SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Silvia. We are going to start today's meeting, so I'll ask Susie Johnson to kindly proceed with the roll call, so that we can start with today's call.

SUSIE JOHNSON: Thank you Sergio. Welcome to the LACRALO ccTLD Working Group. Today is Thursday, 8th of May 2014 at 22:00 UTC. Attendees are, in the Spanish channel, Sergio Salinas Porto and Aida Noblia. On the English channel is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Apologies from Jacqueline Morris. From staff we have Silvia Vivanco and Susie Johnson. The interpreters from today will be Sabrina and David. A friendly reminder, as this call is being recorded, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you, Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Susie. I'd like to thank you all for joining us on this call, and I'll be sending an email to the list, asking our Working Group Members, or rather reminding them that they have to do as Jacqueline Morris did. That is, if they're unable to participate they have to present their apologies and inform that they'll not participating, so that if we have a smaller number of participants we're not going to be incurring unnecessary expenses with ICANN.

I'd also like to thank our interpreters, Sabrina and David, who are kindly working on this meeting. I was not able to thank them for their participation when we started the call. Now, let us focus on the AIs. We

had some topics pending review from our prior meeting. Since Dev is on the call I'd like to ask him if he now formally accepts the position of Chair of this Working Group, so that we can finally have the necessary structure for our meeting. With that, I'll give the floor to Dev to listen to his input. After that we'll start with this meeting. Dev, go ahead please. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Sergio. Firstly, Sergio, regarding the timing of these calls, I'm beginning to think it's because there are so many emails, and having an email come out just two days before makes it difficult to actually try to adapt. Perhaps we probably do need to standardize at least a week at which calls should occur, so it becomes part of a standing call, if we're doing one per month. For example, our LACRALO calls are the 3rd Monday of the month.

We could probably say our monthly calls for the ccTLD Working Group is the second Thursday of each month. That's a suggestion. The second suggestion is that maybe the email notice did go out two or three days ago, but we're all drowning in emails, so it probably might be better if the email notice went out to our general LACRALO mailing list. That's my second suggestion. Now, regarding your third question, regarding being the Chair, I have to admit I'm a big surprised about this.

Perhaps someone has not sent me an email on this? Can you clarify exactly what you mean when you say the Chair of this Working Group? I was under the impression I was only being considered as a Vice Chair, along with you. That's it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: There was a misunderstanding. I was saying Vice Chair. This is what I meant. Not Chair. I'd like this to be on the record so that we can proceed formally with our meeting. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks for clarifying Sergio. Well, I heard the word Chair only when you first were speaking. Okay, regarding being Vice Chair, I have to confess I feel I'm very snowed under, especially when it comes to dealing with the At-Large Summit and so forth. I'm a little concerned that I'm stretching myself too thin. I'd perhaps nominate somebody else to be a Vice Chair because I feel like I'm not going to be able to give enough time to this Working Group, as I'm already committing to so many other Working Groups.

Although I'm very appreciative of this, and I'm a person that's very interested in the ccTLD Working Group, I don't think I want to be a Vice Chair at this point.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Dev. I don't know if you have any further comments, but thank you for your sincerity. I know of your current workload. You are engaged in different At-Large-related activities, so I understand your position. My reply is the following. When we hold our next meeting and all the members of the Working Group are present, we should nominate another Working Group member to be the Vice Chair of this group, so

that we share responsibilities regarding the topics to be addressed by this Working Group.

Maybe at one point I won't be able to participate, so we should have somebody else in that role. So in principle, thank you for being sincere. We accept your reply, because we know that you will give your best in this group. The next item to be addressed, as Dev said, is the meeting notification. We had a Doodle poll with some tentative dates to hold the meeting, and it was sent out quite in advance. Afterwards, on the 5th of before that, an email was circulated informing about this meeting.

We might have to tweak this, or else accept Dev's proposal, which is very interesting. Maybe we could take that on board now and say that if the second Thursday of each month we have our ccTLD Working Group meeting, well, in that case we are going to hold the meeting on that day, and there'd be no further need to send out the Doodle poll. Here is a question to the group – and there's only three of us on the call – what would be the most suitable day and time for us to hold our meeting, from Monday to Friday?

