

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi**  
**September 1, 2015**  
**10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may begin.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, (Toni). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.  
This is the monthly NCSG Open Policy Call on Tuesday the 1st of September 2015.

On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, (John Curr), (Ramina Cabarra), (unintelligible), Marilia Maciel, Joy Liddicoat, Adam Peake, Stephanie Perrin, Klaus Stoll, Bill Drake, (Rosanna Badi), (Jim Gannon), David Cake, (Wally Alsakab), (unintelligible) Robin Gross. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking transcription purposes. Thank you so much. Over to you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Maryam. And thanks to everyone to make time to join the call today.

I see a few new names in Adobe Connect, so I want to welcome them. And just to give kind of an explanation what this - the purpose of this call. So we have a monthly call basically to discuss ongoing policy issues that is - that are discussed within the GNSO Council. So for those who don't know the acronyms, so GNSO stands for Generic Name Supporting Organization.

And we are trying here to go through the agenda that the GNSO Council meeting will have late this week on Thursday, and to have a discussion with our representative on the council so they can give us a briefing about those issues and we can then give them input as to what. So it's always an opportunity if you are a new member or newcomer to understand what's going on and to address or to get a snapshot of the current issue.

So please if you have any questions, feel free ask in the Adobe Connect if it's more easy for you to type. But you can also speak and just you need to be in the queue.

So - and for the agenda, usually we will follow as a GNSO agenda, and then we will try to get a quick update of other ICANN policy and working groups as well to see what we have to do. And then at the end if we have any other business just for any additional topic that we should talk about.

Okay, so let us start with the GNSO meeting. Maryam, can you please share the GNSO agenda? Yes thanks. Okay. So, okay, the first item - okay, so usually we have what we call the conference agenda. So it's usually when there is no - any objection, so that is a perfect, it goes quite quickly.

And yes the first item is about the election of - for the election of the next GNSO chair and then also the approval of the transmission of the combination report to the ICANN board with regard to the final report on the translation

and transliteration of the gTLD data. I think both are not, how to say, controversial issues, so I don't expect we should spend so much time on them.

We can move to the next agenda item, which is about more discussion on the public comment period for the new gTLD applicant procedure preliminary issue report. So basically this is a report trying I think to review what the first round of the new gTLD program and also to try to cover any potential topics or issues.

Before that I see that Marilia is asking a question. Yes, Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Rafik. This is Marilia Maciel speaking for the record. I see that there is a deadline to make proposals for a name of the chair and who has the right to propose them. I just wanted to ask you if (unintelligible) and do you know if any names that are being floated and if we are going to discuss those (unintelligible)?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Marilia, I didn't understand what you're asking exactly. I had a hard time to hear you well.

Marilia Maciel: Okay sorry. Just to ask a question about the election of the chair. I'm aware that each house is invited to propose a name, so just to ask you, out of curiosity, something or some names being floated on the leadership level and if we are going to discuss this at some point. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: As far as I know we didn't discuss within the Non-Contracted Party House with regard to the GNSO chair election. We still are kind of trying to respond to the Commercial Stakeholder Group about the vice chair election. So no, we didn't discuss that yet. And I think we have to hurry up about this issue. And yes the voting is open so everyone can vote without any problem.

Okay. So let's go to the - back to the agenda. We, how to say, any councilor can give a briefing or explanation about discussion here and what are the issues that were arises or we think that it may arise, and what are the concerns for NCSG here.

Yes, Marilia, item number four. Avri? Avri, are you on the call?

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm on the call. I have no comment.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Who else was on this - in the group that worked on this report? Yes, Marilia. You go ahead.

Marilia Maciel: Hi. Thanks, Rafik. Well as far I understand, the election that will be before us in the next call will be what we want to do with the first vote. (Bob) had requested an extension through each of the preliminary issue referrals for this matter because of the complexity of the topic involved. So they had requested more time, and now we are in the phase of public comment.

It just started yesterday, I think, and there is a point to discuss if we are going to extend the public comment period I think based on the fact of the complexity of the issue and the need to involve the community. And (Scott) suggested that we extend it from 40 to 60 days, which would also allow us to have some time to hold a public session about the issue on the upcoming meeting in Dublin.

So basically that's what we have in front of us. And of course we need to discuss between us what are the topics that we need to raise during the public conversation period. But for the call, this is what we need to discuss next meeting of the conversation, the public conversation.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Marilia. So first then we have a public comment and I guess the first action for us we need to work on - in submitting a statement here. So probably we need volunteers to work on drafting a response. And I see that Joy is supporting the extension. I think it makes sense, and everyone is quite busy, so it makes sense to get some extension. And if we get the public session and also in Dublin, it will be quite helpful I think.

I see that (Jim) wants to speak. Yes, (Jim)?

(Jim): Thanks, Rafik. So reading the preliminary issues report or the draft preliminary issue report, and I think we should go along the lines of extending the comment period on this. Because number one, the issues report is also quite complex and not only that, the outcome of how we're going to decide, number one, if there is going to be and if there is how we are going to match in the second round is probably one of the biggest policy issues that will come down the road in the next, you know, say, five years at the ICANN level at the Whois work.

And I think that we need to make sure that we've considered possibilities of the impact that - the impact of how we approach the PDPs and how we're going to section those off and everything else. I think a comprehensive look at how we're going to do that is required, and early on.

So I think giving us the extra time to look at what's in that preliminary issues report and also possibly kind of flesh out how we're going to approach that over the, you know, the next few years will be a useful exercise for us to do.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, (Jim). Okay. So - okay, so I see that we are supporting the extension and also Avri is reminding us that - about some practice before to

avoid the public comment ends before the ICANN meeting, which makes things more complicated for the community to submit a comment. And yes, Avri, it's the first round, but I think we tend to mistake the by the first round when I think we got - what we call the new gTLD program. Anyway.

Okay, so back to the I mean the NCSG comments. So we can draft some recommendations now or just we'll check later on the mailing list and to get some people to talk on this. So to read the report and to work on I'd say to comment it and provide maybe some recommendation.

