GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. On today's ALAC Leadership Team Monthly Call on Wednesday 24th of September at 20:00 UTC we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Leon Sanchez, Alan Greenberg, Julie Hammer. Apologies noted from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche and Maureen Hilyard. Dev Anand Teelucksingh will be joining us in the next 30 to 45 minutes. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew and myself, Gisella Gruber.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Gisella. Have we missed anybody in the roll call? Hearing no one shout their name out, that's fine. Thank you. We'll go immediately to review the AIs from the ALT Meeting and from the ALAC Meeting. Since time is of the essence we'll try and do this quite fast. On the last ALT Meeting we still had three open AIs that are long-term. The first one is for Ariel to work with Dev and Olivier on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of At-Large AIs. That's ongoing.

The next one is for staff to monitor the use of additional languages over the course of a few months. That's also ongoing. The third one being the Speakers' Bureau – should the ALAC [ask 00:01:43] Speakers' Bureau list of potential speakers be expanded to include a database of well-known and vetted community experts, that would be able to address communities in their local language or local cultures, or by topic, rather

EN

than by having it restricted only currently to staff and Board Members. Olivier was to write a note to the Speakers' Bureau and push for a statement. I have sent a note to the Speakers' Bureau, copying At-Large staff. I have not received a response yet. That's also ongoing.

If I don't receive a response in the next 48 hours I shall be sending a reminder to the person that I've sent the note to. Further down the page on the newly assigned AIs, staff is to send another email to the At-Large community and ask Members to contribute questions to the ICANN 51 Q&A workspaces on the Wiki. The deadline is the 25th of September. We are somehow just a day away from this and we'll be looking at those questions in a moment. Then secondly, staff is to ask the ALT and gNSO Liaison candidates to respond on how they meet the requirements for their post. Has there been a response on this Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. All candidates have now posted their responses.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. We can proceed forward. Any comments or questions on the ALT AIs? None that I can see, so we can jump straight to the ALAC call AIs, which took place yesterday. The open AIs have the same two – for Ariel to work with Dev and Olivier on the At-Large AIs and for staff to monitor the additional languages. Thirdly, Olivier is to take up the issue of volunteer recognition and consideration with other SO and AC Chairs. I explained yesterday that I have done that, with little success for the time being – the attention of SO and AC Chairs being taken elsewhere.

The next one is for staff to investigate with web admin on when the ATLAS II website can be moved. Yesterday we explained that the website will be able to move to an ICANN site, but because ICANN does not run any WordPress website, the site will be static and will effectively therefore just be archived. Finally, Terri Agnew is to follow up on the missing reports from ATLAS II Working Group Chairs. I believe that's also ongoing. Terri, how is the progress on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe she's still on the Secretariat's call but I know that she followed up with all, and I think there are just one or two that are still remaining.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next, the newly assigned AIs are as follows: staff to update the ICANN 51 meeting page on Thursday, 16th of October and add the Agenda of the ccNSO meeting. I believe that was done. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, can you respond to that please?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, that's been completed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next, Olivier and Alan to follow up on the ALS certification vote transparency on the ALAC internal mailing list. I think we'll do that within the next week or so. The ATLAS II Implementation Team to

EN

provide the ICANN Board a three-page summary of post-ATLAS II activities as soon as possible. I have discussed this with staff, and I think if you're not part of the ATLAS II IT you will have seen that some emails have gone out to Chairs of Working Groups that have been allocated with tasks, to follow up on the ATLAS II.

I think that based on the response provided by those Working Group Chairs, I shall be writing a three-page summary. I think one of the pages will probably hold the table of recommendations to the Board with a status, and the other two pages will be explaining what our process is and what kind of a response we expect to be getting. Next, the ALAC is to prepare questions to be discussed with the GAC. We will be doing this in a moment.

I don't think I've seen any follow up from anyone on the ALAC for the GAC questions page, so I think it will be up to the ALT to decide on this. Finally, staff is to find out when the new GAC Leadership will be selected. Has this been found, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't believe so. Gisella, have you had a chance to do that through Julia by any chance? Otherwise I can follow up right now with Olaf.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can address that. The process is starting now, and the final vote for the Leadership will be taken in LA. There will be a new Chair likely coming out of that meeting. Heather's term officially goes to next year, but likely a new Chair will take effect almost immediately.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this update.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure. They may do a transition partway through the meeting. That's their call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. Thank you for this. These are the Action Items. Questions or comments on these AIs? Seeing no one put their hand up, let's move on then. We can go straight back to our Agenda. We'll have the items for discussion, the ALAC policy development activities, the statements of endorsement currently being developed – there are four of them. Enhancing ICANN accountability, 2.0. Alan Greenburg is considering drafting a statement.

You will have noticed that there was also a discussion on the ALAC mailing list that proposes that the ALAC, rather than writing its own statement, could be looking at the statement that was proposed by the Registry Stakeholder Group and sign up on that. I understand that other ACs and SOs and SGs and constituencies are also looking at that same statement and also considering signing up on it.   Are there any comments or thoughts one way or the other on this issue? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. As I noted in an email earlier today, which I think went to the ALAC working list, what we saw coming out of Istanbul with a

statement being signed by essentially all the ACs and SOs got a reaction from ICANN, which I have never in my eight years seen before. They immediately took action on part of it, which was opening the public comment, which they hadn't done until then. We then got a not particularly satisfactory by relatively detailed answer from Fadi.