Is there any day in particular with a lighter workload. Dev, go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. For me, I don't know if there is a day with a lighter workload. I would suggest – especially given there are only three of us, and there are more members in this Working Group, I would say, just have a Doodle to specify which day… I guess there are two things. We want to have these calls in the evening around this time. I believe that's the

general consensus of the group, to have it on an evening, because to have it during the day it's too hard, given people are at work and so forth. So I think generally we want to have it in the evenings.

The second question is really, which day is the best day? I'm thinking Thursday is probably suitable, but we really just need to ask the group once more to standardize which day is the best day, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday. I think Friday would personally be too difficult, but unless for ICANN staff that is possible, we should probably just leave it to Monday through Thursday, and just ask the group which day is best. Then we should standardize it on, say, the second week of each month.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Dev. I wrote that I prefer Thursday. So did Aida. We will do as you say. We'll take your suggestion on board. We'll circulate the Doodle poll, so I'll ask Silvia and Susie to take note of this. We'll try to do it as quickly as possible, so that we're able to hold our next call, because it will be before the London meeting. It would be interesting to do this as soon as possible. Silvia Vivanco right now is not on the AC room, because she's facing some connectivity issues, but surely a summary of this meeting will be circulated on the ccTLD Working Group list, and shortly we'll be receiving that Doodle poll.

Now, let us know focus on the other Items on the Agenda. We will have to focus on other Items. I see Silvia is back. Welcome back, Silvia. We have some topics to address. Dev, we will update you on what we've been doing. Maybe you haven't been able to follow up on our activities. We have a survey, and I'll try to access the Wiki, if you can bear with me

for a second. Or maybe somebody can post the link to access the Wiki on the chat room? That would be appreciated, because we have our survey there.

This survey was developed in cooperation with Aida. I also made some contributions. Thank you Aida, I see the link. The idea is to circulate the survey in our region, at least in the locations where we are. Now, along those lines, and that working methodology, the idea is to get together with the people in charge of the NIC registries, so as to have this social map, if you will, of ccTLDs in our region.

I'll ask Aida to kindly read the questionnaire so that we have it interpreted on the call and we have it on record, and so that Dev can listen to the questions being read out loud in his native language, in English. Aida?

AIDA NOBLIA: Okay, we had spoken about this on our prior call. We proposed some questions in order to make up a questionnaire for ccTLDs. I wrote, who is the manager of the ccTLD in your country? Is that a public or private organization? Is it a university? Is it [outsourced 16:24]? Does the manager hold a permanent position? How long does the term of that manager last? How many domain names are registered at present? How many domain names were registered in prior years, or initially?

Do people have to pay for a domain name? If so, how much would the fee be? How often, and what would the proportion be? Is this financially feasible for the population in general, or is it expensive? This is a little bit of a relative question. How many ccTLDs are related to the

business community, to government agencies, to private entities, to professionals, etcetera? Or, do you have any other information? How many ccTLDs or provinces are represented? Does the Government pay for the domain name?

Also, Sergio added the following: the name of the people in charge of that. Their contact email, a phone number, the user email of the person related to that ccTLD. So we had also spoken about the protection of personal data, and also we'd like to have a contact phone number. Also, the local legislation, or the local legal framework for domain names. This was suggested by Sergio: which gTLD would be linked to the ccTLD? What is the expected growth rate for the next year, and for the next five years?

So, we should integrate all these questions, and hopefully someone else will make another contribution or provide further input. This is the questionnaire. I contacted the person in charge of the ccTLD in Uruguay. It's a state-run university, not a private university. That person explained to me that they delegated the .com to the national telecommunications administrations entity. I explained to that person that we were considering a questionnaire, and that I'd be sending the questionnaire to him.

