

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine  
May 15, 2014  
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all parties the call is now being recorded. If you have any objections please disconnect at this time. And thank you, you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Elan). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody and welcome to the BC call on the 15th of May, 2014. On the call today we have Elisa Cooper, Gabriella Szlak, Angie Graves, Ron Andruff, Steve DelBianco and Timothy Chen.

From staff we have myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Nathalie. And thank you to those on the call today. Today I want us to talk a little bit about where we're going with the election. Hopefully Marilyn will be joining the call. If not I'll give you an update as to where things stand with the election of the 14th Seat for the Board member that we elect as part of the Non Contracted Parties House.

Then we'll spend a fair amount of time today on a policy update and then move to John and Gabby who can take us through an update of exactly where we're going on with the Council.

And then are there any other topics that people want to spend time on today? I do want to talk about a couple of working groups which we've asked to provide participation on. One of them we're good in terms of participation and the other one we have a lot of members who want to participate so want to spend a little bit of time talking about that before we move on to the election updates. But are there any other topics that members want to spend time on today?

Okay, well with that so we have had a couple of working groups that are either already formed or in the process of forming that have asked for our participation.

One of them is a GNSO review working group. And both Ron Andruff and Stéphane Van Gelder have stepped forward to participate. I haven't seen that there aren't any others that have interest in participating on that. It's a very tight turnaround. They actually asked that we provide the member's names by Monday. And so if everyone is happy I think we are good to go.

The one where we have a lot of interest in having participation is on the IANA Transition Working Group. And so Phil Corwin, Mark Sloan, Chuck, Aparna, Marilyn, Steve, have all expressed interest in participating in this particular working group.

They're asking for two members from each of the supporting organizations. So what I'm not clear on actually is if they're asking for two from the GNSO or whether they are asking for two from the constituencies.

At this point I'm not sure what members think about how we should go about selecting who should be those representatives in that particular group. They are asking for participants that actually have experience in some (unintelligible). I'm getting some feedback so if you are on the Adobe Connect if you can mute until you're called upon that would be very helpful. Thank you, that's great. Okay. Oh I have it again. Okay I think that solved it.

So, Gabby, actually I see that you have a question. Gabby.

Gabriella Szlak: (Unintelligible) so my question is I have a really bad connection here and I didn't hear which it working group we are discussing right now. I hear the first one but the second one - is this about the Internet governance or the NTIA transition?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. Yes, it's about that. So do members have any ideas about ways forward in terms of how to determine which two we would put forward? I think in the past, you know, we've made these decisions, the executive committee has made these decisions.

And I think there's been and happiness sometimes about those decisions and how they are made and just as we ask for transparency from the ICANN Board I want to ensure that we have sort of full transparency on how these decisions are made. I don't want to make them behind closed doors. I really want all members to feel confident and feel comfortable with sort of when we make these kinds of decisions.

So are there any ideas about how we should go about deciding who should represent us? I mean one possibility is if we can, you know, sort of do a quick

vote among the members. I know we don't have enough room on the call today to determine that today. But any thoughts from members? David.

David Fares: Yeah, thanks Elisa. First I should say I appreciate that you are opening this up for discussion to the broader membership. And maybe we could just do a quick straw poll via email and see if there is a clear - if there are clear, you know, representatives that we support out of the group and if not then maybe a more formal vote might have to do that.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, yeah. So I can...

Marilyn Cade: Elisa? Sorry, Elisa? Sorry.

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Before we do that again I - it's Marilyn. Can I just be clear - I think all of us need to be clear on what the qualifications are. Because I think it's very different, some of the groups require the qualifications are really that you're very familiar with your own constituencies' point of view and breadth of concern etcetera.

In this particular group - and I have spent some time talking with actually the IANA transition team at ICANN and elsewhere. But can we get something in writing that we could send to the membership so members could have a sense and then those who volunteered could write a paragraph which describes the technical background, experience background they have that would help the members I think.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, so I can from the request that ICANN made in terms of what they're looking for in terms of requirements so that's not a problem. And then if those

that have interest can write sort of their experience although I think probably many others are familiar with the folks that have come forward.