Although we didn't like everything he said, he essentially said that this is in the community's hands and we need to tell him and ICANN what it is we want. The power of that statement that was submitted in Istanbul is unprecedented and I think we need to follow up on it the same way. As long as what's being proposed by the registries is pretty close to what we want to see – and I think the last version you distributed an hour or two ago was not particularly bad, but some of the issues that I and Raf had mentioned are no longer in that document – I think we need to look at it carefully.

If indeed there is anything we think needs to be changed, we need to say it really quickly. The power of supporting it I think is something we can't minimize, if we believe generally that that's the way to go. The first statement was somewhat rigid. This one is basically saying we think it should be a cross-community working group, but if you don't follow us then this is what you must do. I haven't read the ifs, buts and ands very thoroughly, but they look like they're pretty good, and I think we need to come to closure on that within hours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. I've not had the chance to study the statement in great detail, but having discussed it with other SO and AC Chairs, it is

well understood that certainly another joint statement from SOs, ACs, SGs, etcetera, would certainly have a much stronger impact than separate statement from the different parts of ICANN, and certainly would symbolically by very strong as well, as a follow up from the previous statement that was co-signed.

With regards to our process, as you know, for any statements that we have we need to have a five-day vote. Unfortunately, the closing date for comments is going to be this Saturday, 27th, so that gives us three days. In the past we have sent statements out pending ALAC ratification, and we could therefore engage the ratification after the statement is sent, providing we have a consensus on the ALAC mailing list.

If we were to engage down the road of co-signing this statement that was prepared by the Registry Stakeholders Group, then I would suggest putting out a consensus call within the next 48 hours, so on Thursday night UTC, a 24-hour consensus call and say, "Does anybody totally object to this being sent out?" At least we'll know what kind of support this statement would have. Let me reopen the floor. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: My answer to that would be we have in the past had situations where you have sent a letter in, on times where we simply haven't had chance to act fast enough. That's the nature of this. We're supposed to be a bottom-up process. There's no way we can be anywhere near bottom-up at the kind of timetable we're given for this kind of thing. If the other constituencies are capable of doing it, that's great, but let's not make

any pretense that anything that we can come up with… Considering the fact that as of this moment we have nothing on the table.

To go from that to something that could even resemble an ALAC statement between now and the deadline is just insane. The best I think we can do is suggest that perhaps you write a letter concurring personally, but based on conversations you've had with others with ALAC. That's probably the most truthful statement we can do at this point. I've got to tell you, the longer time goes on the less confidence I have even in the process that's being done.

We're looking at doing little checks and fixes here and there, and the more I look at it the more there's fundamental problems with the way this is being handled. ICANN should not be in charge of this process. I don't know how to mince words on that. ICANN is a stakeholder in this process and in its role right now it is acting as player referee and lead commissioner in this process. As a matter of public trust, this looks bad. As a matter of effective results, it looks worse. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Evan. Did you have a chance to read through the Registry Stakeholders Group statement?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I didn't see it. I saw the response. I didn't see their statement.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right.   I'll invite you to read through it and hopefully you can comment on it in the next 24 hours or so.   That would be really helpful.   Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. With regard to the last part of Evan's statement, the Registry Stakeholder Group statement [is exhausting 00:15:45].   This should be a cross-constituency effort.   Period.   You get out of it and we'll make recommendations for the Board. I think they are essentially saying what you're saying, but given that that may well not be accepted, given the short timeframe, and who knows what are the other issues that are relevant – they then say if you're going to go ahead with what you were planning, here's a whole bunch of other caveats.

With regard to the first part of what you said, I'll go further than that. Given my position this may sound self-serving, and I apologize. We have before given Olivier the right to speak on behalf of the ALAC, and Olivier I believe at this point should be saying, "Given the current direction of the Registry Stakeholder Group…" I believe that last version you distributed is the final one over the Registry Stakeholder Group, as they had both a .doc and a .pdf version of it, that given that what they're saying, is there anyone who has strong objection to the ALAC supporting this or something similar to it, and if so, giving Olivier the right to speak on our behalf.

Essentially, a consensus call asking if there's any dissent, and if there's no significant dissent – and one is not significant, based on our Rules of Procedure – then Olivier has the right to speak on our behalf, period.

We essentially gave him that right to do it at the Istanbul meeting, to sign the document. It was signed as the individuals but it effectively came from us. I think we can do this formally and do it quickly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to ask specifically, do you think that asking for an ALAC vote that starts after the deadline five-day ALAC vote is superfluous or impossible or…

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're asking me, I believe if we give you the right to speak on behalf of us, it's not necessary. It might be a nice touch, but it's not that you're speaking pending a vote, it's the vote simply ratifies… By the way, the Rules of Procedure do give the Chair and the ALT the right to act when timing is swift and get something ratified after the fact. I could dig out the exact wording of it, but there is wording to that effect.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Certainly we have ratified some statements after we have sent them, when time was an issue. It's not a new thing. Alan asked if there is a link to the Registry Stakeholder Group statement easily at hand to anyone. I sent it via email. I know that staff has been on back-to-back conference calls so I don't think they were able to put it anywhere on the Wiki or link it anywhere to the Wiki.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if you sent an email pointing to the email file in the mail and archive, we'll indirectly give them a point to the statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a very good Alan. Thank you. I could try and find this. Let's move on and we might come back to this in a second. The next one now is release of country and territory names within the .nustar TLD. We did send an email to the New gTLD Working Group and I haven't seen a reply on this. Evan, I know you're running that Working Group. Have you had a chance to have a look at it and find out whether there should be a statement on this or not?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: We basically issued a blanket statement and I think we've adopted a position that every time we have a response to an individual application like this, we basically send a letter saying, "Please refer to a previous statement."   We did a blanket one that unless there's something significantly different about a registry asking for two-character domain exemptions, that we basically have a blanket position about it. I don't think we have to revisit it each time, because essentially we carbon copy the original blanket statement and send it to all of these.