Okay. I don't see any response here. But I see that there is ongoing discussion about - in the Adobe Connect chat and I need to have ongoing - can I still accepting applications, which would make sense, anyway. Yes. I guess it can be a part of our comment.

Okay. So any further comment on this issue? Any questions? Okay. So we can go to the next item, which is discussing a letter from the board chair in exclusive registry access for gTLD (unintelligible) representing generic strings. And honestly we need you guys here to explain what this - and to give us some explanation about this issue. So any GNSO councilor have an idea what - about this - about the content of the letter and what's - kind of what the ongoing discussion in GNSO Council about it?

Yes, Amr? Please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr, and apologies for being late to the call. I could only just get online right now. Yes to be honest, I haven't read the letter yet. I need to go over it, but my understanding is that this is a letter from Steve to Jonathan. I think it involves considering some items be included on an issues report of the PDP.

Like I said, I do need to go over the letter again. I apologize for not having done so already. Maybe I could send a brief - or just a briefing to the NCSG list later on it. But in principle if this is indeed just a consideration to include some items in the issues report for a PDP, then I don't see why we should oppose it in any way. I think we should - I think the GNSO Council in general should always support inclusion of issues into PDPs just for - because this is the issues report, it's not the actual PDP.

So what this will mean is that this is just something that is being sculpted, a potential issue that the PDP working group would have to look at and discuss. And then the PDP working group would decide on the merits or pitfalls of whatever the issue is. So if this is indeed regarding the issues report, the final issues report, then I would support including whatever it is that the letter says. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Amr. I understand that you are suggesting that we are support it because it will start the PDP. Okay. Marilia, please go ahead.

Marilia Maciel: Hi this is - I support what Amr said that we need to consider on the first issue report the issue. And the letter actually just asks the GNSO to take them through the consideration any thoughts on the PDP process (unintelligible) came from GAC on the base, meaning that it's related to strings that could be seen as having kind of a public interest.

And as far as I understand, this is related to strings like bank for instance that could cause confusion and may harm the public if they are used for the wrong purposes. So I don't think that there is much (unintelligible). We were asked to consider the issue, and I don't see why we shouldn't consider it. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Marilia. I think Amr wants to respond here. Yes, Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks. Amr. And yes I completely agree with everything Marilia said. And I don't know why this is coming in the form of a letter from the ICANN board chairman to the GNSO chair, or the GNSO Council chair. Because the preliminary issues report for the process around the new gTLDs was sort of published for public comment today, and there's going to be a few discussions regarding this issues report during the next GNSO Council meeting, one of them this letter, the other on the length of the public comment period.

But like I said, I'm not sure why this letter was sent to Jonathan on the GNSO Council. It would make more sense for me for Steve or anyone from the ICANN board to perhaps submit this as part of the public comments on the preliminary issues report so that it is included in the final issues report. And I would think that that would be a sensible approach to this, and so I'm not exactly sure why the letter was sent to the GNSO Council. This is a discussion item on the agenda, so maybe we'll learn more during the call and maybe Jonathan - I think Jonathan's going to brief us on this.

But as far - with the information I have now, I would say that the most appropriate course of action would be for Steve or someone on behalf of the ICANN board to submit this during the public comment period, which opens today.

And as far as the previous GAC advice that may have an impact on this PDP, then actually yes that should be included in an issues report for a PDP, because the purpose of an issues report is to sort of just collect everything, anything that has anything to do or may have some sort of significant impact on a PDP or might be a worthwhile discussion topic.



It should be included in the issues report and deliberated by the PDP working group once it's formed. And it's up to the PDP working group to sort of make a decision and reach a consensus on how to handle the different issues regarding the PDP and whatever's in the PDP working group charter. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Amr. Yes, (Jim)?

(Jim): Hi, this is (Jim). Just as a brief follow up. Sort of Amr, this one is kind of a rhetorical question but I believe this is something that was brought up in Buenos Aires was that the GAC is slightly concerned that there was still outstanding issues from the Beijing advice from 2013 that still hadn't been followed up by the board.

So I think the reason why it's possibly taken this form of a semi-official letter from, you know, Steve to Jonathan is possibly just to - a practical exercise by the board to take the buck of yes we have considered this and we've now, you know, said this may have policy issues - policy implications, so therefore it's a matter to go down to the GNSO and to be part of the policy process.

So I wouldn't read anything into the fact that it's an official communication. I think it's merely the board kind of passing the buck, so to speak, down to the GNSO with regards to the advice that it received from the GAC on it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri speaking. Yes, I mean this is pretty much a pending historical issue where people like me who were there when we made the policy for this last round had assumed that private usage or single registry usage of a domain name was - yes, was fine.

But we did not make a specific policy statement about it. And so therefore when all of a sudden people starting hating things like .book being used simply by one registry, one community, people flipped out about that. We had this, you know, very active year of discussion about it. And I do think it is something that we neglected to include in the report that came out of that gTLD subsequent round group.

So I tended to just see the letter as, "Hey you guys got to talk about this one" and, you know, the board basically saying, "You know, we're hoping you do come up with an answer." Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Avri. Okay that gives more explanation on the context of why we are discussing this. Okay. So what - okay so in the GNSO Council going to have the letter as their response, starting from the council call or I mean or you will figure out during the call? So I mean just talk about what kind of next steps here.

Okay. Nobody has an answer or my question was not clear. Anyway. Yes, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, I think the next step would be just to talk about that. Now the other added issue on this is the whole public interest issue that has been festering, where, you know, pretty much whether it's the NCSG as a whole or just rather a few individuals in NCSG have come out very strongly against public interest as a concern that we should have. You know, it means that it is difficult for the NCSG to know what it wants to do with it, you know. So I think our only next step is yes put it on the list of things to talk about for the next couple years.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Avri. That will keep us busy for a while I guess. Yes and the discussion about public interest in general is going to start anyway, and we -

I'm not sure yet what - how - the form it will follow and the setting that it will be made to have the discussion. But yes, I think it will kind of for the future.