Of course, that person has no issues at all. I gave him the address to access our Wiki, and I told him, "Welcome to ICANN," because he was interested in getting more information. I'm considering contacting LACNIC, also to get further information. That's all from my part. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much Aida for your repot. I don't know if Dev would like to add anything, but what I can say is that I held an informal meeting with the people in charge of the ccTLD in Argentina. The idea is to finalize this questionnaire and post it on the Wiki. But now we have to decide whether we should leave this on the Wiki, if we should compile all the questions, all the information. What do we do with all the data that we'll be obtaining? Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Sergio. Well, one thing I would suggest regarding the questionnaire, is to really… You'll probably need some introductory paragraph, just to explain what the questionnaire is. Also, the objective of the questionnaire, because I just heard the questions regarding the proposed questions, but I didn't really hear a clear paragraph or two explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and introducing the reasons why we're doing this, and what our goals are. We need that text to be formalized first before this questionnaire is sent out.

Secondly, well, just hearing the questions that Aida has mentioned, I heard things like, for example… Well, I think you have to also make sure to really get these questionnaires on the Wiki separately, because I think the way it was phrased by Aida probably needs more clarity. For example, when you say for example, "Is the ccTLD outsourced?" I understand what that means, but I do think it needs to be a little more clearer. For example, you really want to say, "Are the technical

functions of the ccTLD operations outsourced?" Just to bring more clarity to the questions.

So those are my two suggestions. Also, finally, I heard Aida say LACNIC. We're looking to contact LACNIC, but it's really LACTLD. LACTLD is the organization for ccTLD operators in Latin America and the Caribbean. LACNIC is the organization dealing with IP addresses. So LACTLD is the more appropriate organization regarding a questionnaire for ccTLDs.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Dev. I'm not really sure what it is that you're talking about LACNIC about, but it may be… There may have been some mistake. We are talking about nic.ar. This is the NIC in Trinidad and Tobago. About the outsourcing, I do agree that we should deepen on that, and I think we are putting together different paths. In Latin America, in Spanish Latin America, when we talk about outsourcing, we talk about the fact that the state put the administration of that, [inaudible 24:01] that only the technical issues, but also the administration, was placed in companies, or in universities, that are third parties, with respect to the state.

They are outside the national state. In the case of Argentina, all of the administration is placed on the state, and it is the state, the one that has the missions, to spread out the work of the .ar processes, so that they can have a higher number of domains acquired in our country. In fact, there was a number, around three million, domain names in Argentina, resulting from this policy that the state has applied. So I think we need to deepen it a little more in what the survey is saying, and I think we'll

need to take two different [tasks/parts 25:01] on this issue, which is the outsourcing issue.

The survey is outsourced, or if the NIC is outsourced, how is it outsourced? Is it only the administration, or is it the administration and also the technical issues? So I think this is how this goes. Do you agree with this, Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, just to clarify, I'm not certain how you could say that an administration of the ccTLD is outsourced, because I'd think that question is obviously no, because all of the organizations that run ccTLDs – and correct me if I'm wrong – are organizations within those countries. So I don't understand why you're asking if the administration part is outsourced. Sergio, can you think of any examples where the administration of the ccTLD is outside of the country? That's why I understand the question of outsourcing needs.

I know of ccTLDs that have outsourced their technical functions, meaning what they have done is they've signed a company to do the actual technical running of the ccTLD, and they've also [sat 26:32], but I don't understand the administrative outsourcing part. That's it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Dev. Let me see if we can be clear with this. When a ccTLD gives its administration, and its technical issues, to a private university that is not state-run, they are outsourcing, because there is a third-party that is administrating. Here, the state has supremacy over the domain,

however the one administering this is a private company. Now, the same happens when this is given directly not to a university but to a company. I recall that there were some [inaudible 27:38] cases, such as in .pr, in Puerto Rico, even though they're not in our region it's good to consider this as an example.

In this case, I'm not sure if the state has defined that you need $1,000 to take this. Now, I do believe that we need to review this to clear our outlook and to [clear the mass 28:11] in our region, because we may find situations where a company in a country is administering this, and it's not the state. When we talk about the state, we talk about all the citizens in the country that make an administration. When we talk about outsourcing, we talk about a company or a non-state organization that is administering this.

I also remember El Salvador, or Honduras, where the administration is an NGO. It's not a federal state, and so the state has actually outsourced that. The structure of the state is not managing it, but it's actually a third-party that is taking charge of that. This is what we mean when we say outsourcing. Aida, you now have the floor.