Given the other things that are on the plate of the Working Group right now, I think that as a procedural issue we should be able to say, "Please see this on the position we took on two-letter domains."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. We have done that for others, but this is a different one. This one asks for full country or territory names to be allowed at the second-level. For example, .canada.nustar or unitedstates.nustar or unitedkingdom.nustar or germany.nustar. That's what they're looking for – not the two-character domain names. The statement is potentially quite different. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I will address that particular question. I believe it's a completely reasonable thing to do. If a brand TLD wants to have its TLD usable by the rest of the world, it makes complete sense for the second-level to be the country that you're looking for information on. If I'm looking for IBM, canada.ibm is a reasonable URL for me to type in. I think it's a completely reasonable thing. I don't believe it differentiates from countries. Nustar in their application has said they had talked to the GAC and if any country objects to its use they're willing to engage in one-on-one and not deploy anything until that country agrees. I think it's a completely reasonable request. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, I didn't put my hand up in time, but to speed up – actually, it's even broader than that Alan. Even in generics, canada.com is not owned by any governmental agency or non-profit. Germany.com is privately owned. We already have precedence in the G space where country names are accepted by the public as not necessarily being representative of a government or official entity. I don't see any reasons

why the new TLDs have to go through a restriction that has not been applied to the legacies. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan, they need to go through it because it was agreed to, to launch the round. It may have been stupid but that's what we did.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So they agreed to it and now they're trying to get an exemption?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. ICANN and the GAC agreed to it, and it had a provision for brand TLDs to get exemptions.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Obviously I have a position of no restrictions, personally.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Evan. Do you wish to respond and propose this as first draft? We're looking here at not needing to draft more than a paragraph with about ten sentences that would explain this.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: My problem is I'm about to go offline for about four days. If it's something that needs to be done really quickly, you're not going to be able to count on me for that.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you ask someone on the New gTLD Working Group to volunteer to do it?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'll ask, but if nobody puts their hand up I'm still going to be out of touch for four days.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. That's okay. Ultimately, the deadline for this is the 10th of October and that's for the initial comment period. The reply period is 8th November, so there is some time to be able to draft something and send it out. It's to find out whether we should have no statement on this or have a statement, and judging from what you've mentioned there, there is an opinion you've expressed and you might wish to express this and see what the feedback is in At-Large.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. A statement is literally a one-liner, that is no objection to the use of country names.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Let's move on then. The next one is the Board Working Group Report on the NomCom. There was a discussion on this yesterday in the ALAC call. Eduardo Diaz was unfortunately not able to make the call but I pointed him to the recording of the call and he also

EN

enquired with a number of people. I can see 20 comments under his statement and a whole string of discussions. Alan, I know you've been quite involved with the discussions. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I put my hand up to go back to the previous issue, but I will comment very quickly on this one. There has been substantive comment. I find it very encouraging. People are making statements. Others are saying, "Hey, that's true, I'm changing my position." I've said that, but a number of other people have said that as well. Eduardo is tracking these things and I think we're in good shape on that one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. The deadline for comments is the 1st. We still have another week of potential comments. As you say, it's great to see activity on that. I know several Members of the NomCom have now been also commenting on this, so that's great. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: With regard to taking action on the accountability going forward, I put in the chat that what I'm suggesting is that the Chair ask for the agreement of the ALAC via essentially a consensus call, asking for any disagreement, to allow the Chair to speak on behalf of the ALAC in this regard, in the general direction of supporting the registry statement as it stands now or as it evolves over the next few days. We give you permission to do that. That's number one, what I'm suggesting.

If that is not done, there is a Rule, 5.11, that says the ALAC Chair may make substantive decisions on behalf of the ALAC, if the matter is of such urgency that the ALAC cannot practically be consulted. To the extent possible, this must be done in consultation with the ALT and any such decision must be reported to the ALAC without undue delay and then ratified with the ALAC as soon as possible. That's if you don't ask for permission to act on our behalf, which I would suggest you do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I've sent the draft to the ALAC mailing list three hours ago, at 17:48 UTC. Knowing that now it's 20:34 UTC. I've sent this out. What I will do tomorrow, leaving a little bit of time for ALAC Members to read this, I shall do exactly as you say and ask for a consensus call to allow me to make the decision in pressing forward with saying yes, and then probably launch a vote after the deadline, for next week.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest in that message you reference having discussed it with ALT. Sadly, most of the ALT is not here yet, but nevertheless.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Let's go for the last one on the list, and that's the PIC community input draft document from GAC Sub Group on Geographic Names. This is something that wasn't around yesterday. It's an email I've received today from GAC support. I'm not sure why it's not going through the official public comment system. It looks as though it may be an internal consultation, but the letter has effectively asked for SO, AC

EN

and SG Leaders to ask their groups about the plans of the GAC Sub Group on Geographic Names.

