

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALS Mobilization Working Party Call, taking place on Monday, 7th of September 2020 at 18:00 UTC. On our call today, we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Barrack Otieno, Daniel Nanghaka, Sarah Kiden, Ali AlMeshal, Amrita Choudhury, Nadira AlAraj, Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, Natalia Filina, Roberto Gaetano, Yrjo Lansipuro, David Mackey, and Judith Hellerstein. I have received apologies from Heidi Ullrich and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. And from staff side, we have Evin Erdoğan, Alperen Eken, Herb Waye, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. And I'll be on call management.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes. And now, I would like to leave the floor over to you, Alan. Thanks so much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Yeşim. Welcome to the call. This may be another short call. And I'll say that with glee for some of you and probably regrets for Cheryl, who got up at 4:00 AM to be here. But we'll see how long it goes. It may take some time going over the document or may not. And thank you for all of those who are in North America and here on a holiday day. Thank you.

If we can bring up the application process. That's the one. Now, if we quickly scroll through it, there are a number of places that are highlighted in purple—or at least I think they're purple. The first one is page two. There it is. So, these are all the places where we've identified

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.

potential times in the application process. And the first one was seven days, which is embedded in the next one. So, the seven day one is not really critical. The next one is 30 business days. The seven days was the very quick pass for RALO leaders to make any comments. The next one is 30 business days and that's for the entire due diligence process.

If we can scroll to page four. And there's a few there. We have five calendar days—I'm sorry, five calendar weeks—which is the timeline allowing RALOs to make a decision. And that was set at five weeks to ensure that there's at least one monthly meeting within the period of time, with a couple of days before or after it to either prepare for it or to consolidate whatever the decision was, if there was a decision. And we'll talk about that a little bit going forward.

The next time is item number seven, where we gave five business days, one calendar week, for the ALAC to consider the recommendation and decide whether there are any questions that needed to be asked. And then, the last timeline is on page five, where it says that we're expecting the whole thing to be done in 90 days.

If we can now flip to the spreadsheet—the Excel spreadsheet and the live spreadsheet so we can make changes going on if necessary. And that is it. So, that is the times that we've just talked about. Let's make sure we have no hands up. No, we don't.

And each of them translated because we recorded them, initially, in a variety of different ways. I've now, in the third column, translated them all into calendar days. And you'll see it adds up to 91, which exceeds

what we were hoping for of 90—does not provide any slack time, which I think is a bad practice.

So, we now, at this point, have a decision to make. Are the times that we've indicated for each of them reasonable? In which case we probably should add some slack time and change the 90 to a larger number. Personally, I believe the ALAC review time is a little bit low. So, I suspect we should increase that a little bit. We could decrease the vote by a day or two but I don't think that's really a critical issue. And it's good for normal votes to allow a full seven days.

So, I open the floor. What do we do at this point? Is due diligence, 30 business days ...? Is 40 ...? That's six full weeks. Is that more than we need? Remember, the process goes on hold if we ask the applicant for more information. So, that doesn't count out of it. But any internal processes, of course, do count.

So, the questions are is the due diligence something we can cut down a little bit? The RALO five weeks was to allow things to be presented on monthly meetings. And the question is does anyone actually do that? I know, on various monthly meetings, we report that someone is applying. But is that really a necessary part of the process or just a courtesy because we're holding a meeting?

So, open the floor for anyone who can either suggest that we cut down, recommend increase, or change the overall total. And I see we have Cheryl and Daniel. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. I guess I'd like to look at these here slightly differently than how you've just presented them to us. Bear with me while I explain why. I agree with you that designing something without any wriggle room is problematic. But we do have the safety valve of the clock being able to be halted for all the right reasons, with all the right notifications, [as you go along.]