Okay. Any further comment on this issue? Any questions? Yes, Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks. This is Amr again. And yes this may be a little off topic but I just figured I'd put in a little marquee remark on the public interest issue because I guess I'm one of the NCSG members who has a pretty serious problem with how the public is being used in the ICANN context.

And really my problem is when things like this come from the GAC or from the board and I say okay this is what needs to be done because it's in the public interest. I have a bit of a problem with different groups appropriating and having sort of like monopolizing the use of the public interest.

I think public interest is a very subjective thing, and different groups may have different views on what they believe may be in the public interest. And I just think that may be a better approach to that. And if it does come up in this discussion, then yes I plan on putting that argument forward. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Amr. Yes, Bill?

Bill Drake: Hello. This is a topic that a number of us have gone around in circles on for quite some time. But I'd just like to say that I'm not clear, Amr, when I hear you make that argument, which is undoubtedly true, where you go with it. This has been my problem.

I know that when we talked about this in the past, there's the argument that the term gets appropriated has been thrown forward and then people say so therefore we shouldn't talk about it. And I'm - I remain puzzled by why that

means to solve the problem. The terminology will not go away, it will not stop to be - stop being invoked, and so therefore I think there's something to be said about trying to have a principled discussion around it and try to establish some boundaries for how we think about the issue if not in some shared definition.

So I just never understood the argument that because people abuse the term, therefore we should dodge the whole issue. That just doesn't make sense to me. We are going to have to engage on this. There has been a bunch of work being done people on the board and staff - well a lot don't think that's true actually, so we can disagree about that.

But in any event, this will be coming forward after Dublin and it is in the strategic plan, and they are fixed on the idea that they have to address it. And so we're going to have to find a structured, principled way to talk about it as a group and to outline our differences and try to see if there's any common space that we can work through in order to engage with the rest of the community.

Because frankly I've had a number of people come to me and say it seems like you guys are all over the place on this issue, and it seems to be pretty fundamental. And civil society groups historically have tended to describe themselves as public interest groups. The idea that now that's verboten or that the term is apparently too problematic to even invoke, just leaves a lot of people totally confused as to where to go and how to engage with us.

So not to belabor the point, but we have to -- after we get through Dublin -- we really do have to get on top of this. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Bill. Okay it's kind of - it seems to kind of be an issue - we are talking about this issue for a while for us and how to - if we should or not discuss about public interest, how to engage if there is discussion, what kind of arguments we can put forward. I guess it's a lot about how we can frame this first, and also how what is the setting.

There will be some things starting, and that will be led by the -- what's the name -- the Public Responsibility Department, or something. So that will be led somehow by ICANN staff. So we need to be strategic (sic) here. To avoid the discussion is not going to work, so we need to have to frame what kind of limits we can put, what kind of talking point we can use and so on, so we'll have to engage anyway.

Even if there is a disagreement, we need to find some consensus on the public matter interest for many people. So we cannot just ignore that. Anyway. I see that Amr, I think, wants to respond to Bill and then David. Yes, Amr? Please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr again. And yes I did want to respond to Bill and maybe clarify my position on this. I fully understand where you're coming from, Bill, and I appreciate that greatly. And when I said that I would oppose this, I - what I meant was I would oppose the use of interest as a term specifically in this PDP.

Obviously whether I like it or not, there will be a discussion regarding the public interest and the topics of ICANN strategic plan. But within the context of this PDP, as I first said, regarding the issues report, yes if someone says this needs to be in the issues report, we want to discuss it, then yes it should be. And if they want to frame this as sort of registry access for generic strings that serve a - sort of a public interest, this should be part of the policy discussion,

then yes it should be because someone has an issue with that and we should discuss it.

But I think when I said I would oppose just sort of throwing around the term public interest and using that, I would probably do - I think that would be more appropriate when we get to the PDP working group stage. I think it would be important if the GAC or anyone else wants sort of exclusive access to a generic string for a specific registry or any form because of a public interest goal, then this - then the merit of this needs to be discussed in detail on the PDP working group and we need to understand why this serves a public interest goal, and we need to see whether we agree on whether this serves a public interest goal or not.

So if this is just in - I mean within the context of a policy, as a policy developed by the GNSO, then yes these are the sort of steps we need to go through with the public interest and the - as part of ICANN's strategic goals. Yes that's a different issue I think and I totally appreciate where you're coming from. And we obviously need to be engaged in that discussion as well.  
Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Amr. Yes, David?

David Cake: Hi there. I just wanted to more or less agree with there being discussion coming up about this. I know that we were not - we did not have a unified opinion with NCSG on it, but I had some discussions with some of my other staff members who go gunning this and they really - I mean we have to engage dedicatedly.

We won't need to engage in a unified manner; we may have a different - we may have differences of opinion, that's fine, but this issue of the public

interest is going to - I think it's going to dominate a lot of 2016 discussion at ICANN and we need to really jump in there and be - (unintelligible) really be dominating that discussion but agree that really it's motivated by public interest and cares about. And we can't let it be defined away from us by, you know, Steve DelBianco, or whoever it's going to be. We should be in the thick of that discussion.

That said, yes of course the term's being issued. That's why we've got to engage in that process and make sure it gets sort of - that we can control and constrain the ways in which people can abuse the term within the ICANN processes. That's it. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, David. Yes we have to occupy the discussion about public interest anyway.

I see Stephanie. But I'm not sure if it's an old hand or you wanted to respond.

Stephanie Perrin: No, I'd like to respond if I could here, Rafik. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I have been saying in the chat we better be sure we have the cycles for this one. It's not that I don't agree that public interest is mentioned frequently at ICANN and therefore it gets to define it. It's just that it is so complex on so many levels and there are so many different views on it, and it has been used in so many different countries in different ways, that I think it's going to be a real nightmare.

So I would recommend - I don't disagree. It's going to come up in 2016 and we may have to deal with it, and we don't want DelBianco defining it for us. But we better make sure that we understand all the different points of view so that we don't contradict each other in public, you know?

I'm in the middle of reading (Graham Greenleaf)'s excellent book on data protection law and constitutional rights in Asia, and even just in the three regions he designates in Asia, it's contradictory. And it's used in so many laws, and whoever is a practitioner in a particular area of law -- (Milton) has been eloquent on how we haven't been able to define it in telecom regulation in the United States -- that's what we're going to be looking at.

