ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
October 10, 2017
7:00 am CT

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon good evening. This is the NCSG Monthly Policy call on Tuesday 10th of October 2017 at 12:00 UTC. On the call today we have Abdul Saboor Malik, Arsène Tungali, Ayden Férdeline, Bruna Santos, Ishan Mehta, Jahangir Hossain, Krishna Seeburn, Marita Moll, Martin Silva Valent, Poncelet Illeleji, Rafik Dammak, Tapani Tarvainen, Zina Brahim Mahamat. And on the phone bridge we have Kathy Kleiman. From staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi. And I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Maryam and thanks for everyone for joining today call. So maybe just kind of reminder as usual we have our monthly call prior to the GNSO Council call which is will in Thursday. And so what we are – we try to do is two things is to go through the council agenda to discuss the motion how to vote with the councilor and try to go through the different topics. And on other hand we try to go through different policy discussion to get update of about ongoing policy and so on.

For this time the GNSO Council agenda is quite light if I can say it is so. And so we don't have a motion for vote. There are mostly topic for discussion. And so that I think it won't be – it won't take us too much time but at least give us some insight what's going on currently. On other hand I see that Kathy is with us and she asked if we can move the agenda and we start with the second part of the agenda which is about who has the update. So since we don't have a motion I think we can accommodate that. And we can start first with the second part of the agenda which is about policy update.

The first item it's about the planning of public comment. And currently there is only one open. It was just published yesterday which is about the draft PTI and IANA fiscal year 2019 operating plan and budgets. So here we need one or several volunteers who want to draft the comment for NCSG. So the thing is that with the new accountability mechanism for ICANN and also the IANA stewardship transition we got more participation from the community in the ICANN budget in general.

And we also have now the PTIs kind of supposedly separate structure. And so they have their budget and so on. So it's an opportunity for us as a group to participate in term of commenting their budget and operating plan for the next year. At least it's a good opportunity for even newcomer to try to understand what's going on and to go through the budget and so we see if we may need to comment or not. So here it's just asking if there is any volunteers any - I mean if not necessarily just one volunteer but the global volunteer so you can share the workload. So if you want to do so please let me know.

Okay. Seeing none I guess we can move to the next item which is kind of well it's a policy topic. But it's just trying too how to say to aggregate several discussion in different groups. So we start first with update from working

group. And it's from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure. That working group already started several topical things right for us?

One is about GEO names. So it's I think territory and country names at the top level. And on the other hand there is also they started the discussion about the (unintelligible). And I think for this one maybe Kathy want to I think she wanted to make some comments and fully to explain more what it's about and what are the concerns for us in NCSG. Kathy, can you hear me?

Kathy Kleiman: Sure, thank you Rafik. Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I can hear you.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: So please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Good morning good evening everybody. This is Kathy. And yes Subsequent Procedures has now in a group called Sub Team 2 has now circled back to looking again for the second time but now in more detail at the topic of closed generics. And this is one where historically the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group has actually been - had multiple opinions. So I will do my best but I hope there's someone to speak to the other side as well.

When the new Applicant Guidebook came out in 2011 I guess some of us most - some of us thought that the only – that there was a special category for brands. That if you wanted to be registry for a brand, you know, a .Sony or a .IBM then as the registry you would own all of the second-level registrations because how could you force Sony or IBM to sell a domain name to someone that wasn't - that they didn't want to sell it to. That wasn't affiliated with

them, or franchise with them or a blogger of them? But we didn't think that applied to any other top level domain.

And so Michele Neylon and I were shocked when we saw that there were dozens of applications in 2012 for closed generics. So Amazon applied for .books where not only would they be the registry they would be the registrant of every single domain name of Google and .search Amazon and .cloud. So a whole bunch of closed generics. And we said wait a second this really isn't fair. This could really be kind of disastrous to all of the competition if the registry owned the generic word of the industry.

And generic word is a term of ours. If you're a milk producer in the United States you cannot apply, you can apply to the US Trademark Office as the name Borden, or Elsie, or I don't know pick your favorite milk manufacturer Horizon. But you can't apply to them for the word milk. You because then you'd be taking the generic word of the industry away from other milk producers, other milk distributors other milk pastor risers.