It's a Sub Group of the GAC Working Group on Future New gTLDs and it will be looking at several public policy aspects related to geographic names. It's currently seeking community input on the draft text. I must say, I received this about an hour ago so I haven't been able to read through it yet. I don't expect any of you to have been able to read through it yet. The question is, what kind of an answer should we provide to this? I guess it's a little premature for us to decide here. I just wanted to draw your attention to this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I haven't. I had to step away because my phone rang, so I don't even know what you're talking about. I just wanted to point out that if you're asking for agreement I'm not agreeing because I don't have a clue what you're asking about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm very disappointed that you don't agree on something that you're not aware of. That's really terrible. It's to do with a draft document from the GAC Sub Group on Geographic Names. We've just received this. I'd like to draw your attention to it. We'll ask the New gTLD Working Group if a statement is necessary on this. We had a group on geographic names in the past and we're quite interested in all this aspect of geographical names. Was that a group that included Tijani Ben Jemaa, Fatima Cambronero, Sandra Hoferichter? I'm saying this from memory at the moment. Does anyone have an idea?

ALAN GREENBERG: I know Tijani was on it. I don't remember if Fatima was, but she could well have been.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Unfortunately Tijani has got a conference at the moment, so we're thin on this. We'll put this to the side. Have a read when you all have the time and come back to us on this. Finally, .C, the currently open public comment, but the ALAC is not going to respond to the proposed changes to gNSO Operating Procedures. We don't need to review again. Therefore we're now going to review the ALAC Monthly Call.

On this occasion, since I know several of us have to leave early, and we are not that many people on the call, I'm not going to go through each one of the sections. Are there any points you'd like to make on any of the discussions that we had yesterday? Any follow up points that you think we should pick up? I'm just reminding you the items for decision, where we had the policy development, and then we had the ALS accreditation voting.

Alan and I had to get back to the ALAC and decide on whether the ALS accreditation vote should be anonymous or should show how each ALAC Member voted. We might need to send out an email to the ALAC list to follow up on this and get the different points of view on the table. Then the review of At-Large meetings we're going to have a look at very quickly now. The update on the post-ATLAS II implementation activities.

EN

I think that there's been no movement since yesterday, so you've all heard what's going on.

Just one thing – yesterday night I did send out to all of the Chairs of the Working Groups, to whom those recommendations were addressed to by the ATLAS II IT. I sent an email out to them asking for a timeline on how long it would take for their Working Group to come back to the Implementation Team with their recommendations or their expanded recommendations. I have not had a response yet. It was late last night for me, and it's less than 24 hours ago, but I hope to be receiving the responses within the next 48 hours, I hope. Alan, and then Evan.

ALAN GREENBERG: The only thing I think we may want a little bit of follow up on is the IANA Cross-Community Working Group that we now have to select people for and that's who our formal five reps are, or whatever it is. I'm trying to remember, is that something you've asked the RALOs for already, or is that a different five people that you asked the RALOs for?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There are two cross-community working groups that we could be supplying people to. The one you're referring to is the IANA Stewardship Transition Cross-Community Working Group. The Charter was agreed by the ALAC and there were two amendments that were also agreed by the ALAC. It looks as though the amendment that the ALAC proposed is not likely to be taken up by the other SOs and ACs, because it arrived a bit too late. With regards to the composition of the membership of this Working Group, the ALAC was afforded five slots.

The process that the IANA Stewardship Transition Working Group pursued was to email the RALO Chairs, since the five slots were really there for us to provide a demographically diverse panel. I've therefore asked the RALO Chairs to select someone from the At-Large IANA Issues Working Group so that we've already got someone who is in the bath, who is in the know. I've now received the names of all the people selected by the different RALOs.

As far as NARALO is concerned, they will be coming back to us shortly. That's the only RALO who has not provided us with someone. As far as AFRALO is concerned, it's [Soon 00:37:33]. For EURALO it's myself. For LACRALO I believe it's Fatima Cambronero. For APRALO it would be… Staff, do you have that email at hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We'll look for that. Just a moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll find that out in a second. These are the current ones. [Soon] for AFRALO. Fouad Bajwa for APRALO. Myself for EURALO. Fatima Cambronero for LACRALO and unknown at the moment for NARALO. That's the overall list. Now, bearing in mind those people are going to be relaying with the work of the IANA Issues Working Group, the IANA Issues Working Group feeds on the one hand our two Members on the IANA Coordination Group – Mohamed El Bashir and Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

On the other side it will feed the people in the Cross-Community Working Group. We'll see, as time goes, how those people perform. One of the problems we have at the moment is the amount of workload, and I think that the more we can share the workload among many people the better it will be. I don't expect everybody's performance to be 120 per cent, like some people, but I have real concerns that those people that have their hands in so many in the Working Groups are feeling such strain at the moment that 110 per cent is not possible anymore, and you might end up at zero when people burn out. There's a concern on that.

Thank you. These are recommendations by the RALOs by the way. The process forward, as for any appointment in cross-community working groups is for the ALAC to agree to these people. The way it will work, as soon as we receive a response for NARALO, the way it will work is for the IANA Issues Working Group to publish that list, for it to send it to the ALAC, and for the ALAC to agree to it. I'm not sure whether we will need a vote or a consensus call on that. That's something that I leave you, Alan, to remind us, for such appointments, does it need a vote or is it a consensus call?

