of course, 95% of the viewership with that clip would happen within three days, right? It's that kind of thing. So that interactivity itself isn't necessarily the sign that you're looking for. That's all. I don't mean to get a big conversation going.

JAMIE HEDLUND: No, it's an excellent point.

JOHN LAPRISE: We have Bartlett and Mohamed in the queue. We have eight minutes left in the session so we're going to take these questions. I see now Olivier in the queue and Justine, so I think we're going to run that queue to its close and probably that will be the session unfortunately. We have a lot more to talk about but we're under a time constraint. So with that, Bartlett –

BARTLETT MORGAN: I'm just curious about the stats you mentioned and that you break it down by region. Is the dominant complaint or complaints pretty much the same throughout all the regions or does it vary?

ROGER LIM: Actually, if you could move down two slides for me? Next two slides, sorry. One more. Yeah.

This is basically our complaints by region. We basically track the number of complaints from the different regions around the world, numbers. We also have numbers closed before first notice all the way to volumes closed. So it's pretty detailed if you want to look at the numbers. It tracks all the time as well by month for

the last 13 months. Some of this stuff is there. The next slide if you don't mind please.

This actually shows the complaint type that we received. Predominantly you can see on the left in red, it's WHOIS inaccuracy. It's the majority of our complaints and you can see that it's about 50% plus of our complaints. It's just that one complaint type. So it's pretty general across the globe that that's the majority of the complaints. Does that answer your question?

BARTLETT MORGAN:

I was asking my question, the context of what we do here in the At-Large, end users and that kind of thing. We kind of do our work, outreach engagement and that kind of a thing based on different regions, so obviously if the kinds of complaints that are coming in and that kind of stuff were different then it allows us to have a more sophisticated nuance message per region. That's what I was trying to figure out if like abuse was dominant in Asia versus customer service in North America, that kind of a thing.

ROGER LIM:

I don't think we actually published that specifically by region at this point. I don't think so. Yeah.

JOHN LAPRISE: Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much. I think I misheard Jamie when you mentioned that there's no contract with the registrars because there's contract with the registrars.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I meant to say registrants.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. My ear is ... the fault on my side. I have two questions. One regarding the registrars – we have the compliance certificate, how regular you check the registrar's compliance? Is it like an annual process where you issue this compliance certificate to registrars? That's question number one.

The second question is regarding the statistics. When I look to the percentage of registrars with complaints by region and you look at Africa, the figures are misleading in a way. It says here 41% of the African registrars have complaints. When you look at the table, if you look at Morocco, there's two registrars there, they have only two complaints there. Actually they have almost 12 southern domain names in management. So that result is misleading because it gives the impression that [bell rings] ... I

think I'm done. You need to be careful in terms of how that is presented because when you look at the details, there's number of complaints compared to the registrar [inaudible].

ROGER LIM: Thank you for the comment.

JAMIE HEDLUND: We do try to show separately complaints/tickets by region. So North America gets 50% of the – I think 47,000 roughly – tickets. APAC region get 30%.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: North America in that [inaudible] 3% on total registrars. And here when you look –

JAMIE HEDLUND: When you look at the red –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're saying 40% of them are [inaudible].

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yeah.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Noted. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, John. Thanks for this presentation. I couldn't help noticing that the framework of the presentation itself is pretty much identical to the one that we saw in several ICANN meetings ago when Maguy Serad took us through the things. The numbers have changed. [Inaudible], thanks for updating them but the rest of it is pretty much the same as what we've had in the past.

What has changed though since this presentation was first put together and one of the big things is all the new gTLDs that have come out. Now, I was looking at Spamhaus, and you know there's a lot of tracking of all the rogue or sort of misuse of TLDs and so on. And the question I have here is how much of this are you tracking? Because when you have some of the new TLDs where 94% of the domains in that zone are rogue or spam or malware, etc., isn't there a problem with the registry itself?

JENNIFER SCOTT: There is a metric in the dashboard that breaks it down the number of complaints by new gTLDs versus legacy TLDs. I think we started reporting that probably about a year ago on that breakdown, so if you're interested in those numbers, they can be tracked on the dashboard.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But the tracking is one thing, the enforcement is another. Are you going to take these guys down? Are you going to close down these registries?

JAMIE HEDLUND: A couple of things. One, obviously there's a lot of interest in the community and focus on DNS infrastructure abuse. That was a focus of the CCT Review Team report. It's also the focus of OCTO and their work in the DAAR project (Domain Abuse Activity Report) and it is the focus of the ongoing registry audit which is like previous audits, it's focused on one specific issue, it's not on compliance and it's of all registries as well. We should complete that audit by June and have a report out on it and we we'll report on the results.

We'll caution though – the slide isn't in here – but the provisions we have to work with to take on whether it's DNS infrastructure abuse, other claims of abuse, the provisions under the Registry

Agreement as well as the Registrar Accreditation Agreement are not terribly strong from the perspective of giving us the ability to take affirmative action quickly. My hope was that from the audit, the outreach that we're doing, that folks will become more aware of that than they are. I understand the frustration but there's also a limitation on our ability [to act].

JOHN LAPRISE:

Justine, I'm going to have to hold your question or take it offline because we have a gap transition that I was made aware of and so we have taken that if that's okay. We have to transition to meet with the GAC at those points. My apologies to Justine. I will make sure that your question gets answered by Compliance.

I wish we had more time. I want to ask everyone to please thank Interpretation and Technical Services for their support of this meeting. I'll call this session adjourned. We are adjourning up to Ohwada B for the joint GAC-ALAC session. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you, everyone. The Joint GAC-ALAC session in Ohwada B so that is just opposite Registration 1 –

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]