So we need some serious scholarship here to maybe not settle it but at least understand all the different points of view so that we don't take some strident position that someone else - I agree, David. I'm reading the chat. It's okay for us to disagree in public as long as we're not being stupid about it. And I'm - I'd like to put in a plea for getting educated on how complex this is. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Stephanie. Well I mean disagreeing or not it's, yes, it's not a big problem. But anyway, I think when people speak it's not clear that they are speaking on their own capacity. I think we should work on some - maybe comment, maybe a position paper just to clarify what kind of different position we have and to show that the diversity at the end is really linked to the complexity of the issue.

So that can be a good start for us at least to write something. It would be helpful also for our membership to grasp what we are talking about, what's the context, what we want to achieve, what are our concerns here, so that can be kind of a think we should work. This discussion will start anyway and it will take some time. It's not short term before.

Okay, so any further comment here? Okay, I don't see any. We - maybe we can move to the next agenda, which is a discussion regarding the protection of intergovernmental organization acronyms and the second level of - in all gTLD.



So anyone can give some update here to explain what it's about? Yes, David?  
Please go ahead.

David Cake: Okay so this is - the working group's been ongoing for some time about what's an appropriate way to not just to protect the acronyms of intergovernmental organizations but the curative rights. So, you know, we've known about registration, this is about what to do if they believe that someone has registered their acronym, you know, in an inappropriate way.

And this has been a difficult sort of full issue with the GAC right from the start with the GAC issuing a lot of sort of, you know, worried sounding and urgent but not particularly clear comments on the matter, and communiqués and stuff. (Unintelligible) this has sort of settled down where the working group has taken a lot of effort to consult with the GAC and to very carefully - I mean this has been a working group where I think there's been a lot of division within the working group on - yes it's a very divided one.

This is one where, you know, in, you know, hard against it with the IPC, and I think this is really has been quite core for the working group dealing with some very complex and hard to deal with legal issues, and the concern - because, you know, international law specifically dealing with the protection of IGO domain names is not exactly sort of an everyday area of the law. There's not a lot of - it's very hard to work out what's going on.

And the issue here really is that Phil Corwin, who one of the co-chairs of the working group, raised a concern that he thinks that the work of the working group is essentially being sort of worked around by - whether the GNSO working group is concealing the issue at some length from the serious sort of legal scholarship point of view, but it's being sort of worked around by a

bunch of representatives from the IGOs, sort of being convened by the GAC, talking directly to the board.

And the IGOs have not been participating in the GNSO process and are tending to basically create an entire - are going to create a parallel policy process that, you know, will present an opposing viewpoint. And so the issue here - I don't think this is the one where it is any real - the NCSG really has a different position to the rest of the council.

I think, correct me if I'm wrong, anyone else who has been sort of following this issue closely, but I believe it is one where the council is trying to resolve conflict with the - well specifically with the GAC and with - the GNSO rather than the council is trying to work out how to deal with an issue where the - well, I mean the IGOs, which, you know, normally are part of the GAC, do not think the - had any interest in sort of cooperating with the GNSO process and are just trying to sort of create a parallel policy process to the board.

So in the sense, this is an issue where - I mean I don't think the NCSG is sort of going hard on the outcome of this process but we do care about the process here a lot in that we - I don't think we feel we certainly feel the GNSO should be developing policy here. And while we want the GAC to, you know, provide input absolutely, the idea that there should be, you know, a parallel policy process that sort of works against the GNSO process is terrible.

So that's basically what - that's the sort of underlying background for this issue. Phil, who has been trying, you know, I think doing really good work as the co-chair of this working group, and is starting to get very concerned about it. So I, you know, I don't know what we're - I don't know what council is going to do, but I certainly feel that we, in the NCSG, should be sort of standing up for the GNSO policy process.

And I've just got to say, this is actually probably a rare example where we probably are quite probably in some agreement with the IPC here. So that's about it. Welcome to anyone else who has comments on this issue though. That's just my sort of personal sort of interpretation here of what Phil and other people in this group have been saying.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, David. I think you gave quite a lot of briefing about the issue and the historical context. Any question here or comment? Does someone want to ask something? David, is it an old hand or do you want to add something here? Okay.

Well okay if there is not further comment I guess we can move to the next item, quite exciting. It's the final report from the data metrics for policymaking working group. So it's in the public comment, and I think that Amr volunteered to prepare something. So, Amr, first are you able to share comment for review within the next day so we have quite several days now in the coming days so we should welcome that. Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks, Rafik. Yes I will try to have something up on this working group. I think there's a non-PDP working group and their initial report is out for public comments. I'll try to get something on that within the next couple of days. It won't be - I don't expect it to be terribly long; I just had some concerns on some of the recommendations and how that will affect the GNSO's PDP, the policy development process, and I think some of it might not necessarily be terribly helpful but may be very time consuming. So that's kind of the gist of what I plan on saying in the commenting. But, yes, more to come on the list in the next few days, I hope. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Amr. Okay so we will wait then for your comments to be reviewed by the membership and the policy committee. That will be quite - we will be busy but I think we can make it.

I see that Stephanie's asking a question here in the Adobe Connect. In the meantime, any question, any comment? Okay. Okay.

The next item I think is a little bit, two, maybe more, not (unintelligible) or taking much more important time and attention. And this is about ICANN Accountability Cross-Community Working Group. And we have ongoing public comment for this report. And the NCSG draft comment is led by Milton here.

But let's get some update from the working group and I mean for the participants in the working group, maybe starting with Robin, who is our representative there. Robin? Are you here? Okay. Anyone want to say something about Accountability Cross-Community Working Group? Yes, (Milton)? Go ahead.

(Milton): Just reminding people that we have a comment under preparation (unintelligible). And there was some disagreement in centers about some of the things they say (unintelligible) probably about the building adaptation. Is this an appropriate time to discuss that or should we just continue doing it on the list?