But, yes, so I think what I'll do is I'll send out basically the list of members that have expressed interest to the full group. I'll include the qualifications that ICANN is asking for and then perhaps those members that have expressed interest can sort of identify their qualifications to participate.

All right so that is actually all I had to cover today. So with that I think we should probably, unless there are any other questions or comments? Okay so I think we should move on to hear from Marilyn where things stand with the election. Marilyn. Marilyn, are you there still? Okay so perhaps we lost Marilyn.

So this is where we're at in terms of the election. The plan is that we're needing...

Marilyn Cade: Hello? Hello? Sorry.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. Okay, yeah, go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Oh thank you. I'm sorry, I was trying to figure out I think maybe the microphones go out. Members have seen the transcript. And I think that's a really good practice that we are continuing as CSG ExComm just as the ExComm on the BC makes these kind of decisions, we took the decision to do a transcript of the discussion. And members have all seen that so you've got the detail.

But the summary here is consideration has been given to a proposal from the NCSG to withdraw both candidates and put a different candidate forward.

There is not a firm candidate from the NCSG. Members need to understand that this is a preliminary we could put this name forward but we haven't decided to put his name forward, we haven't decided what we're going to do. But the resume is out there. Sam understands that he's being eyeballed by people.

Because so many people from the IPC were at INTA and there were other issues there hasn't been feedback yet. There is a CSG executive committee called this afternoon for other planning purposes. This topic will be discussed there.

The question of the - the one question that's been raised in some discussions is Sam is very much a development guy. I think I put this into my email. He is trained as an economist but he is actually an international development expert. And he isn't well known to the NCUC; he's very, very new to ICANN.

Some of the discussion that has taken place includes the fact that if you just looked at the external qualifications there is - there could be some similarity between he and Bill Graham. Bill has a major qualification that he doesn't have and that is he has long experience and understanding of ICANN. But that's maybe irrelevant if we can't get agreement on how to get a candidate elected.

There is the possibility that there could be an agreement within the NCUC that they would withdraw Avri. They haven't reached that yet. There is no firm agreement that it'd be Sam they put forward. They might; they might not. They have two other candidates that they have been throwing around that are kind of waiting to see if there's a different approach.

The - it is possible that the CSG could put forward a different candidate that we thought would be a compromise candidate. And I'll just refresh members' memory here that for years ago we had a candidate that did have the votes, including a pledge of votes from NPOC, and that was cancelled.

And the candidate withdrew and Bill was put forward - recruited and put forward as the compromise candidate. And I was the candidate at the time and withdrew. But we did put forward a compromise candidate at that time and managed to get him elected.

So this evening we'll hear more from the IPC and the ISPs on where they are. Getting a candidate agreed to if we put one forward from the CSG, would mean that candidate would have to be able to draw votes themselves from the - either the NPOC or the NCUC so it would need to be someone who has long standing presence and relationships and interactions with that side of the house. There are some people like that, not many but there are some.

So we're going to go into probably a fast-paced discussion after today's call on whether Sam is in any way acceptable to IPC and to ISPs. And we need to hear from the BC members who've been able to watch the video Steve distributed and read the resume and think through other issues.

The procedure for the election is also now becoming a topic of discussion. And the 60% - I want to say again it's fixed by bylaw. So the need for eight votes is fixed by bylaw; it's not something that we made up so it can't be waived.

We could have a voting procedure which goes only one round by doing a - or only two rounds by doing an elimination vote where it's Name A, Name B and

none of the above and the entity that gets the lowest number of votes gets eliminated.

We haven't done that for a variety of reasons. It's not impossible that we would be asked to agree to that. We need to conclude the election. We don't have to but we want to conclude the election by the time of the June meeting. It's not a requirement; we can still meet the deadline, I'm told by John, for the review. But it would need to be done very close to that. Let me pause.

Elisa Cooper: Marilyn, this is Elisa. I thought we had discussed hearing from Sam directly?

Marilyn Cade: We can't hear from Sam until he becomes a candidate and he's not a candidate because they haven't decided to put him forward. So it isn't that - and that's why we've circulated the bio. We had - that question was challenged by Metalitz, if you remember, on the list. He's not actually a candidate because they haven't decided to withdraw Avri. They're sort of throwing this out at the - so I'll just say a bit more.