But I see some of these times as absolute minimums or should not be fiddled with and cannot be reduced in any way, shape, or form and still be reasonable. And I see others as maximums and, in all probability, things will have functioned well underneath those times. And so, I'm wondering whether we should almost treat some of these bands slightly differently. So, reviews and votes, to me, at least from the ALAC review and vote point of view, really can't be played with. But I almost see that diligence and the RALO review as long enough, and good enough, and will probably be less than anyway. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I did think about that. And for simple cases, the due diligence and the RALO review will be much shorter. There will be some applications that are slam dunks, that we just know everything is okay. The applicant filled in the form properly. There's no additional questions to ask. The queries with GSE and things like that go quickly. My concern, however, is that the problematic ones are the ones that will use the maximum of amount of time in all of the cases.

So, it's not as if some of them might take a long time in due diligence but it'll be really easy for the RALO or vice versa. My fear is that the

problematic cases are the ones that will extend each of them to the limit. Daniel, please go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Looking at the time, I was thinking, could there be a way that some of these processes can happen concurrently to [a different] timing? If that is possible, then it would be good to at least put that into consideration, looking at project management perspective of handling things.

And also, another thing that ... My suggestion would be if we are to reduce the due diligence, probably we can set it down to maybe 25 business days or maybe 20 business days. We shall push it to approximately, maybe, one month for the time in calendar days, which is 30 days, also.

Then, the RALO review, that one, I think it can take less time. But there should be, at least, some conditions whereby if these conditions haven't yet been met, then it will affect the timeline. I there should be need for some little bit of flexibility there. Then, the ALAC part, I think it is too much time for them, since they have a small team. Yeah. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. I will be calling on Evin, once we go through the other people on the group talking, to look at the due diligence. A couple of things ... There already is parallelism, I believe, to the extent it can be. That is, the initial RALO leadership review is in parallel with the due diligence.

The other ones are all contingent. The RALO review can't really start until due diligence is completed. The ALAC can't think about it until the RALO makes a recommendation, if they do. And the vote can't start until the opportunity for the ALAC members to have reviewed the document. So, they are serialized at this point.

I will point out we do have an escape hatch that says we can extend the time—I believe it's on a chair's discretion—in unusual circumstances. So, we do have that escape hatch for the cases where everything goes to the maximum. So, at that level, perhaps we're okay. Perhaps that's our slack. But we really would not want to use that, except in very rare cases.

I have a speaker list, still, of Sarah. And then, I'll go to Evin. I think she's on the call. Sara, please go ahead.

SARAH KIDEN:

Hi, everyone. So, on the RALO review, I see a question about this. Can the RALOs use monthly meetings for this? So, in the case of AFRALO, we bring all applications to the meetings every month. And the general feeling is to maintain this format. So, the 35 calendar days would work well for us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sarah. Any comments from other RALOs? I know RALOs and the ALAC document these things. But are they actually opportunities to comment and therefore impact the decision is the real question. I don't see any other hands. So, Evin, any thoughts on ... Is the six calendar

weeks something that we can reduce or is that something that you would feel really uncomfortable.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Alan. And yeah. Thanks for the comments as well. I would request that it stay as it is, just because I think it allows for some more flexibility, given various other tasks or projects that may be going on. So, I guess my only comment is that I would ... I think 30 business days is still good.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Let me ask you. I'm going to put you on the spot, though. That's the maximum. Would you expect, based on your experience, in a reasonable number of cases that you'll, in fact, complete it in under that? Is that a reasonable assumption?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

It is. But I think, also, as some of the comments have been shared as well, it also depends a lot on the applicant and all the other people that are providing feedback. But for the due diligence itself, if the applicant is responsive, if they're a good candidate, if it's not controversial, then yes. It can be done ... In fact, there was one recently done in LACRALO. I think I completed that under a week. But since there's a lot of activity going on in that RALO, feedback is coming back from that RALO.

So, sometimes the due diligence is speedy, based on the applicant. But other times it can take a long time. There have been several other RALO applications where questions have been sent and a response hasn't

been received yet. And sometimes, it's because the quality of the applicant is not so great. Or maybe it's because they had a typo on their email address or something. And going on their website, you find the correct one.