ALAN GREENBERG: Any appointments can be done by consensus call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thank you for this Alan. We'll probably do a consensus call on it. Let's go over to any other comments on the ALAC conference call? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You were saying that you were asking for reports of Committee Chairs about how they were going to react to the ATLAS Committee. I just wanted to ask, in terms of prioritization, I'm either Chair or Co Chair of both the gTLD and the FCWG, both of which have been involved at things that were discussed at ATLAS. Both of them have pretty full plates when it comes to things that are going to be discussed up to, and including, in LA. I'm asking you in terms of prioritization whether or not responding to the requests of the ATLAS group, is that a higher priority? How do you want me to treat them?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Those recommendations that you've received as Chair of the New gTLD Working Group and as Co Chair of the FCWG are recommendations that are aimed at the Board. The ATLAS II Declaration was sent to the Board and immediately the Board came back rather fast and said, "That's really great, we see all this great work, but the recommendations that you're sending for us to act on are mostly either generic or very wide in scope, and not very targeted."

Just telling the Board to do something, i.e. "do something" doesn't help. You have to tell them what it is you want them to do. Those recommendations need an expansion. They need to be maybe sometimes taken apart and put into their little components. A recommendation that says to the Board "do something" would be transformed into a recommendation that says, "Do this, this and that, agree to this and that, put together this and that."

EN

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I understand that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let me continue on this. Effectively, the ALAC is going to meet with the Board on the second day of the ICANN Meeting. The aim is to have one of two things ready for them by then. Either have a fully drawn-out set of recommendations for them – and I realize with only two weeks remaining that's going to be very hard to do so – or I think we might have some low-hanging fruit that we could put forward on their desk for them to start working on, and at the same time provide them with a status update on how we are detailing those other recommendations that will be coming to them very soon.

With regards to priority, this has the highest priority because we're dealing directly with the Board here. They seem to have the era open for us at the moment.   We definitely don't want to miss that opportunity.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. In other words, having seen what's already on our plate, which has to do with things like future gTLD rounds, things to do with ICANN accountability and other things that I already thought were pretty high on the list, you're now saying that these get bumped off, or down the line, for these groups that have to open up what the ATLAS group did and have to try and jig which of these can be massaged, in two weeks' time, for presentation to the Board. Is that what you're telling me?

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think you've got it Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry to have to say that, but it's unfortunately tight deadlines and certainly yes an added workload on this. I guess you're going to have to try and balance that out and maybe get share the workload on your Working Groups?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I'll simply make the comment that based on the way that it's operated to-date, FCWG does not react very well to "drop everything" requests.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for your thought. Unfortunately, this really is down to the success of the ATLAS II, so I guess it's going to have to do something and it's going to have to move. I know it's the wrong time because in two weeks' time people will be starting to work. Certainly on the accountability issues Evan, it's not as urgent as it was supposed to be to start with, because the process was just only starting and will probably just only start in LA.

I have a feeling that with all of the recommendations that have been allocated by the follow-up IT to the FCWG and also in addition to all of the other things that the FCWG is doing, you might wish to split your group into more than one team and get them to do things in parallel – not get everyone involved on one thing. This is really down to the management of the Working Group. With regards to the New gTLD Working Group, would it help if we try and ask to find a Co Chair for this? I can certainly feel that you have some strain in your voice regarding this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The strain is not just personal. I don't know if you remember, anyone here who attended the last New gTLD call, but I think we had four people in it. I don't know if a Co Chair is the answer. Delegating tasks, I'm not sure if it's the answer. Right now it's simply a matter of the resources going around and what people are capable of working on. I can ask the question, but based on the attendance at the last conference call, there's not too much load to be shared. I'll leave it at that. I'll ask the questions and see what comes back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Just one more thing – you have been put in touch with 150 ALSes a few months ago. It might be worth asking for help on their mailing list? I would probably do that. Say, "Look, we've got all these tasks in front of us, FCWG, please join us." I don't think you're going to get 150 answers but you might get three or four more people able to help out on this, and then you can delegate to the different people on

there. I know that Dev is in the chat now. Welcome Dev. Dev is in a more undesirable position.

I think he's Chairing three of the Working Groups. That's the reason why he's only now able to put a smiley on the chat. He's absolutely speechless for everyone else. It comes very late, but this request from the Board has also been quite insistent, and we have had the summer that spaced things out a bit. Hopefully, now that the summer is now out and we're back to work in September we can get people back on this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're not going to like what I'm going to say. The Board has very practically deferred things when their table is full, and they're higher priority items. I wouldn't be surprised if dealing with the ATLAS recommendations are one of those things that may partially slip. If we have to say in LA that we're not quite finished, because of all of the other things we're working on, I think they'll be very understanding. Just my opinion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. That's a very good point. This is why I felt if we can identify the low-hanging fruit we could provide them with a handful, or maybe less than a handful, of recommendations that they could already start working on, whist we continue to work on the rest of the recommendations, and then make it a date with the Board in Marrakech for the rest of it to be all ready and put on their desk and move forward with it all. It's keeping their interest in this, because I do have to remind

EN

you by the way that our next face-to-face meeting would be in March. It really is five months until the next opportunity.

ALAN GREENBERG: What I'm saying is if one Working Group cannot come up with something, I'd prefer them to do the job well than to do the job in a week and a half and do it poorly. This is important and if it's not one of the ones we can address in LA then there's time to go forward on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Understood. Thank you. I would agree with you on that. That's fine too. Anyway, I look forward to the feedback from the Working Groups. Let's move on. I think we've done all of the review of the ALAC call. The Working Group updates were all fine and the rest was as well. Nothing else of particular importance. I'm mindful of the time for this call. Let's move onto our next Agenda Item and that's the review of the At-Large meeting at ICANN 51 in LA. What we have really, we've done the agendas yesterday. I don't think there's anything else to be discussed about the agenda.