So you're never allowed to register as a trademark the generic word of your industry because it would be anticompetitive and you'd be able to block newcomers from coming in. And that's kind of what these top level domains look like. And so we Michele and I convinced we did a lot of writing on this and we convinced the board to open up a proceeding. There were 264 comments from all over the world from small businesses in particular that said wait a second oh my gosh, you know, Amazon.book, Sony.book we're a book publisher we want to be – we want a domain name in .book.

And so ICANN actually forced all of these open except .food because the Food Network actually has a trademark in food which is really interesting. But dozens of these were – they were given the choice you can go, you know,

we'll if you want to go vote as an application you have to agree that you're going to be a traditional registry and sell domain names to anybody who basically, you know, who basically wants one and fits.

So lawyers doesn't have to sell domain names to accountants but they do have to sell it to all appropriate lawyers, all qualifying lawyers. They can't just sell to lawyers in New York City they have to sell it to all lawyers. And so most of these open - so .cloud is Michele's favorite example now. Anybody who doesn't know Michele he was President of the registrars at the time. And he's head of Blacknight the registrar of Ireland. And so these opened up. And his favorite example is .cloud which has become a really robust area for all sorts of cloud services providers large and small and has a lot of domain names registered in it and so really kind of robust areas were created under .search, and .blog, and all of these instead of being closed off to one provider.

So Subsequent Procedures Working Group which I do not chair and I'm not an active member of but they asked me to come and speak on this, you know, asked me to come back when they were considering it and let me know when the meetings were. And they really want to close it off. The registries really want to close it off. And the trademark owners really want to close it off again. And I think it's because they know they can sell these names they're very, very valuable. And I know that they can sell it to one competitor who will then own all of the second-level domains. And I, Michele, and I and others remain just as concerned as we were before. And so the question is, you know, what do we think as a stakeholder group?

The other argument and again I hope somebody here wants to speak to it is simply about experimentation that companies should be allowed to experiment as registers with all sorts of new business models. But my thought is they can experiment in every other variation of top level domain names.

They really shouldn't experiment in the generic terms. Thanks. Rafik, thank you and thank you for rearranging the schedule so we can have this discussion now because it's a really important one, back to you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Kathy. Thanks for this explanation. And as you went through it it's kind of an old topic that is now coming back again because the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Group and has also you mentioned there is other we've seen NCSG that they have a different opinion. But I think what we need as a stakeholder group is to find maybe a common ground here and to check the different side of the issue.

So the question here is how we can build some common position and try to maybe have stakeholder group to make a proposal through our members and the working group so we can move forward on this discussion. So I'm not sure that we can find a response today but at least we can put this in our agenda for the coming month and see how we can elaborate on some position on this issue. Okay so any comment or question on this? Taking the opportunity that we have Kathy with us? I see that...

Kathy Kleiman: Rafik, it looks like there's a question from Nick in the chat room. Can you clarify my understanding of the risk please that registries who apply for a string, e.g., search for commercial use then sell the entire string to Google? Close Nick, close. That Google will and did apply for the entire gTLD of .search and .blog. And don't quote me on that. I'm not sure about .cloud but a lot of people did. Amazon applied for .cloud. And they applied for it as an exclusive registry of kind of another word for a closed generic exclusive registry where as the registry they would own and control and literally be listed as the registrant of every second-level domain.

And I have to tell you that really caught us off guard. And I think the best thing that happened in 2014 was ICANN making sure those applications were opened up so that the second-level domains were sold around the world and to competitors large and small to really open up. So .blog has become sort of a cool place. Again .cloud I think .search is developing into something cool. But so that all competitors who really feel like they have a second-level domain that belongs in the top level domain can go in there.

This is a little different again from a .bank or a .lawyer. Those are restricted TLDs. And I understand that. But they're not they're restricted to all that kind of fit with the second-level domains. So in .bank you can't put, you know, a phishing site. But it does all banks that are qualified do go into .bank. And this is something that, you know, different groups worked really hard on was that kind of opening it up across the board to all who qualify.