AIDA NOBLIA: Yes. When companies take a task on their charge, but it's not them taking it, but it's actually third-parties doing it on their behalf, it's sort of an outsourcing. They ask that a part of the task of the organizations or a country is put in charge of someone else. That is that company is hired somehow, so that they can just do those tasks. In our case, the

university delegated. There are different ways of delegating, but the function is on the university, and I have not really deepened on this.

I don't really know how ANTEL, which is a state-owned entity, a state-owned telecom company, how it is that they have the .com. This does not mean though that it's international. It may or may not be international, but it's actually showing a relationship between two companies, one of which has one function, and it delegates part of this function to someone else, which may or may not be international. The concept we used is precisely that concept.

As for the questionnaire, this was presented here as… I mean, I totally agree that it has to have a first explanation paragraph. This is actually a draft that we're presenting so that we can receive other input and a more orderly structure, even with a more orderly format. Yes though, I agree that this is an improvement that we need to make.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Aida for your comments. I'd like to ask a question about what Dev has just posted. This is related to putting this on the Wiki. This is already on the Wiki Dev. I'm actually having a look on the Wiki right now. The questions are on the Wiki. They are there, the ones that Aida mentioned. Now, aside from this, we will put them again there. We'll upload them again, so I suggest we add everything that Dev has added to this, so that these can be discussed again, and so that we can see this. Dev, you are raising your hand, so please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Okay, in relation to... When I said the questions should be put up on the Wiki, I saw Aida had put it in a comment on our Working Group page, but what I meant was a separate page entirely, "survey questions" or something. Give it that title and put the questions there so then all of us can see it better and comment on it, or make additions, modifications. That's what I meant when I said it needs to be on the Wiki. Then of course we can point people to that specific link and say, "Here are the proposed questions," not, "Scroll down the page to a comment."

Of course, this makes it easier for us to modify the page, and update the questions and so forth, rather than… So that's what I mean. Regarding the question, Sergio, with the explanation for outsourcing, I think I begin to understand it more, and I guess it's going to be a potential difference of opinion, because I'm one that believes that ccTLDs do not need to be state-run. It needs to be a multi-stakeholder organization involved in the running of a ccTLD, including governments, but also the civil society business, etcetera.

Potentially, having something under government control, there are downsides to that. One potential downside is that the government would run in a closed fashion, so that it's not open for citizens to raise issues. It would be purely under government control. Secondly, governments change and have new administrations, and at times, let's just say that potentially the running of their ccTLD is not considered a priority. I'm of the opinion that ccTLDs need to be more independently run.

When I say independently, I mean independently in that in there's a particular organization dedicated to running the technical function, and there's a policy body within the country that brings all of the inputs of governments, civil society, all working in a multistakeholder fashion. In any case, the question then, the part about outsourcing, needs to be reworked. I think Aida mentioned – and I see it on the comments page – about where it is run, and so forth.

So perhaps that question could be expanded with some multiple-choice options, to say private/public partnership, government-run, etcetera. That's it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: First of all, I'd like to thank Dev for his intervention. Then I wanted to say that we have also made a presentation, a few years ago, and we keep insisting that the Argentine state, in the case of Argentina, should have an Internet administration committee, similar to the one in place in Brazil, with the participation of users, civil society, the telecommunication workers, the companies, and the state itself, and academia as well.

I think we will agree actually with Dev, that the difference here is a technical difference on who is the one running it. There is no personal opinion on it. If you ask me then what I want is an organization of the NIC administration in the whole of Latin America, where users – and this is a sartorial issue – that users can have a participation and academia and civil society can have participation as well.

This should be [multistaketorial 38:02] and I think we should discuss what's going to happen with our domain name, as a user, as an organization that defends the rights of users. So I am going to fully agree with Dev, and it's very nice to see that we're on the same page.

On the other hand, we do have the obligation – and this is just a technical issue, to know how the administration works in each of those countries. The question is, outside an ideological thinking of how this administration should be – and I see Dev and I at least do agree on this – I think we need to know if the administration is being run by the state itself, from some kind of state office, and that if NIC was given to a private university, or a company so it could administer this flagship domain, and this was actually what I was targeting to.