Sorry to bore members with this. What happened was the NPOC managed to get a signed agreement with the NCSG that they would live with Avri as a candidate and that if she didn't win that then they would be able to put a candidate forward. But although they have it in writing the NCUC does not want to honor it.

So they - the compromise was that they would informally fill Sam's name. So if we were to interview Sam we have to make a decision - ethically we would really have to make a decision that we're withdrawing our candidate or make it clear to the NCSG negotiators that there is an informal discussion that will take place but there is still no commitment to that candidate.



By the way, Bill Graham has been updated. Elisa circulated the update that was provided to Bill and Avri was updated by the other half of the house.

Elisa Cooper: So we can't...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, I mean, so we can have an informal conversation with him; there's nothing that prohibits that. Because I just don't see how we can agree to anything until we get to talk to him.

Marilyn Cade: So it's Marilyn again for the transcript. I'm just going to say historically eight Board of seats are chosen by the Nominating Committee and that has been the avenue by which people who have no relationship to ICANN have come into the Board.

Historically the six, very limited six, selected seats have been where the community has tried to put seasoned, experience people into the seats. I'm not saying that has to continue to be the case but it hasn't been the case up to now.

Sam has not been active in ICANN for even a full year. And I'm not saying that we couldn't get acquainted with him by having a call with him but, you know, I think members need to first of all also think a little bit about what their criteria is. Do they think experience with ICANN matters? Have they looked at his - his commitment is to development. He is very much an expansionist in the development space.

Elisa Cooper: Okay well maybe we should discuss this further on our CSG call which is later today. I saw that David has his hand raised and then probably we need to move on to a policy update. David.

David Fares: Yeah, I think it has been our policy generally to try and have potential Board candidates speak with the members. I think we did that for Avri and Bill recently too so I think we'd want to try and do that indeed.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, no, I agree. And we are meeting later today with the CSG Executive Committee. And so I think the feeling from the IPC is they're not, yeah, they can't do anything until they get a better understanding of him as well.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, and that's also true of the ISPs. And I want to be clear, I'm not saying we shouldn't talk to him, I'm just trying to be really clear with members that he isn't even yet a candidate so you would be having an informal conversation with him, that's my only point that I...

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: ...I'm trying to be...

Elisa Cooper: All right. Thanks, Marilyn. Steve, let me turn it over to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Elisa. Folks, I send around a policy calendar two days ago. Hoping that everyone has received that. This is dated May 13. I'll first start off by recapping the fact that we filed two comments since our last call. One was on the IANA transition process.

That one was very well received by several members. A special thanks to Marilyn, Aparna, Phil Corwin, Andrew Mack and I was the other one who did the drafting.

Ours was quoted in Kevin Murphy's Website, domaininsight.com, as among those that called out three principal problems with ICANN's process for the IANA transition. And I think we have an echo chamber of others who agreed with us on three major points.

One is that this committee should not steer but rather convene or coordinate and it ought to be open to stakeholder group participation including constituency level, as opposed to the Chairman of the Board and Chair of the GAC simply handpicking folks that they wanted on the steering committee.

The second major point is that ICANN's statement on restricting the scope for what the IANA transition could look at was unduly restrictive, to use Fadi's own words, when something like this came up at NETmundial. And so the scoping should be determined by the convening committee and it should not necessarily be dictated ahead of time by ICANN management.

And third, the BC was in good company at suggesting that ICANN's accountability track, which was just opened last week, is a prerequisite really to the IANA transition since the IANA contract ends up being one of the chief measures of keeping ICANN accountable. So thanks again on the filing.

Second, the Strategy Panel on Multistakeholder Innovation, that report was filed thanks to Gabby, Chris Chaplow, Andrew Mack for drafting that. It was really a solid comment that went in. And again that's on a high level strat panel so we don't expect them to do much with that.

I'm sorry, did somebody need something? Are we having echo issues?

Elisa Cooper: It sounds okay.

Steve DelBianco: Okay thanks for piping in. So real quickly there's six open public comments. The first I want to turn to Ron Andruff, who's on the call. Ron drafted a very brief comment on policy advisory boards, and these would be there for the new gTLDs who are operating a string in what is called a regulated industry. And this is pursuant to GAC advice.