Okay Farzi don't kill me but I hate the idea of closed generics. I think it's a good way of – right I agree Farzi. Closed generics can be nightmares. Nick, did I answer your question? Rafik is there anything else…

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Kathy. Yes I was going to maybe to ask here. So I think the issue is that we cannot just say that we cannot allow let's say those name to be applied for those generic string. But my question is that I think some they try to use like the community based TLD. Like for example you mentioned .bank is the I think they went through the - that community gTLD.

So what can be the solution? Is that just that one an applicant that it will apply for that string and then it open leads for everyone or its we can - we have like to ask maybe not a community but a consortium of different maybe companies or groups that they apply for that gTLD or what can be the option? Is that – I mean I'm trying to see here how we can allow that string to be available but

also to maybe to create some composition? So what can be the way to do? So I have no answer but I think I try to wonder here.

Kathy Kleiman: So Rafik you want the string to be available but you want it also to be what? I don't quite understand the question although I know it's a good question.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So I think your issues that you don't want for example like one applicant that he monopolize the TLD in the way that all the second-level will be only available to him.

Kathy Kleiman: Right.

Rafik Dammak: And so suggesting is that to be all available. But so if we take for example the case of like I mean it's not just like I'm thinking it cannot be just for example one applicant maybe we can encourage a consortium of groups, or companies or organizations that they apply for that string. For example like the case of .book so we say for example Amazon should not get .book.

But how we can create like a group of I don't know a group of authors, publishers, libraries and so on how – what's the best way here to allow that not just one applicant then asking him to open later to other registrant? Also encourage can maybe kind of to somehow community based TLD here so to make it available and to get more support for such application. I hope…

Kathy Kleiman: Interesting.

Rafik Dammak: …it's more clear now.

Kathy Kleiman: Interesting. Is there anybody else in the queue or would you like me to give it a shot? It looks like Nick's in the queue Rafik. Do you – I'm not sure if he has an answer to this.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Let's...

Kathy Kleiman: I can give it a shot on mine or we can wait for Nick, whatever you'd like?

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please Nick.

Nick Shorey: Yes. Just to follow-up on Kathy's sort of response previously. That's really, really helpful. I think this is really, really interesting. So are you saying that there's an interest from companies to reopen this debate as to whether generic terms, you know, Google could, you know, should be able to apply for search again as part of the next round or are you saying that there are some people are suggesting a like a new mechanism through which they can get around this issue so that a registry could apply for a generic term, say it's going to release a commercially and then just sell all the second-level strings within that TLD to a single entity. Again that would have the effect of closing that TLD off in effect. So yes so is that…

Kathy Kleiman: The latter case I think goes against the rules right? One - you - it has to be - registries selling all their domain names at the second level to one owner. Interest – we haven't talked about that scenario Nick. You've mentioned it twice now. We haven't talked about it. I'd need to think about. The scenario that's being talked about is that absolutely the registry is literally listed as the registrant for all second-level domains. So .cloud would have been had that original closed generic application gone forward.

Amazon would have wanted every one of, you know, 100,000 domain names in .cloud and probably limited it in some way to some groups that were affiliated with it although there I'm making an assumption. So to – so but if there is another model we should be thinking about and concerned about if we, you know, please feel free - I'll be happy to develop it with you and we'll look at it but that hasn't been talked about yet.

Most registries are like Donuts in the unit registry they'll sell these are open TLDs and they'll sell to everybody. That's their business model is selling domain names. That's the traditional registry, registrar, registrant domain name model. But that's why closed generics came as such a shock because these are registries that really want to own that word.

And the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group and the Non Commercial Users Constituency have had a long history of fighting the ownership of words. That words don't belong to trademark owners they belong to the world. And then trademark owners get exclusive rights in certain categories of goods and services. So what's the one - the example there is Fox Media. Fox doesn't own the word fox. Orange Telecom doesn't own the word orange they get to use it for their particular area of goods and services but that doesn't mean the rest of us can't talk about Foxes in the forest, or the color orange or the fruit orange.

So this ownership of the generic term and the ability to block your competitors out of the second-level this is really there's really a huge interest in this, the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. And this is being led by their chair and cochair Jeff Neuman really wants this. And he's made that very clear. And so it's a change of policy. We already went out and asked the world and the world was shocked. The world did not support this.