Rafik Dammak: Yes you can. I mean it's a good time to - yes it's a good opportunity to get some feedback quickly here, yes. And I am sharing the document. Yes, (Milton)?

(Milton): (Unintelligible) the document.

Rafik Dammak: Yes I shared the document, the draft in the Adobe Connect.

(Milton): I don't see it on my screen; I just see the agenda. But I have the...

Avri Doria: I just shared just shared the URL so people can click on it themselves.

(Milton): Okay good. So two things here, (unintelligible) and the sole member community mechanism constitute a radical redistribution of power in ICANN that we don't like and then there's a statement the building allocations represent a satisfactory aspect of the diversity of the Internet community as expressed in the full matrix of ICANN's supporting organizations and advisory committees.

Probably most of you know that I (unintelligible) the obvious things on that. So I think we probably really need to discuss this and come up with an acceptable resolution.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, I see that Avri wants to speak here, yes Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, well I mean only if we're going to get into discussing it and I guess one of the key points that my feelings, my beliefs, my argument stood on is that yes we are by giving the community the ability to overrule the board in many aspects we are indeed radically changing the balance of power in ICANN I mean that's very much the holding.

And so when we get into an argument of sort of saying well with increasing everybody else's power but not concomitantly increase the GAC's power so that they may have some kind of a status quo is an argument I have difficulty with.

Now I have to confess that I was probably the first one months ago to utter the sentence that they should either have one or the other. But when I argue that I'm also arguing against another argument that I've been making for a long time that all AC's and in fact advice from all SO's now should be treated the way the GAC advice is being treated in terms of its read if they go along with it fine if they don't go along with it there's a discussion and the board can still reject it.

And this whole motion that sort of says that, you know, the GAC has some special power in with the process by which their advice is considered, you know, is I think sort of an around about argument because their advice while they do have to have a discussion on it can be and has been rejected.

And I think that that's what is critical in terms of doing this. So I don't see allowing the GAC to have a vote which I'm expecting them not to take in any case because they don't want to be that deeply involved.

They don't want to vote and be responsible for in the decisions with everyone else once the need for footing. So that's why I think that arguing for and leaving out all the advisory committees and trying to make the voting balance inside the single member be the same as the voting (portionality) in the board however we try to play with the numbers on that is really not a good parallel argument.

So while I would prefer five across the board I realize that that's not going to happen. And I see what we've got in the reference implementation and now as kind of the consensus point that we've been able to reach and I don't see it as particularly (unintelligible) or bad, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Avri.

Milton Mueller: So should I just jump in with what I think or do you need to recognize me I had my hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Milton and then we will move to Omar. Yes please go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Okay, so I think actually we kind of agree on the principle which is that GAC does participate in the community mechanism they must do so as, you know, I'm going to think that as I remember it.

The problem many of us have with that is the GAC doesn't have the same status now and I think this was made clear by the transcripts on the (borough) meeting.

And in the record we know that GAC advice is more powerful and constantly whatever rules are the GNSO in the other kinds of advice. And these are governments, these are not, you know, stakeholders in the normal sense of the word.

They are people who claim to represent the entire public in their country and people who claim that they actually have a monopoly on the federation of public policy.

Now (unintelligible) GAC and take away the special advisory status of that bylaw which does not exist for any of the other AC's. And then it would make sense that we talk about them as main unequal put in a community mechanism but that's just something that we don't have at the moment.

So there is a choice we'd have to make. It really does have to be more than the other and since it seems unlikely if not impossible the GAC would give up their special advisory status.

It seems that we just have to insist that they do not be given those in the community mechanism. And I don't agree that GAC doesn't (unintelligible) well taken. I think they want both.

I think they wonder which power they can get just like all the other advisory committees and if it's possible for them to have both their special advisory status and participate in the community mechanisms they will take it, they will do it ultimately.

So I really think we have to make clear our position that we're opposed to that. (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Milton. Omar.

Omar Kaminski: Yes thanks Milton and thanks Avri, this is Omar. Yes I wanted to address one of the points that Milton made on this and I think it's a really important practical point.

Having GAC in the single member model may be problematic like from a practical perspective because the GAC has a lot of trouble working with the rest of the community intercessionally.

And you've been seeing this in the GNSO, PDP and right now there is a script going on between the - with some members from the GNSO council and some members from the GAC trying to sort of work out a process exclusively for



the GAC so that they could sort of, you know, we kind of like eased them into getting more involved with the GNSO policy development process.

And it hasn't been easy and we spent a lot of time on this so far and we've made very little progress. So Milton did raise this issue I believe on list and he said that, you know, having the GAC as part of the single member model may be a problem because they might actually just keep delaying the process until they get their act together and do some things.

So apart from the substance of reasons on why they should or shouldn't be in there I think we really also should be considering the practical reasons of whether it is feasible for them to be on this and what it will mean to everyone else trying to work with them in this model.

So I just figured I'd chime in with that thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Omar. (Jim).

(Jim): (Unintelligible) sorry I was muted. So I'm broadly in agreement with Milton. So I think one of the key things we have to remember here is we have to look at all of this in context.

So I think it's pretty safe to say that the GAC is undergoing a period of change at the moment. I have an internal debate over whether they're happy to remain an advisory body or whether they want more.

You know, it was pretty clear in Paris that we had GAC members that (unintelligible) us. You know, for a lot of GAC member's advisory, advisory may not be enough going forward and that they want to discuss their role within ICANN.

And I think that is a risk that we - once they get played by the GAC with that the GAC will utilize the work of the CCWG to get something out of the staff that wasn't necessarily there in the first place.

And I think in context of the quality among the SO's and the AC's we don't have numerical equality within all the SO's and AC's as of the moment. And I think going on the line of, you know, offering numerical voting equality to groups that are advisory in their role at the moment is a dangerous (unintelligible) CCWG is there to do.

It is not required for us to improve the accountability of ICANN as an organization. I think if we start using the CCWG to put in place organizational changes that groups have wanted for a very long time then we're perverting what the CCWG is actually there for.

And I think it might be held up with an example of how ICANN is not accountable and how some stakeholders might actually utilize the work of, you know, working groups or accountability measures in order to further their own interest or to doing what the core work is actually there for.