So, long story short, it can be done, yes, under 30 business days but it's variable. So, I guess I feel like 30 business days is a good standard practice.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Just to be clear, Evin, two things. Number one, you listed nonresponsive applicants as one of them. Remember, when you ask a question, it goes on hold. So, the clock stops at that point. So, the nonresponsive applicant does not impact this at all. And presumably, a bad email address ... Once you send the message, it's on hold. If it comes back and says it bounced, that'll likely happen soon. If it doesn't happen at all because it just goes into never-neverland, then again, it's on hold. So, let's not concern that.

And the question I asked for the—does it sometimes work—[so I] was not trying to pressure you to reducing the total. I was trying to get a feeling for if, in a significant number of cases, you end up doing it in less time, then we have slack. Then, other things can expand a little bit and still be within the 90-day limit. So, the way I'm interpreting your answer is yes. In a lot of cases, it will be done in less time than the 42 calendar days. Some might not. But in many cases it will and that will generate the slack we need.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thanks, Alan. Yeah. I think that's fair to say. But sometimes, it can be more time as well. So, yeah. I think 30 business days is a good timeframe. But I would ... If we're already ... If I'm able to provide feedback, I do think the ALAC vote could potentially be shortened because usually, when it gets to that stage, it's a pretty straightforward procedural stamp of approval. But yeah. Just thought I would note that at least. That could be shortened a bit.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which? The ALAC vote or the ALAC review?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: The ALAC vote. Because we do other ALAC votes, as you know, of course, for ALS applications, and elections, and so forth that can be a shorter timeframe. So, that probably is flexible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Traditionally, we allow a week for a vote unless there is some overriding reason that it has to be shorter. Maureen's on the call. Maureen, do you feel comfortable saying, "All ALAC votes will be less than seven calendar days?" I wouldn't. As chair, I would not feel comfortable saying that. I think we put pressure on ALAC members when we have to, to vote quickly. But we shouldn't necessarily do it on every vote. But Maureen, any thoughts on that? Thank you for joining us.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. I think that we probably have to be consistent with our voting. That's been our process. And yeah. The week—the seven days—is the typical. Perhaps we can shorten the review time as, as Evin has mentioned, a lot of the times a lot of work has gone into the review of the application before it actually gets to the ALAC. Probably knocking off a weekend or something like that, we might be able to manage that. But I think the vote has to be—basically, to remain the same.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Like to hear from ALAC members or former ALAC members on the ALAC review. That was one that I said seven days may not be enough. My concern there is not really the amount of time it takes to do it but the time it takes the ALAC members to get around to doing it. And I'm aware that some ALAC members don't read the document until they get to the vote. And there's not much we can do about that. But ALAC members should be looking at the documents prior, to make sure there aren't any additional questions.

If we want to make this—keep the 90 days, which is a nice, round number, given what we've said about everything else, we would have to reduce the ALAC review to six days. From ALAC members or past ALAC members, do you feel comfortable with that? Putting on my past ALAC member hat, I'd say yeah. It's not that worse than seven and it's probably a reasonable ask for the ALAC members, who we do say are expected to spend several hours a day on ALAC matters.

So, the question is cutting this seven down to six for ALAC review. ALAC members, anyone care to raise an objection? And I see we have no

hands up. We maybe don't have any ALAC members on the call. All right. Then, I would suggest we change the seven to six. Yeşim, if you could do that and we'll lock in the numbers. That's the seven for ALAC review, changing to six. And this is now final.

Now, one more question that comes up. I noticed Evin has been continually saying "business days." And business days are a highly variable thing. Normally, business days, are pretty much—for most weeks are five business days per calendar week. Occasionally, there's four because there's a holiday. The New Year's period is quite different, in that ALAC offices, I believe, are closed for as much as a 10-day period—something like that.