Let's just focus on the four questions stated workspaces: the Global Stakeholder Engagement questions workspace, the Board, the GAC, and the topics of the Public Forum. Starting with the GSE questions, I note there's been no suggestion there. GSE is going to be Sally Costerton, and I believe she's bringing all her team along with her, with the Regional Vice Presidents as well. This time we will start with Save Vocea, who's in the Pacific Islands. Asia is divided among several different people.

There are some questions that we will probably wish to ask. Since we haven't got any on the page at the moment, I ask you if you have any idea of what questions we'd like to ask Sally Costerton and her team?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: In the absence of anyone saying anything, I may have a question that I just want to ask. It's one thing to go through the website and revamp the website, revamp the website... I want to go to the issue of the content of the website and what is being done essentially to make the issues of ICANN accessible. This is a constantly recurring issue. There's constantly the thought that in order to participate in ICANN you have to be knee-deep in the lingo, you have to be knee-deep into the culture and the processes. What is the organization doing to try and rectify that and make the issue of ICANN accessible globally? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. That's a good point. With regards to the website revamp, we will speak to Chris Gift later on on the same day. As you should be aware, or might be, the website is currently being redeveloped – our At-Large website. I've also received a request from one member of the ICANN Team to supply people as beta-testers of the new search facility for the new ICANN website, which will be based on a customized Google search. I've forwarded this email to the Technology Taskforce and I believe that some Members of the Technology Taskforce have already volunteered to become beta testers on this.

With regards to access to information by newcomers or by people that wish to be involved in ICANN, I think that's a perfectly legitimate

question. If that question is transmitted in advance, maybe Sally could provide us with a round-up of what is now out there to be able to involve people in ICANN. I know that there was a myicann.org on the one side and then a number of other bells and whistles that came out, and I'm not quite sure which one survived. I think maybe that's the gist of your question – what is there out there to involve people, and is there a one-stop shop that tells people, "This is how you can get involved"? Is that correct?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's not so much a matter of how to get involved. That information is out there. I think it's a matter of having people armed with "here's why you want to get involved" not "how do you do it?" I think the "how do you do it?" is adequately covered, but the "why do you want to?" is not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a good point. Let's try and design a question around this. Heidi, have you taken notes on this? I think the answer is no. All right. Heidi, fine, let's just redraft it ourselves then.   Let's hope the recording captures it, because we are wasting time on this at the moment. The question that Evan is suggesting to ask GSE is… Tell us Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'll come back to it offline.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I heard you talking about the website?

EN

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, the issue is not the website. Lots of [potential 00:58:03] is being given to redevelopment of the website. The issue now is a matter of what content is it populated with and what efforts are being done in order to make jargon-free, easy to understand, information about ICANN issues, that is accessible to a global audience. The redesign of the website is not relevant to what I'm saying. I'm talking about content and substance – that if somebody comes to the website they shouldn't need to be knee-deep in the lingo. There are issues. Things like WHOIS and gTLDs does not need to be done in rocket science, and for the end user who's not thinking of buying a domain name, they need to know "why does this matter?"

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's one, and I think if we don't have that then we can always take it back from the recording. The second one, Dev has put into the chat: "How does global stakeholder engagement identify gaps in stakeholder representation and how does GSE act accordingly?" I think that's a good point as well to ask. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The second one fits in perfectly, but the first one, that's a communications question – either for Chris Gift, who's speaking with us at another time, or maybe Duncan in the Communications Department, but it's not going to be for GSE.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Isn't GSE in charge of all of the stakeholder engagement?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Not the website content, as far as know. I can ask that, but in terms of the acronyms, that's more…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, I'm not talking about drilling down that low, Heidi. I'm talking about seeing end users as a stakeholder, which makes them part of GSE. If that's the case, what are we doing to make ICANN accessible to them? Don't even use the word website.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, that's much better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Here we go: "What is GSE doing to make ICANN accessible to end users?" There you are. That's a short enough question. Then, how does GSE identify gaps in stakeholder representation and how to GSE act accordingly. Okay. Thank you for this Evan. I think that's enough. We've got two questions for this. That's fine. Next is the Board questions workspace. In the questions for the Board we've already got a main question first, which is the discussion of the ATLAS II recommendations and observations.

If we haven't got that much to share, we will need a second topic to discuss with the Board. I have asked, as usual, for the Board to supply a

EN

topic, but apparently they're reticent on doing so. They'd like us to bring a second question to the table. I open the table and the floor for questions. I believe Evan might wish to speak?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you. Actually, base don other conversations I have one question and I think it's very pertinent to other things that might involve other answers. That question is, does the Board of ICANN believe that ICANN itself is a stakeholder in the current IANA proceedings? If so, what are the consequences of that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In what proceedings?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The IANA stewardship transition.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: If we're in a multistakeholder process, is ICANN, the institution itself, a stakeholder?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not answering that question, I'm just asking is there anything else on our Agenda you're going to need me for? I am leaving shortly.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Shall we turn that around? Is there anything you needed to talk about before you left?

ALAN GREENBERG: All I see is the Accountability CC Working Group, which I thought was open to all, according to the announcement they're pointing to. I don't think there's anything to discuss. I may have misunderstood (6), which is why I'm asking the question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: (6) is actually specifically about this. Originally there was a thought that this CC Working Group on Accountability was going to be as it is – a CC Working Group, but it's actually not – it's a CC Group on Accountability. That appears now to have been the case that this group is available to everyone that puts their name in the hat. The question there was, I haven't seen my At-Large people on there, shall we send out a call for people to go out and join that group?

Originally we were going to have a process to select people to go and join that group, thinking that it was following the CC Working Group system of having five Members per SO, AC and SG, but that is to be not the case.