So your idea Rafik of encouraging consortiums and community groups to apply for new gTLDs is a really good one. But what do we – and we should. We should kind of proactively encourage communities to go out. And in fact the GAC, the GAC filed dozens and dozens and dozens of early warning objections against closed generics in the first round. And there are a lot of GAC objections that I didn't like but these early warnings I did because they I thought they were really smart. And they said hey, you know, these domain name should be available to every company, every organization competing in this area.

So they set up a public interest test. So they said look if the registrant - if the registry sorry if the applicant if the registry can prove that they're operating that generic term in the public interest that great big term that we still haven't defied in ICANN but that's what the GAC said in the public interest then we should be able, you know, then let's, you know, let them prove that and then we'll consider letting them become the registry. But if they're just going to close it off and own all of it, no they can't own the second-level domains of a generic term.

So that's one of the avenues the working group is looking at is what would be the public interest? What would a registry applicant have to prove in the application in order to qualify for a closed generic? But I can tell you a lot of people in the working group who are registries and trademark owners don't want that. They just want their clients to be able to apply for closed generics. And they're going to if we let this through they will be applying for dozens and dozens of them in the next round. It's very clear they really, really want it. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Kathy. Thanks I think it's good to start to have this discussion and, you know, we need to think how we can continue it and not just through the calls but maybe also in the – in our mailing list and try to (unintelligible) maybe some positions we can share. And I mean since we – we're talking in the context of the working group we need to get more people and probably on the sub team.

And also in addition to that one about Work Track 5 about GE names my understanding they are kind of now getting the different coleader from the different supporting organization at very select committees. So I don't think they have – they started the discussion yet but maybe those who are in the working group can tell more about that. So okay so let's follow-up on this discussion and see how we can develop some positions.

I know that we said that several times before but I think it's a good time to have more kind of at least some kind of say -- I'm not sure to find the right word -- but to build something that we can share or at least to elaborate more in our how to say elaborate some solution or suggestion that to move forward. Okay and I see that (Bruna) is giving updates about the Work Track 5 which is about the GO names. So still we didn't really start yet. And I see that Farzaneh is in the queue. Yes Farzaneh please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: Rafik sorry I wanted to just make a brief point on the question about closed generics. So from what I'm getting is that there are not many organizations and noncommercial or associations applied for the generic names at the New gTLD level. And then we ended up having all these commercial applicants that might have - that want to have a closed generic and kind of do whatever they want and whatever (unintelligible) they want to adopt for allocating domain names under these names. Am I right?

The problem is that the idea of having like organizations or noncommercial organization or consortium to apply for these generic names might not have worked out. So as you said we have to discuss this more probably have like a working team like establish a working team to discuss this. But there is a reason why I think there is not much interest from the broader community to apply for these (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Farzaneh. I'm not sure if you finished or just we let's say we lost you here. So I'm not sure that we got let's say noncommercial applying for closed generics but maybe Kathy know if there are some cases? I mean there are a few cases if I'm not mistaken but asking Kathy here if she has more – if she knows more about the current applicants?

Kathy Kleiman: Rather than typing I'll just speak. It's already – it's really clear that some of the biggest companies in the world will be applying for as many closed generics as they can find in the next round. If - they really want to change the rules. And these would be it's really valuable to control a generic term. So unless we help the response chances are they're going to win change rules. I'm just that's what I'm seeing from the working group because it's really clear the heads of it really, really want this rule changed. And I think it was the best thing in the world that the board clarified and asked, you know, again .cloud, .search, .blog asked the registries to open up and offer domain names to everyone who one would think should be eligible. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Kathy. I hope that respond to Farzaneh question. So it's already like spend 30 minutes on the call. And I think it's a good time to move to the next item. But again that said we – it's important for us to follow-up on this and we'll see how we can continue the discussion and try to at least write down maybe some ideas and some suggestions so we can participate in an ongoing process.

Okay. So the next item under policy topics it's the GDBR. And it was put there because we have several kind of thing going initiative and thoughts on the topic. So there was I think it would now be last week and there will be a cross community session in Abu Dhabi meeting. And also there is the task force but I'm not sure what – how much is done there.