Do we want to put an exception in for that, just as we have done for face-to-face meetings or for ICANN meetings? I don't feel uncomfortable doing that. So, say, "Meetings that straddle the end of the year will have an extra 10 days added onto it?"

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My discomfort is marrying these things to Gregorian calendar. You're going to start talking about high days and holidays, then I'm going to start toting out the far-more-variable and far-more-lengthy

requirements of many countries in APAC. So, I would leave well enough alone and state that the business days are measured by wherever the ICANN office—either headquartered or the staff operating the specific activity is.

ALAN GREENBERG: My only concern, Cheryl is that ... You just used “business days.” And I think the practice that we decided we would use was calendar days because those were something that are well-defined. Now, if we want to put everything back into business days, then it becomes rather difficult to measure whether we’re meeting our targets or not. And I feel less comfortable.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your question was about business days. I don’t care whether you just use “days.” I do care if you start getting into high days and holidays.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. No. I said Evin was using “business days.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That’s where it gets way too complicated.

ALAN GREENBERG: I said Evin was—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This document does, as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may speak, I said Evin was using business days. But in our document, we will use calendar days. And that's why the question came up. So, you feel uncomfortable mentioning this 10-day period because then we will have to mention another 10-day period that's applicable in other regions. Any other comments from anyone else? I see nothing. Roberto, please go ahead.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah. I'm a fan of [inaudible] rather than "business days" because that creates all sorts of additional complications, due to the fact that business days vary country-by-country. And it's difficult to plan. So, since I'm a fan of standardization, I think that calendar days that is a concept that is more—how can I say?—objective.

Now, this said, if we had exceptional circumstances like—I don't know—to have the approval of a Brazilian ALS during Carnival or something like this, where the problem is not one day but is a longer period, I think that we can be open to an exception. But that [inaudible] be case-by-case and discussed case-by-case. But the general rule should be calendar days because if we do business days, we get into all sorts of different problems. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Roberto. So that, perhaps, leads us to saying that should applications be processed either through due diligence or the RALO

period at times when there will be significant unavailability, we use the chair's exemption to add 10 days or something to the period and let the applicant know for those particular cases. That sound reasonable to everyone? Done.

All right. Let us go into the report document. Now, I only saw a very small number of comments in the report. There were one or two people who pointed out typos. And I corrected those. I don't know to what extent other people have been in the document but there were very few comments. If we could pull the report document up on the screen, please.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: I believe I am displaying the correct one, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's pointed to in the document. It's version one of the draft report.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Yes. I'm displaying it right now. Or I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I'm seeing the agenda right now.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Yes. Correct. My apologies. Sorry. I just clicked the wrong page. I wonder how it happened.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay. Everyone is allowed one error on a call. I've already made several so I'm over my limit. There we go. Any chance we can make it a little larger for people? The document is pointed to in the agenda, if someone wants to bring up their own copy.

All right. What I'd like to do first is go over the things that are different from what was in the approved process. There were a number of things where either there were changes that were implied by the work we did during the application process or, in one case, there was something just left out of this document, which I added an hour or so ago. If we could scroll, first, to page three—bottom of page three, top of page four. It straddles the two, I think. No, it doesn't. No. Sorry. Now it's at the top of page four. It moved. My apologies.

All right. This is the section on the ALS must have a website and they must mention ICANN in it and At-Large in it. The existing criteria said—and I'm quoting, "Post on the internet, on the ALAC's website, or elsewhere publicly-accessible, current information about the ALS's goals, structures, description, constituent groups, working mechanisms, leadership contacts."

So, that was in the existing criteria. It was not in what we put together during the criteria and expectations part of this work group earlier this year. And so, the suggestion is we add to this criteria, “The internet presence must also include,” or “the ALS should also consider including in its internet presence, current information about organizational goals, structure, descriptions of membership, working mechanisms, and so forth,” and a description of why it’s involved in ICANN, which is something else that we had suggested be included somewhere.