So I can't agree with rewriting the organizational balance of ICANN under the pretense of it being an accountability measure.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks (Jim). Well we have a queue now. Yes Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Avri speaking. I wanted to sort of discuss a couple of the points that GAC made. First of all in terms of the GAC not being a stakeholder that is actually a statement that I have trouble accepting.

And to say they're not a stakeholder because within their own areas they try to bring together all the stakeholders. That would be like saying that the GNSO can't be a stakeholder because it is multi-stakeholder in and of itself.

So I don't think that argument holds. I think that, you know, in the last answer from (James) it ignores the fact that we are overturning all of the power balance by creating a single message, the single member and that is an incredible change.

I think also sometimes, you know, we make too big of difference between what's a recommendation and what's advice. We've seen that the board can turn down recommendations and can turn down advice, you know, like I said before.

Now I would like to be able to insist that the GNSO gets the same respect that the GAC gets in terms of if you're going to go against a recommendation then we need to sit down and have a powwow with us.

And if other people are coming with other advice that's counter to our recommendation then we should be sitting down and discussing it. And that this process that only the GAC has and I agree that that's a problem but I think that the way of fixing that is not saying okay so the board won't have to talk to the GAC anymore but rather to say that the board needs to talk to everyone.

Now doing that in work stream one would be what I think (James) says is trying to achieve some long-term goals using the transition. But in this one case of - and so perhaps this is something that should be listed as a work stream two issue but in the one case of very adequately with the GAC while we are increasing everyone else's power or rather the SO's power and ALAC

seems to be an imbalance that we are creating as part of our transition work and that's where I see the problem.

I don't think and I argued all the way through ATR committee and so that's why I know it's a longer term issue that everybody should get their consideration from the board not just GAC but in taking it away from them is the solution. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri. (Matt) you hand.

(Matt): Yes quite frankly (unintelligible) on this one. On one hand I think not only because I don't agree with (unintelligible) since there is a reference model or various (themes) of the reference model.

But I do see a fundamental problem here which is Avri (unintelligible) the notion that the GAC to have this special privileged advisory (unintelligible) advising.

And at the same time none of the others have that and yes it's (unintelligible) providing them with equivalency of (unintelligible). And I think that is a fundamental problem.

And I would like to see (unintelligible) confirm that at the end of the day we should - none of these - if we are multi-stakeholder, if we are how can we operate in this construct (unintelligible) stakeholder group.

Then we should not be (unintelligible). I think one of the problems but that's not my main - my main point is that can we come up with something, some alternative or is there a way forward that would actually secure the buy in

from the stakeholders in the process because it's time for us to go into this and say we don't agree with it.

And that we should have (unintelligible) of the various models which improves (unintelligible). But it would be nice if we could find something or some way forward that would actually get some kind of support from some of the stakeholders and I'm not sure that that's going to happen.

I think there are other stakeholder groups that are comfortable with the number of votes of reference model and they're comfortable because they believe that there are other changes or other mechanisms constitute of the accountability changes that will make those (unintelligible) people might think. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks (Matt). (Stephanie).

(Stephanie Paren): Thanks, (Stephanie Paren) for the record. I'm sure those who don't know me I'm a retired bureaucrat at the federal level so take what I say in that context.

First of all I think whether or not this belongs in the whole CCWG process the fact is with the role of the GAC and the jokers that they hold, the wild cards they hold is kind of an historical anomaly in my view.

And we are now at a maturational change of ICANN and it's time the GAC grew up. And when I say it's time the GAC grew up I mean I think there is a huge disparity that kind of maps to the multi-stakeholder model of the level of GAC - pardon the noise of my coffee pot but I'm on my third call so I need it.

That the maturity of the folks and the level of the folks who show up at the GAC vary enormously. I'd like to see the level of work input that and this means metrics that the GAC reps are putting in.

And I'd like to see how accountable they are to their own governments. And I think with (Thomas) in the chair maybe you could get some work on this because I'm sure it's a pain in the neck to be a serious GAC rep to go back and do all the government work that is involved in getting consensus positions of all of their different departments and constituencies to have people who just send the geekiest guys in their government in their, you know, telecom or commerce department that happen to understand what ICANN is talking about.

And then I have serious doubts as to whether they're reporting back at the level that is required to come up with a consensus position. Why does this matter? Because you're getting this whacky advice, sometimes I would say out of ignorance.

And I really do think that this needs to be addressed before anybody even talks about giving the GAC five votes. Let's talk about how they constitute themselves.

I mean they say, they admit we don't do any work between sessions. Well how does that work? I'm putting in 40 hours a week, you know. So I just wanted to raise that point.

This is not the way other international government delegations work I would suggest. Some of them do work this way and never with good results but never with the kind of important life changing impact that the GAC can have on things. Thanks, bye.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks (Stephanie). Okay, so I think we heard a lot of comments here. Milton are you still here? Okay, so to move forward what we should do here, what we should put in the comments.

We think active discussion (unintelligible) can understand there is high interest in the topic. And (Jim) wants to say something here, yes (Jim).

(Jim): Yes I think it's pretty safe to say that there is still a lot of discussion and a lot of work to go into finishing the NCSG comments. So I don't think we're going to get any closure on it right now.

But I encourage people to comment, you know, have a read of what's already been written and, you know, make suggestions, make changes, you know. We need more input into it.

The more input we get from (unintelligible) members the better the comment will be. So I strongly encourage people to (unintelligible) the agenda (unintelligible) strongly encourage people to have a read on what's been written and give their input to it.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks (Jim). I think it's better to send all comments we have to the (unintelligible) that can nudge people to read and participate. So if you will do that that's the best way.

We have only now if not mistaken maybe 11 or 12 days to finish the comment and submit it. So we are entering in the last mile I guess. Okay, yes (Marita).

(Marita): Thanks (unintelligible) responsibility but not quite as we were discussing before. This is to inform who is on the call that (unintelligible) responsibility

was (unintelligible) expected to discuss a change in the bylaws to make the inclusion of (unintelligible) commitment from ICANN.