ALAN GREENBERG: If the Registry Stakeholder Group statement, which everyone endorsed, is honored, then there will be a new CC Working Group on Accountability. If ICANN goes ahead with the current plan then it seems to be an open group, unless that gets changed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In addition to the Accountability and Governance Public Experts Group on one side, the ICANN Accountability and Governance Coordination Group on the other, and the ICANN Accountability and Governance CC Group, that sounds like a very interesting set up.

ALAN GREENBERG: I admit I'm lost. Certainly the group that you're talking about, based on the announcements and the pointers in that link, I don't think there's anything for us to do at this point. Yes, we may want to beat the ground and get more people on it, if it stays as it is, a completely open group, but let's wait to see if it exists a week and a half from now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, that was essentially the gist of the discussion that I wanted to have here, and to make sure we're all on the same key so we're all aware of that. I've had several people asking me about the appointment of people into this ICANN Accountability and Governance CC Group. What I would suggest then is just sending an email, a reminder, to the ALAC, to let everyone interested in this know they should that CC Working Group and see it from there.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: With a preamble saying based on the other activity we don't know
                         where this is going, but you may want to sign up anyway.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That this might change, exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's only a mailing list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That was the only discussion to have on that topic. We do need
                         you to remain on the call for the GAC questions and the topics for the
                         public forum workspace.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm still here for four more minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We've got the question for the Board that Evan suggested: "Does
                         the Board of ICANN believe that ICANN itself, as an institution, is a
                         stakeholder in the IANA stewardship transition proceedings?" Are there
                         any other suggested questions?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: You could widen that into the accountability and the stewardship. It's two different issues and I think it's a relevant question for both.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I consider that a friendly amendment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Maybe not written in the way I've drafted it on the AIs, but I'll work with staff to try and smooth this out a little bit. Finally, the GAC. The discussion with the GAC. That's going to be an important meeting, because I remind you all we have not had a meeting with the GAC when we were in London. There's an open floor on that basically and there's been a lot of discussion with regard to the change in the Board threshold for going against GAC advice, but that doesn't appear to have been such a big issue in At-Large, so we might wish to discuss other things with the GAC. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I agree with you – not only is it something that ALAC has not taken strong issue with, but it's probably not the kind of thing that needs to be taken up with the GAC itself. I think the GAC itself is probably in favor of having the kind of things that are recommended. What I just want to draw your attention to is the ongoing issue of public interest commitments, the PICs. Essentially, any headway about getting ICANN to change its mind about the way it's doing PICs, our last shot at this is getting the GAC to stand up and say, "Some action needs to be taken on this." Short of that, we're basically yelling into a tunnel.

I would suggest, if everybody else is okay with it, that we put forward a question asking if the Board still feels strongly about better treatment of PICs in category one TLDs, and if it's prepared to work with us on getting ICANN to change its ways on this. We don't have much time to work with. ICANN has already started to sign contracts with category one TLDs, in contravention of the GAC asking it to hold off. We're basically running out of options. If the GAC isn't willing to work with us on this, we basically might as well give up on it.

Frankly though, I wouldn't like to give up on, at least without asking the GAC if they still feel strongly about this. Thank you. Obviously I'm not giving you specific wording, but I'm asking if there's still interest in the topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. If someone was recording what Evan said earlier in his sentence, he said Board, but he meant GAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. Thank you for this Evan. Effectively yes, that would work. I'm just thinking how we could bring this forward. Evan, you mentioned that the GAC category one was asking for a suspension of delegation. The reply that I had from Heather on this was that this was not explicitly the case. There was certainly no blocking of delegation based on the public interest commitments.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: In fact, that goes to the heart of some of the problems – that the last GAC advice, while the very fact that they mentioned it was noteworthy, they weren't really very forceful about it. It was done in the form of a series of questions to the Board, as opposed to a request for action. What I want to ask of the GAC at this point is, does it want to take any action at this point, because the lack of any action basically means that the status quo goes ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may intervene? I think the question is, is the GAC still interested in any action alone, or with [unclear 01:10:50] to try to make sure that there's more control over category one TLDs?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: To try to make sure that category one TLDs have what?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to try to reword the wording, because I left a minute ago, but… Is there any interest in pursuing the issue to which PABs were addressed? We can refine the wording in the next day or two. I think that's what Evan was saying.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. I've made a note on this on my little pad here. Would the GAC be ready to take action at this point, with regards to category one TLDs, or is the GAC still interested in any action, to make sure that category one TLDs…

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Is this something still on their radar, or have they shrugged their shoulders and said, "It's too late, we're giving up"?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Three: is there any interest in addressing the issue to which PABs were addressed?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think those are all the same question. I've got to go. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. I've put in the AIs a very rough text on the questions for the GAC. I think that that's only dealing with PABs and PICs. Any other suggestions with regards to the questions or the topics of discussion with the GAC?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I wouldn't mind finding out the GAC's feeling about having a new round of gTLDs, quickly, before the consequences of the first set of applications… Before the first round is complete. ICANN seems to be in a rush to do a new set of applications without waiting for the dust to settle or reviewing what happened from the first set. I wonder if the GAC has a take on that or if GAC Members have a take on that? Thanks.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: "What is the GAC's feeling about having a new round of gTLD applications starting before the review of the first round of gTLDs is complete?" Is that okay?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Before seeing the impact of the first round.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Any other questions or topics for the GAC? None for the time being. Thank you. Finally we now have the third, which is the LA topics for the Public Forum. You would have seen another email that I sent to the ALAC a little earlier today, detailing the special high interest topics. In fact, they're not called special high interest topics, they're called high interest topics. The topics are at the beginning of the week. Now we have the end of the week. On the Thursday there will be specific topic to address.