I also agree with Dev that we should see whether the technological issue is also right from that point of view. I think Aida now has the floor.

AIDA NOBLIA: Well, I just want to reaffirm that I agree with Dev – and I actually wrote it in the chat – in the sense that what we are researching is what is the situation like? Because from that point of view that we have, how and why should a public university here, and the university information system, how is it that they transferred .com, and what happened with that? Also, now for example, when I talked to these people I asked them about the cost. This is the cost that the university gave one-fourth of what this cost is.

It's usually a lower cost. It's actually $25, and ANTEL is charging $60, which is not a lot, but we are talking about .com, not the others. So I

don't really know. These are specific issues, specific data of our reality, that can allow us to make some conclusions.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much Aida for your comments. I see Dev is adding something else to rephrase the question. I think what he is saying is okay, because he says something like… Let me have a look at this. He's saying, "What type of organization is running the ccTLD? Is it s non-profit, is it a private company, a government-run company? An entity administered by the government?"

We could rephrase this to give it a different flavor, and add some reply options. I'd also add an item saying "other" because there may be some other kind of organizations that may not even be mixed, and to leave this open so that if there's something that does not work, and cannot fit in any of these possibilities, the person answering this can [adjust 42:07] it any way. We could add something like "other comments". So if we agree with this… Is there something else? Is there something else you would like to add?

Okay, I see nobody would like to add anything, so I'm going to go on with this meeting. The next issue the metric sent to the LACRALO Secretariat. This is a request that was made by the Chair and Secretariat of LACRALO, so that we can know how is it that we're going to work. This was Item #4 in our Agenda. I added this on the Wiki, but I'm going to read this. Basically what I'm going to do it list the metrics – the most important part – and we have the first progress report to be finished by May 15th.

We still have one week to complete this. Another deadline we have is the second progress report, which will be finished by June 2015. I think perhaps we can move this date? Perhaps we can do this after the London meeting. Then there's a fourth one, which is going to be the last progress report for August 2015. Now, by September 2015 we should deliver a final report. These deadlines that I just stated, this was just so we could have an objective and go along that path.

I think the first stage will be the easiest one, because it will imply meeting with each of the ccTLD administrations in our countries. They are usually close to us, or we can come closer to them. We can just ask those questions from this questionnaire. The most complex task will be to work with those ccTLDs where we have no representation – [that were 44:41] an organization within LACRALO. So by that time, for that stage, I also have talked to Eduardo Santorio from LACTLD and I've asked two things:

First, to approach this group formally, to the [NICs 45:04] that we're submitting, and on the other hand, he said he was going to work on everything we needed. I thought that perhaps we can have a meeting and invite LACRALO to participate in the meeting, provided by LACTLD, dealing with domain names in our region, and specifically to have a set of questions or issues that we'd like him to address, so that he can really prepare this issue and be focused on it.

The last time he came to us, we didn't really take advantage of him. He was on a LACRALO meeting, maybe last year, and I think it's very interesting to have him here again among us. The Working Group then should take some kind of activity to LACRALO. This would of course be

after our GA, and this activity should aim at training our members. I think those of us who need to help him in the root of his talk will be us actually.

I now open the floor to any of you that would like to talk about this, or just give your input or opinion. The floor is open. Go ahead Dev, please?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Sergio. I think having the person from LACTLD give a presentation, or have a conference call with us, would be very useful. Thinking more and more about it, I'm quite certain that perhaps LACTLD already has the answer to many of these questions in the proposed survey, so in fact they may be able to already have the data for us to look at in terms of how many domains various ccTLD have. I think it would also give us a better understanding on the ccTLD situation in Latin America and the Caribbean.

So I think definitely that's important. I think perhaps after that, would that knowledge that is available, we could probably obtain it from LACTLD and that could better inform our activities. For example, I noticed that one of the scope of actions is to make a map of the situation of each of the member countries of LACRALO ccTLDs. I'm quite certain that LACTLD has something like that already in their visual presentations, as to what countries are in LACTLD and so forth. Maybe that needs to happen first.

Then when we've gotten some information as to the type of information already out there, that can inform our activities and our scope for work.