(Unintelligible) we had the call last week and I think that after some interesting discussion we came up with a group (unintelligible) however (unintelligible) basically in Google (unintelligible).

And we were especially (unintelligible) of where we are and the facts that we have come up with. And he said that we are (unintelligible) something that (Matthew) (unintelligible) thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks (Marita) for this. Okay, any further comment here? Milton do you have any other questions that you wanted to ask in the call? Okay. Hello. Who is speaking?

Okay, so we don't have - I guess we can then move and back to the other agenda. So (unintelligible) to the list to get peoples comment and input here. Okay, so the next item is more (unintelligible) about the preparation for ICANN meeting.

So (unintelligible) with (David) as the vice chair can you pass some update here? Is there anything changed or we are going with the same schedule as before.

And also maybe since we are discussing about this topic as you want to talk with the board, GAC and so on. (David).

(David): And so I'm actually not (unintelligible) organizing for this meeting. But I don't think we are anticipating any major changes in the organized schedule for this meeting.



We are definitely actively soliciting topics to talk to the board and senior leadership about. In particular NCSG is indeed where we don't have as much to talk about.

Some of those (unintelligible) so I suggest as many topics so it would be very good to hear from anybody some general topics that we'd like to hear especially (unintelligible) membership the board and so on but it's not going to dramatically change I think.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks (David). (Unintelligible) I think it's just six weeks before a little bit more maybe. Six weeks before the ICANN meeting starts so we have to start (unintelligible).

Times change and you've got the more accurate number. Okay, so is there any questions here? Yes Omar.

(Harmon): So far I don't have a question on this point I was just waiting when this point is over I'd like to ask a question. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes please go ahead, yes that's okay I'm going to move anyway to (unintelligible).

Omar Kaminski: Okay great. I was just wondering I was on my way back home now and I thought I saw an email from one of the councilors of the registry stakeholder group asking to add an agenda item to the council meeting regarding the new ICANN meeting schedules that are going to be handled.

And I was just wondering if anyone had some more information on what the agenda item was and whether it was going to be discussed and whether there was anything we needed to pay attention to on this. Thanks.

This is Omar again, yes I think this was more about the meeting the meeting days, the second meeting of the year which I think is a very short one according to the new schedule format. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Omar. I'm not sure who can respond to this if it (unintelligible) a few hours ago. Okay, so any other business as far as (unintelligible) agenda is (unintelligible) progress cross committee working group from the use of country and territory names of gTLD.

I saw that (Carlos) is a good chair there but he is not on the call. I am not sure who else is active in that. Okay, nobody. Okay so then (unintelligible) brief update of the implementation of new ICANN meeting (unintelligible) and I see that we are complaining about it.

And it's a quite challenging format and (unintelligible) to have a meaningful discussion in (unintelligible). So I think the first will be in June, somewhere in Latin America.

Anyway if there is no comment here I think we can move back to our (unintelligible) agenda. (Unintelligible). Yes (Bill) I mean what do you want to ask (unintelligible) chair?

I mean do you have something to suggest?

(Bill): Well I would think that we need to be thinking about what our preferences might be an engaging in some strategic dialogue with other groups. Don't we need to do that?

I've had many conversations with people about who is interested, who is not, who might get support, who might not. I'm sure others have too. I don't know that we've had that conversation at the NCSC level. I might have missed it.

Rafik Dammak: I think we started somehow within the policy committee when we are discussing about the (unintelligible) election process.

(Bill): Yes but that was very fragmentary.

Rafik Dammak: Yes we still didn't really get a clear consensus about that issue. So for the chair, GNSO chair we didn't really kind of have clarity on how we should do. I mean probably I think we need to break the kind of - this kind of unique position that GNSO should come from the contracted party.

If you want someone from the contracted party who should be. If we can accept someone from the (COG) or not and so on.

(Bill): Well maybe we've reached the end of the call and this is the wrong time. We'll have to get discussing this on the PC list.

Rafik Dammak: I'm not sure about the process (unintelligible) some GNSO council that can clarify that until the question comes in. I think it's not (self-elimination) (unintelligible).

Omar Kaminski: Hi this is Omar. Yes (unintelligible). Each house has to nominate one candidate or may nominate up to one candidate and then there is an election that takes place between the two.

It's not for example like our nominations for a GNSO councilor for example where anyone can nominate any of the members or a member can self-nominate.

It's the two houses. Each house has to work out a nominee and then the nominee's from each house can run against each other at some point. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Omar for the clarification. Yes (Jim).

(Jim): I'll just follow on with my question then and has there been a discussion around (unintelligible) contract party house will we support. My understanding is that contractor party house will agree on a kind of (unintelligible).

Back to my knowledge I don't want to put the name out there because I don't believe its official but is quite a good candidate. So is it a case of we're going to support that person or are we going to put together a strong candidate from the non-contract party as well or are we going to assume that we go with the contract party house candidate?

Do we have a strategy around this or have we just looked at (unintelligible)?

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible) discuss several times that we should maybe get the non-contracted party can be made but it seems that we have to find agreement with our council (unintelligible). So, yes Omar.

Omar Kaminski: Yes, thanks Omar again. Yes I would mention that a couple of years ago I think it was we set up a non-contracted party house leadership email list. And that list has the GNSO councilors from the non-contracted party house as well as the stakeholder and constituency chairs and executive committee members.

But for some reason that list was never used and it seems we have some sort of individual back channel communication between the NCSG and some folks from the commercial stakeholder group.

I'm not even sure what constituencies they might have been from. But we haven't had any formal discussions and I think that's kind of unfortunate. And we do have that list and the non-contracted party house leadership.

And I think it would be a good idea for us to try to use it for issues like this and as well as maybe perhaps for selection of a board member on behalf of the non-contracted party house but no official dialogue has taken place as far as I'm aware. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Omar (unintelligible) several times that we move. That issue in CSG has got for every issue for topic they have a different contact person. So for example for ICANN meetings it's very kind of alternation between so far this time APC to handle the CSG schedule.