So, the question is, is there any objection to altering this criteria or this expectation to include this? And if so, do we make it a “must include” or a “should include,” or, “should consider including?” My preference is the second of the phrases in square brackets. You’ll notice that the “add here” section, there are two alternatives to the way the sentence starts.

So, my recommendation would be “should consider including” but not necessarily make it mandatory. We don’t really want to ... I don’t think we really want to require that everyone do massive updates of their website. But these are things which certainly are recommended.

And we have David ... We have comments that are scrolling past. I have most should be “should include.” “Leave it optional.” “‘Consider’ should work fine.” Ali, I’m not quite sure if you’re recommending it “should” or “must.” You’re saying “should—” so, “should consider.” All right. I think we’ve decided we’ll use the second of the square brackets and include it. And that’s a done deal.

If we can now scroll to the bottom of page four. This is text that was in our decision in the expectations but got omitted from this document.

So, those of you who may have looked at this document earlier would not have seen the words that are shaded in gray. But they are our formal approved wording and it shouldn't be any controversy. I'm just noting that they were not there, if you review the document earlier.

And if we can now scroll to the bottom of page five. This wasn't in any of our discussions. But in formulating the report, it sounds like something we really should be telling ALSs about. And this is other things that are not mandatory. We're not going to fire them for it. We're not going to remove their accreditation. But we expect ALSs, to some extent, to do these kinds of things.

And I've tried to put together a very summary statement saying, "There are a variety of activities that an ALS might be invited to participate in. An example might be outreach activity in their area or helping to organize activities if an ICANN meeting were held in their locale. None of these are obligatory but our literature should give them an overview."

So, I would recommend that an expanded version of something like this be included in the literature but that we definitely mention it because these are things that, in many cases, we expect ALSs to do but we're not going to absolute require them. Comments, please. The floor is open.

I see some "agrees" in the chat. All right. Everyone agrees. If anyone can provide other—people from RALOs can provide other examples that we can use here to flesh out this statement, I would really appreciate it—not in this meeting, but on the email list, please. And I will put out an explicit question about that. Let me just make a note.

All right. Next item is straddling page six and seven. And these are things that were not in our original criteria. But there are things that we added into the process and therefore need to be put into the expectations. So, these are, essentially, the certifications that they're making, the confirmation that it doesn't require any money—that it doesn't require ICANN money—and the ALS commits to following the RALO rules and the Memorandum of Understanding. Again, should not be controversial but they needed to be retrofitted into this document. Okay. I see no comments. I'm not sure there are comments here. There's a lot of "agrees." I don't see any "disagrees" and no hands up.

All right. I don't know to what extent people have reviewed the document. I'd like to open the floor quickly. Do people feel comfortable that what is here, and particularly the preamble on the first page, are something they feel comfortable in presenting to the ALAC and the RALOs? I'd like people to look at it from a point of view of what else do we need to say to people who have not been participating in these calls for eight months but need, perhaps, to know something that I'm assuming is a given but might not be understood by someone who hasn't been involved in all of our discussions?

So, again, if you don't have anything now, if you can please look at this document very soon. And hopefully, we will get it to the stage where we can sign off on the draft. There's another section that it will be coming. Now that we have the timelines locked in, I will be importing into this document the application process. The exact form of the application form will not be part of this document because that's followed from the—or may include it as an appendix. But we're getting pretty close to getting a presentation to the ALAC, at that point.

One other comment ... I see some hands up and I'll open the floor in a moment. The question of whether we allow cross-region, spanning-region ALSs to selection the region of their choice. The question was delayed, unfortunately, for no good reason. But it has finally gone to ICANN Legal. I will share a copy of the request for legal input with this group. And I'm hoping that we will get an answer back relatively shortly. And hopefully, it will be a positive answer. Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yeah. Thank you, Alan. A couple of points. I think it was page five, if you could scroll back. There was a headline. Yeah, "Explicitly not Expectations." And, of course, under that headline there are a few things that ALSs can do but they are not ... I think that the headline is a little bit ... It's a negative. So, could you ... Perhaps we could find a little more positive-sounding headline.