Are there any topics that you would like to see discussed in the Public Forum? Yes, I already know that the Public Forum often sounds like the same cranky wheels and the usual suspects going behind a mic, but are there any points that the ALAC would like to make and push forward? Any topics that we feel particularly strongly about? I realize there are very few people left on this call at the moment. None-ALT Members are encouraged to speak as well, if they wish to, since we don't really have a long queue here.

Okay. That doesn't seem to be very inspired at the moment. I think we might need to leave this one empty for the time being and think in the

EN

next 48 hours. When do we have to have to those ready by Heidi? Is it by tomorrow 25th of can we wait until Friday 26th?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

On one hand I thought I'd reached my own quota for questions, but I have this comment: why do we have to make a decision now on what we say at the Public Forum? People get up at the Public Forum and read statement that they've written 30 seconds before they've stood up to speak. Why are we being called upon to have this kind of thing done in advance?

I think it's perfectly acceptable for us to wait until we get through our policy session on Thursday night and decide at that time if there's something worth standing up to speak about… Sorry, later on Thursday. We have our policy meeting on Thursday. Let's decide then what we want to talk about at the Public Forum. Why do we have to decide that now at all?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

The Public Forum is organized in a series of sub-sections. For example, there'd be one section on new gTLDs, one section on ATRT, one section on ICANN accountability and then one section on pretty much anything else. The session on anything else is the one that's fully open for 100 people to stand at the mic. We're not being asked here what we're going to say on the microphone, we're being asked whether we would like any part of the Public Forum to have a theme that we are interested in in particular.

EN

If we are interested in having an ATLAS II Public Forum input, we could say, "We would like to have some time to discuss ATLAS II in the Public Forum." Therefore the Board would reserve say 15 minutes for anybody who is interested in commenting or talking about ATLAS II to come to the mic. I'm not suggesting that we do such a thing, but this is to give them the idea of the topics that we'd be interested in. If you were interested in saying, "We'd like 15 minutes for people to come to the mic and talk about ICANN accountability or express their views on the public interest or the end user at ICANN," or something like that, that is our time for us to suggest it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I'm assuming there's already going to be a slot about accountability issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very likely. If you can put any comment into that, add the word "trust" into that – accountability and trust, because one of the things we've been talking about in Future Challenges is that accountability and transparency are all very valuable and necessary, but they're not ends in themselves. They're means to an end. The actual end is public trust. I'm wondering if it's worth working that into whatever ICANN decides they want to do in the Public Forum about accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Evan. Any other comments on this? I think that would be fine Evan. Accountability and trust. I could emphasize the

EN

fact that we don't want to just have "accountability" as a header but we'd like to have "trust" in there. That would certainly open the door for any of us to be able to go to the microphone, introduce the topic and focus on the trust side. I think that's a very good point. I think that's enough for us at the moment.

If any of you have any additional suggestions for the questions for the Board, the GAC, the Public Forum, all of what we've been discussing here, please add them directly to the Wiki. They are linked to this Agenda page. Since we've already dealt with Agenda Item #6, this takes us to Item #7. #6 was selection of delegates for the Community Working Group on Accountability. What we've found out is that there's not going to be a need for a selection for the time being.

Taking any time on this is probably not worth it, since there might be changes if the statement from the Registry Stakeholder Group gets traction across Supporting Organization and Advisory Committees. That therefore takes us to #7 – Any Other Business.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Is this our last call before LA?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So it's your last call as Chair and it's my last call as ALT Member.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That is correct as well Evan. I was going to say a few words on this…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Dev's also.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's also Dev's last call as ALT Member. The three remaining ALT Members on this call are having their last call, at least in their current positions. Two of them are moving out of the ALT and one of them is moving out of the Chairing position and having someone else take over afterwards. It's been really great to work with you guys – some of you for many, many years. It's difficult to look back.

I don't know how many topics calls we've held together, but I can say that I think we've spoken more times to each other than I have spoken to my family and my friends in the past few years. That certainly is interesting. I'm going to miss Chairing those calls, but no doubt Alan will do an excellent job of it in the future. No doubt he will be able to do something that I've never managed to do, which is to stick to the time that's allocated for such a call.

Thankfully today, yes, it is 21:27, which is three minutes to go until the end of this call. So for the first time ever, after I don't know how many hundreds of ALT calls, it had to be the last one for it to be within the bounds.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Never let it be said you couldn't pull it off.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There you go. It was finally done. That's why I was so concerned asking for Any Other Business. Usually Alan comes out with an idea and says, "I've got this important topic." Alan has left early today. Evan, I hope you don't have any big other business to come up with? Dev, you neither. Evan, if you'd like to say a few words, and Dev too, on your last ALT call?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No. For me it's just so long, and thanks for all the fish.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Dev? Is Dev able to speak?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think he must be tearing up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev is typing. We have two more minutes until the official end of this call. "Thanks, it's been an honor." Well, thanks Dev. It's been a real pleasure to work with you and an honor. Thank you very much staff for having been able to keep up with us for all these years. It's been a real pleasure to work with you as well. It has been a tough road and some tough days. We still are in the middle of battle, but it's great to be working with such a team. Ladies and gentlemen, it's the end of this

call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and good night. Goodbye to everyone. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]