Now comments closed end of last week but we told ICANN staff we would be getting one in. I circulated Ron's draft comment and member review - BC members need to give me comments on it by tomorrow close of business. Ron, would you like to take a minute or two and explain what you're doing so we can take questions right here on this call?

Ron Andruff: Thanks Steve. Not too much to add to what you've just said. I think you've captured it pretty well. What I tried to do was - with regard to the - having created the - or being one of the creators of the policy advisory Board model is we're really looking for safeguards for the public interest to make sure that when anyone goes looking at any of these strings, dotInsurance, dotBank, dotHealth, dotPharmacy, whatever they might be that in fact that they are - they're going to a place where the policies it would be something they would expect in a regulated world.

And so I kept the comments in-line with our previous BC comments and it specifically referring to the safeguards where that BC believes that working in consultation with relevant regulatory bodies to make sure that harm mitigation strategies are promoted is the way forward.

So that's really what we did. I went back and thanks to you for leading me to the previous BC positions to make sure that we are - this is just a follow-on from where we've been in the past. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Ron. And, folks, Ron did a great job summarizing everything that's sort of the pre for the comment. But Ron's proposed BC position is, you know, is a clarification bringing forward what we've done in the past. And it's the last two paragraphs on Page 3 of his document. So please refer to that. It was the first attachment - probably be the only attachment on today's policy calendar.

So I'll take a queue for questions for Ron so we can work this out and get this approved and submitted. Okay, seeing no hands why don't we proceed then to the next item? Thank you, Ron. If we get no further comments from members by tomorrow night we'll be submitting that to ICANN. Appreciate your leadership on that.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Second one is ICANN's five year - you're welcome. Next one is ICANN's five-year strategic plan. Chris Chaplow and Tim Chen have been working on that. Tim, I believe you're on the line. I don't think Chris was able to join us today. Anything to report on when you and Chris thought you might get a draft around for BC members to review? Tim is on but doesn't have a microphone he's telling us in the chat.

So we'll have time to get around to this one. And it's not due until the 31st of May. And I realize that some elements of five-year strat plan were only just released.

Number 3 on here, we elected not to do - there's sort of been an opportunity to comment on cross community working group input to the NETmundial. We really believe that events overtook that. Thanks to Marilyn, Aparna, David and Phil for participating but probably the BC will not be doing a comment on that.

Number 4, interim report on internationalized registration data so this is the data that's held in Whois that has, in non-Latin scripts. Reply comments are due by the 27th of May. The BC has not, in the past, commented too significantly on this. Are there any BC members how want to register a strong degree of interest in internationalized registration data? Again, Whois data, non-Latin scripts. Great.

Next one, this'll be fast then. There's a Board member compensation proposal, it's an amendment to ICANN's bylaws. And initial comments are due the 23rd of May. We'll have into June for the final set of comments. And this was an amendment on paying Board members.

And I have just read the amendment and it doesn't look as if it tells us the amount they're going to pay the Board members. I believe it's really just setting up the opportunity to do it. Are there any comments in here on - on BC members or interest in having the BC weigh in on paying Board members of ICANN?

Personally I don't think it's a bad idea. They put roughly 20 hours a week in on average. It's a very significant amount of work. And I imagine that some amount of compensation is necessary to attract the kind of people they really want. Looking for a queue. Any BC members want to weigh in on this or participate in - I see Angie Graves has got a checkmark. So I assume that means you agree with the position I just mentioned?

And Andrew Mack, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes, Steve, thanks. I agree completely. I think it's especially difficult when you're talking about trying to attract a more diverse group of people. It's just,

you know, economically impossible the amount of time that you're asking for a lot of people from parts of the developing world and things like that. So I would be in favor of it; it makes sense.

Steve DelBianco: Well let me - thanks, Andrew. Let me ask if anyone else on the phone wants to weigh in. I mean, it may be that there's enough consensus that I could draft a paragraph to that effect. I see Ron Andruff in the queue. Go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Steve. We led the charge - the BC led the charge some years ago to get some compensation for the Board members because of that all the work that they put in. And I think that there's - there was a lot of pushback then but, you know, fortunately we have something for them now.