So there is not really, there is no kind of consistent up growth from this (unintelligible). There is nothing to lose so we can - okay. Yes we will try again and to - yes we will try to activate the (unintelligible) to updating who are the list because there are some changes in the leadership in the CSG side.

So yes I will take that (unintelligible). Okay, no (Joy) I don't have any (unintelligible) so there is no way that they have one. Okay so let's move back to our agenda for (SAG).

So (unintelligible) we will try to get an update from working groups regarding policy. We got some (unintelligible) NCAG comment will be drafted and should be submitted for review to the membership soon (unintelligible).

So does anyone want to give an update about some working group what we need to hear? I mean we need to give some attention. Yes (Jim).

(Jim): I'll just very quickly note that I submitted a comment to the design team review for the cascade rollover and (unintelligible). And it's a very, very, very, very, very, very, very technical document and dealing with some of the issues that arose when they realized that they hadn't actually done a full cascade rollover yet which is the (unintelligible) that's used following the DNS route.

And I didn't want to go into the depth of the actual technical information because to be honest very few people around here that can actually qualitatively look at what's in there.

And the design team was very well composed of people who know about this fun stuff. So what I did do is instead of going through writing an NCSG comment I wrote an individual comment from the point of view of the CWG's work, the stewardship work and we did some overlap where we are looking at (unintelligible) and well over the part of moving between the IANA functions operator.

But I noted in my comment that I was an NCSG member but they were individual comments on it and I doubt if we'll get very many that will actually comment on this as it's a very technical document.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks (Jim). (Unintelligible) individual comments and (unintelligible). So the more (unintelligible) the more (unintelligible) influence the process here.

Okay, any updates about some working group? (Unintelligible) discussions.

Man 2: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible) in that working group very important crucial for privacy stuff that's getting close to the end. We're getting some (unintelligible) disagreement (unintelligible) interpret (unintelligible).

And then taking the public comment that work is ongoing it's (unintelligible) a bit of a pitch (unintelligible) be able to give a much better idea of the details. But I don't think just note that it's very active (unintelligible).

Okay thanks (David) (unintelligible). Yes (Jim).

(Jim): So sorry I jumped around to the next agenda item on open public comment periods that's why I was talking about the cascade rollover. So on this one I think it's important to note and since the CWG which is the one that everybody has kind of forgot about and all the focus on the CCWG.

And so we seem to have broadly agreed on a way forward on the intellectual property rights issue. And Milton may want to speak a little bit more about it but that was basically one of the final big stumbling blocks that we have in front of us with regards to formation of CPI and how we move forward with the CWG and proposal as it got wrapped up into the ICG proposal at the next level.

And so it's important to note that has been largely resolved. It's not (unintelligible) but it seems to be that we have broad agreement on the way forward and so I think that's important.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks (Jim). (Stephanie).

(Stephanie Paren): Thanks Rafik, (Stephanie Paren) for the record. I just wanted to set the PPSAI working group work in the context of the Whois. And I added this comment to (unintelligible) report.

I think it will be very, very important to make sure that that issues report doesn't foreclose having other relevant Whois data related issues be considered in the work of that PDP.

You know, I've said this before I'm really worried about this massively complicated design that they've set forward. And I'm still smarting from all of the things that they claimed were out of scope for the EWG work which of course were absolutely fundamental building blocks for any work on the RDS.

Mainly the contract, the RAA contract, the articles of commitment, the Whois conflict. With law procedure how can you possibly scope that out and come up with a new RDS model, you know, this is not just the technical end.

So in the same way the PPSAI work will be designed to be closed off by the time that that PDP starts work. And I want to be able, I want to bring able to bring that in if it conflicts with where we're heading with that group. And I'm still smarting from these absolutely Alice in Wonderland experiences of discussion on the procedures for the conflicts of law. And so the comment period on that is closing.



I'm going to do a dissenting report. It's going to mean work until midnight but you'll see that shortly. That is just a joke that (unintelligible). And of course that will be sealed off for another - I assume that was thunder, applause and agreement.

That will be closed off for another 10 years once this thing gets put to bed and I want to reopen it in the PDP. So I'm going to try and put some more things into the Google document and I really apologize for not putting more in but I think as long as we get the key points in it's better than writing a thesis, you know.

I do mean that literally but I mean figuratively as well as long as it's short and we make these basic points we'll be fine. And thanks for everybody that's put in comments. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks (Stephanie). Yes (Jim).

(Jim): Just very briefly I want to comment on what (Stephanie) said. So I think it's very important that we - that it becomes a drop dead issue for NCSG that the resulting PDP from this issues report has to be able to work from a blank slate if it wishes too because the issues report itself is slightly ambiguous on this.

So it talks about (unintelligible) PDP and it talks about assessing this like (unintelligible) report and the Whois review and, you know, lots of other things but it doesn't go into detail about where the PDP will start.

And I think that's an important thing to note because if the PDP is constrained in some way by staff or by, you know, the process to stick within an incremental model where we're, you know, take what we have and try and improve or anything like that.

It's just not going to work its too important of a policy issue for us to let that happen. So I think it's very important that we need to make sure that the PDP is allowed to basically do its work and create a replacement for Whois that's suitable for the 21st Century.

And we need to make sure that that issue is drop dead first that we can't report the PDP going ahead without that qualification in the charter (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks (Jim). You want to add something (unintelligible)? Okay, we still have 15 minutes on the call and it depends if you have any update you want to share or any question or any issue that you want to discuss.

Okay I see none. Well so the last item is any other business and just to remind you about the (unintelligible) election. The (unintelligible) in which that after some time (unintelligible).

So you can know what and submit your ballot. If you have an issue please send an email to Maryam and she will handle that with the GNSO secretariat. So if you have any question or you want to know exactly about the board please send email and she will reply to you.

Okay, anything else that you want to discuss? Okay, so I see no - there is no further comment or question I may call for adjourning this call. So I am giving you time guys if you want to add something.

Okay, sounds like people want to leave and to go. Okay, thanks again guys sorry if there was some noise but that sometimes we cannot help that. Thanks again, please vote and see you soon, bye-bye.

END