That's my first comment. Regarding the final report at number 15, I'm not sure that's really clear because one, you have the London Summit happening next month, and then, well, I don't think we'll be able to get that much work done before then. Perhaps we can indeed get LACTLD coming onto the LACRALO calls for example, and giving a discussion about LACTLD and so forth, and learning as much as we can about that.

The second thing is, I'm looking at the scope of action, as posted by you, Sergio. I'm not really seeing any interaction on any of the policy issues now in ICANN that affect ccTLDs, that we want to look at and give comment on. I thought this was one of the concepts of having this Working Group in the first place, rather than not just defining and proposing the perspective of ccTLD processes.

Maybe that second point, to offer a watching brief on policy issues, related to ccTLDs, that we wish to comment on, has been dropped by the group. I wasn't present on the last two calls, so… That's it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Dev for your interventions. I didn't really understand what it is that you mean. I need you to be more clear so that I can understand it. Can you please elaborate a little more?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I fully support the idea of LACTLD having a presentation, to inform about the work they are doing. I agree fully with that. What I'm saying is that the information we learn from that experience, we can then update our scope of activities, because we may understand or see gaps

that need to be rectified, or things that are already done and we don't need to do again. That's one.

The second thing. This Working Group itself, one of the concepts, when I heard of the ccTLD Working Group, was to look at issues that are currently… There are several ICANN policies and Working Groups happening in ICANN right now, related to the ccTLDs, related to the work of the ccNSO, I should say, which is of course dealing with policy issues affected ccTLDs. I'm not really seeing anything in the scope of action as to, are we monitoring that? Are we monitoring the work of the ccNSO?

I'm now looking at the document again. I do see there's one line talking about following the work of the ccNSO and [inaudible 51:55] opinion. Maybe that covers it. It's just that it's not very prominent, because it's buried under the objective. Perhaps this needs to be a separate objective, is what I'm saying. Do you understand now, Sergio? I hope I've explained it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Dev for your intervention. It's understood now, and I'd like to add that there are two Working Groups. One of them will deal with ccNSO issues, and the other one will work on the social map. The thing is that at some point, the ccNSO Working Group was deactivated, and we need to bring this back to life again. I'm willing to work, if you want, together with you on this ccNSO issue. There were a few members only, and this is why we decided to work on the ccTLD map issue, especially to be able to have a real idea of what is going on in our region.

This is something that I can ask you about Trinidad and Tobago, and you can ask me about Argentina. This is how we're going to learn about our NICs. I'm not really sure about what's going on in Honduras, in El Salvador, in Guatemala, in Nicaragua. That is why this was necessary as well. We need to first decide if it's the egg or the chicken, and we need to choose one of the two. We cannot have many front-open ones. We have a limited number of members in the group.

However, I do agree with you that the ccNSO issue is very important. Silvia is telling us we only have five minutes more, and I'd like to take this time just to see how it is that we're going to work. There is a mailing list that we can use so that we don't invade the LACRALO list with the ccTLD emails. We have our own ccTLD mailing list, so it's good for us to use it and discuss. There's also the Wiki where we can discuss issues. In principle, let us try to use the mailing list.

Let us give life to the mailing list and let us discuss on that. I'm not really sure whether this mailing list is translated, but if it's not we can use Google Translate. Google Translate or Bing!. Bing! I think is better than Google in that sense. I actually prefer to copy and paste the text if necessary, and to translate it myself and not have it translated by the automatic translation machine we have on the list. This is my suggestion.

I also suggest that we keep in contact so that we can reach our goals. The metrics are there. They are in place, and this is something that we can review on the next meeting, but we can make it flexible and reorder them. We can add some new deadlines. I think September 2015 for the

map is a good deadline, and if it's not, then it's going to be October 2015, or November, but then we can reach it.

It is now 8:00. It's in fact 8:05. I'd like to thank our interpreters. I'd also like to thank our staff, and you, who've been working with us during this hour, during this teleconference. I'd like to suggest, Silvia and Susie, and I also think that Gisella is connected, that you start assembling a Doodle with a possible deadline. Now I'm going to send, via Skype or email, some indications on the days and dates, so that we can have it at a better time. So, good evening to you all.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you everyone, and thanks again to the interpreters.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]