But I think it's important to also to note from a NonComm perspective when we're having conversations with the search firms and others the amount of compensation that ICANN pays its directors right now is so low that it's almost a non-issue insomuch as they don't even discuss it in any great detail with the candidates and other than to say it's a very, very low compensation.

So I think that it's important for our members to know that while the Board is compensated the compensation amounts are radically different than what anybody else to do this kind of work at this level. So I think that it's a good thing to have and I would support it. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Ron. Anybody would disagree that the BC would be supportive of this amendment? If anyone disagrees let me know now, otherwise I'll proceed with a draft and circulate it.

Elisa Cooper: Steve, this is Elisa. Just to go back to your former request for the internationalized domain name Whois data, I'll draft something on that.

Steve DelBianco: Well thanks very much, Elisa. Anyone else interested in helping Elisa, who has experience at using Whois data that is non-Latin scripts? Tim Chen on the chat, Elisa, has just agreed to help out, which is fantastic.

Elisa Cooper: Okay thanks, Tim. I'll send you a draft and then we'll coordinate.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: I'll do a first scan of the last several years of policy positions on this for the BC. And I will send it to Tim and Elisa just in case we've done something on it before that I can be helpful with, okay? Thanks again.

All right turning to the next item which is the final item I've got which is the brand new process that Fadi announced at NETmundial, the idea of a parallel interrelated process of examining ICANN's accountability mechanisms, doing a reset of ICANN's accountability mechanisms. Initial comments due the 27th of May.

This was the one that Elisa spoke of at the beginning of our call where we had several BC volunteers already who are interested in getting engaged. And, Elisa, you discussed with Marilyn a way of soliciting - with David Fares as well - a straw poll of BC members on who would represent the BC to the extent that we'd be able to name two people.

But keep in mind that whatever position, whatever written position or whatever position is advocated by the BC's representatives will be sorted out through the regular BC policy development process, the one that we use now, circulating comments for others to look at.



So the 27th of May is, at this point, less than 14 days away so we will have to have an expedited review but we're going to need to get on it right away. Marilyn Cade, for instance, suggested an initial get together, phone call, this Saturday to start to work it out. And I believe I can do that as well but we'll let folks reply to that by email.

I did want to suggest that the accountability mechanisms are not just the affirmation of commitments. That's a huge one because that includes things like the accountability and transparency review and the other reviews that are done on ICANN.

But there are at least three other mechanisms that have been discussed that may need a reset as well. I'll quickly recap those. One is the Independent Review Panel where an accountability structure's expert panel in 2010 recommended that ICANN create a standing panel of independent review panel folks that could be called upon for reviews. They haven't done that yet even though the bylaws require it.

The second is a reconsideration process, a lot of weaknesses there. And the third was the ombudsman office. So there's three in addition to the affirmation of commitments that should be on the table for discussion. I'll take a queue now for anyone else who wants to give ideas so we can start to flesh this out. We're going to need to move quickly.

I see hands from Andrew Mack and then David Fares. Go ahead, Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Steve, this is mostly just a clarifying question. Do we have a sense of how this is supposed to dovetail with the work that's already been done, ATRT 2 and things like that? I think that's a little bit of confusion for me.

Steve DelBianco: ATRT 2 did findings and recommendations. Their recommendations were supposed to carry a significant assumption that ICANN will implement the ATRT 2 recommendations along with the ATRT 1 recommendations from 2010...

Andrew Mack: RIGHT>

Steve DelBianco: ...that haven't been implemented. So I would suggest, Andrew, that we can look at recommendations that came out of both ATRT 1 and 2 and if there are any of those that are useful for the reset of accountability we would repeat them and amplify them in the filing that we put in. But I don't believe there's any formal tie-in or overlap between the ATRTs and this reset.

Andrew Mack: Okay, just trying to get...

Steve DelBianco: Anybody else want to weigh in on that?

Andrew Mack: ...good views for what the work we've already done, that's all.