The other thing is that I tried to open this document but I was told by Google, which is fairly typical with Google Docs, that I have no permission to view it. So, could staff make sure that we can all see this document, meanwhile? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yrjo, you're listed in the list of people. Are you signed onto Google? Do you have a Google email address? Is that what you use to sign onto Google?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yes. I have. I have. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And staff has put your Hotmail address in this. If staff can please replace Yrjo's Hotmail address with his Google address then he can sign on. Then, he can see the document normally.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If there are anyone else in that situation, please let staff know. David, please go ahead.

DAVID MACKEY: Hi, Alan. Thanks. I'm just looking at ... Sorry. I'm just going to go to the top here. I'm looking at how we have section four, describing the mandate, and then the expectations and criteria—what we expect from an ALS. And then, it goes into the a bunch of the work that we did.

I'm wondering if it makes sense ... And I'm not sure where I would put it but I'm wondering if it makes sense to have a conclusion of the work that we've done, that says that we have met the expectations that were in the mandate that we were given. Is that reasonable? I'm just curious. That might be something to consider. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought I did that already but maybe not.

DAVID MACKEY: You may have it in the individual ... It's more just having a summary saying, "This is very clear ..." Who knows?

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a section on work party mandate. And it's reasonable, at that point, to put in a comment saying, "We done it."

DAVID MACKEY: Yeah. It's not so much to do any more work. It's just to have a clear, "Here's the mandate and we're done," or a conclusion. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm not quite sure it's conclusions but yes. Okay. I've now put a note to myself in.

DAVID MACKEY: "We done it." That's good. Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: He's commenting ... If you scroll to the top of page three, you'll see what David's—top of page two, you'll see what David's talking about. All right. And Yrjo, I didn't actually answer your suggestion of things. I think you're correct. That section should be suggestions and simply noted in the text that these are not expectations. I think it already says that. It

doesn't have to be emphasized in the title. You're quite correct on that. Thank you. Yrjo, is that a new hand? No.

All right. At this point, I appreciate any comments in the, either email or in the document, for people who have any thoughts on what needs to be added—and, as I said, from a point of view of those who have not been on these calls. What questions are they going to ask that we should be answering within the document? And I may send this draft out to a number of people who are not part of our process to get their thoughts on what may be missing. That's probably a good sanity check.

Other than that, I have nothing else for today. Whether there'll be a meeting next week or not ... I think we're going to be very close to the end. And I'm not sure we'll need a meeting next week. But we may defer the final meeting and then try to wrap everything up at the same time. But keep your eye on email. Natalia, please go ahead.

NATALIA FILINA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I'd like to share with all of you my thoughts after the reading our draft of review. Does it not seem to all of us that we, maybe often, use the word "should" for our ALSes? And we will give the full freedom for our ALSs, and we will give a very soft—not rules but recommendations. And maybe, can we [upgrade] this, "ALSs 'will.'" Keep the [title and] position, just after the correctly filling out of the application form. It's my strange, question, but maybe we may create a more strict rule. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I guess all I'll say is as we went through these things, we did discuss whether something should be "musts" or "shoulds." So, I would guess that if you're suggesting that, in some cases, we should make things stricter—and I think that's what you were saying—I think you need to identify the specific places. And then, we can debate whether, indeed, others agree with you or not because none of this was done ... I don't think any of it was done without consideration at the time.

So, please go through it. And if you see places where there are "shoulds" that you believe should be "musts," then let's identify them and have an opportunity talk about it because I don't believe it was done accidentally. But that doesn't mean we can't rethink it, based on how people feel now.

NATALIA FILINA: Okay. Thank you, Alan. I will put my comments into the document. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. And that may justify a meeting next week, if Natalia has enough of those. All right. I see no other hands. And then, we will give you back an extra 12 minutes or so of your day. Thank you very much, all. Bye-bye.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Meeting is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]