Steve DelBianco: That's right. So I'll tell you what, that would be one of the tasks that we would want to do is to have the volunteer from the BC dive into the ATRT 1 and 2 and pull forward accountability-relevant items because there's much more in the ATRTs than just accountability but if somebody could dive into the unfulfilled recommendations. Any volunteers to do that? It's a relatively bite-sized task it would help to get us jump-started.

While you're thinking about that, David Fares.

David Fares: Thanks, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

David Fares: And this is really just a clarification. I don't recall seeing an email regarding a call on Saturday. Could you recirculate that please?

Steve DelBianco: Sure. Marilyn sent it out this morning, David. And I'll circulate it more widely. Marilyn, you're still on the line, right? I don't know whether we still have her.

David Fares: I think it would be - the weekend is a bit difficult for me, not just because it's a weekend but this weekend in particular. If we could do it on a business day that'd be much - much easier I think.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, that's a great point. We did lose Marilyn's line. But, David, please reply on that once I circulate Marilyn's note as well.

All right see no other hands in the queue and so that's it for policy, Elisa. And turn it back over to John and Gabby.

Elisa Cooper: So...

Gabriella Szlak: Hello, can you hear me okay?

Elisa Cooper: I know that John was going to join but now he cannot so, Gabby, over to you.

Gabriella Szlak: Okay thank you. Can you please check that you hear me okay?

Elisa Cooper: We can.

Gabriella Szlak: Hello?

Elisa Cooper: We can.

Gabriella Szlak: Oh okay thank you. So basically there were two most relevant topics at the Council call. The first one was about the motion on Specification 13 and the other one was about the GNSO review and the 360 assessment and the formation of a working group party - yeah, working group party to act as a liaison in this process.

So regarding Specification 13 well maybe you all know but I will explain this again, the Council received a request from the New gTLD Program Committee to provide advice as to whether the Council believed that an additional provision that was included in Specification 13 that allows registry operators to designate up to three exclusive registrars - this was a proposal from the Brands - was inconsistent with the letter and intent of Policy Recommendation 19 on new gTLDs.

And this recommendation, for those that are not familiar with, is about an obligation for registries to treat registrars in a nondiscriminatory fashion. So there were lots of discussions in the Council. We also had Martin Sutton that came and talked with us, not in this call but before that.

And there was very interesting discussions and negotiations and finally a motion was passed. And now I think it's a good motion for us because it's in line with BC's position. And it's about - so the Council says actually that Specification 13 is inconsistent with Recommendation 19 but at the same time notwithstanding that the Council does not object to implement this specification as a whole which is actually good for the Brands and what they wanted to do.

So the BC has historically recognized the importance of the single registrar model for the Brands so we believe this was really good. Actually John did a great job in these negotiations.

And the other topic that was interesting was about the GNSO review. And this is related to what Elisa talked at the beginning of the call that a call for volunteers was circulated to form these GNSO review working party to function as a liaison between the GNSO, the independent examiner and the SIC, well Structural Improvements Committee, to provide input on review criteria and the 360 assessment.

So it's great that we have two volunteers already because we had to answer very fast. This process has already kicked off the 7th of May. So I think that's all for my part. And I can receive questions if you have some. Thank you. Any questions?

Elisa Cooper: It appears that there are not so thank you so much, Gabby.

Gabriella Szlak: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: So I know that there are a few more members that have - I'm sorry let's see if we can mute Gabby's line. Okay. So it appears there are a few more members that have joined the call since we started. And we do have some additional time today so are there any other topics that members wanted to bring to the table or to discuss?

Okay, it appears that there are not. I don't actually have any other topics to discuss. We are, once again, drawing close to the next ICANN meeting so I will just let you know that we are in discussions with the CSG in terms of what we'll be discussing at our joint CSG meeting and as we get a little closer

I'll start soliciting information about what you want to discuss at our BC only meetings in terms of items for the agenda and so forth.

So unless there are any other topics to discuss I will give you back 20 minutes of your day. I will stop here and just check again to see if there's anything else people or members wanted to discuss?

Okay, with that I'll give you 20 minutes back. I hope you guys have a great day and we'll talk soon. Thank you so much.

David Fares: Thanks all.

Coordinator: Thank you. And this does conclude today's conference. You may disconnect at this time.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks very much, (Elan), you may now disconnect at this time.

END