And on the other hand there was a plan to have I think a meeting with data protection authorities in Brussels but that was postponed to define a date. So this is all just expanded. We have this kind of been going (unintelligible) regard to GDBR since Copenhagen meeting. And we as a group we have to push more and more and to voice our concerns because it's going too quickly and we are not informed about what's going on, on the topic.

So I don't want to maybe put someone on not say on the spot here but I see if Ayden will answer the call. I'm not sure if he can talk or not. And he is a representative to the task force Ayden can you speak or not?

Ayden Ferdeline: Yes hi everyone. This is Ayden for the record. There's really not much to update you on. I've continue to email Theresa Swinehart and other contexts ask them what is happening with the task force. I don't get responses. I did actually get one response just to say that she was traveling and would get back to me two weeks ago. But just to know what is happening with if there is anything - there is an information a (unintelligible). But I think it is now between community in-between staff because from what I understand that (Keesh) is no more informed than we are from the letters that we have seen in writing or (unintelligible). So I seems that ICANN staff are behind the scenes taking some action on GDPR and ICANN's compliance with it. But in terms of the community involvement it's very limited. In one of the working groups the Registration Directory Service Policy Development Process Working

Group about 32 weeks ago we received advice from external counsel on whether ICANN's existing gTLD policies would be compliant GDPR. And based upon the advice we received we were informed no it would not be compliant. So that is something that the group at the working group level is trying to consider.

But the problem is is that the working group's charter speaks more to creating a replacement system and not to addressing issues within existing – with existing policies. There is a limited amount of maneuvering that we can do there. But what has been happening which I just briefly touched upon was that two letters have recently been sent to the CEO, one from the ITC and one from Business Constituency. And in both of these letters these upper constituencies have put forward what they consider to be solutions to the problem that ICANN faces in (unintelligible). And so I - they believe that there are exemptions in the GDPR that we could avail ourselves of.

One of the (unintelligible) it's in - under GDPR is if you're - if the actions that would be necessary to protecting the vital interest of someone. But the IPC is either the in my opinion is rather being very disingenuous with their reading of disclosing GDPR or they haven't read it comprehensively enough because the vital interest clause in GDPR speaks only of to protect the interests of a human life. That is it is not in a sense under GPR for instance to notify if you somehow became aware that someone's life was in immediate jeopardy you were able to violate their privacy to notify the emergency (unintelligible) like suicide or something along those lines. It is not intended as the IPC is reading it to protect the vital interest of a corporate. And even if it was the idea that the intellectual property consists a vital interest is a very bizarre misreading in my opinion of the clause. So I see that is something that we need to be doing is offering some rebuttals to these (unintelligible) that have been sent to the organization.

The Business Constituency letter I didn't disagree with it but I think that their reading of GDPR is at least a more honest take on what is in it. There was a response they received from the organization that suggests that they again have no more clarity than we do. The response they got was that a helpful Webinar is the two other sort of throwaway line but do not actually provide any indication as to what the organization is actually doing to seek a level of compliance with GDPR. So in the policy committee mailing list over the weekend I drafted up which was a provocative an intentionally provocative letter for us to send to the CEO and to Theresa Swinehart into (Jack Romatella) to ask to offer a rebuttal to the point that had been put forward by other constituents just recently and to be able to say that we do not think that the content of their letters would survive scrutiny from data protection commissions and we would encourage you to seek additional guidance here.

So the language in this letters intentionally – I know that we are going to turn it down if we do decide to send it. But something else that I touched upon in the letter is something that I think we need to really consider. I think we're at the stage but at least in my interpretation of being in the working group my feeling is of in the RDS PDP Working Group my feeling is that we're not going to get anywhere as a working group. There's going to be filibustering for the next year. Clearly ICANN the organization is not serious enough about engaging with us as a community. We are not receiving any - the information that we need.

So I think we have to sort of (unintelligible) them and say ICANN is not going to deal with us. So what we need to do instead is to launch our own campaign to raise awareness among data protection authorities that ICANN does not care about privacy, that it does not care about compliance GDPR and it does not take you seriously and it has a continued 20 year streak of

noncompliance (unintelligible). Why is that going to change now but can you please remedy the situation using the local tools that are at your disposal?

I think that the time for diplomacy with us is over. I don't consider myself to be an advocate for the most part but in this case I think we are now at that stage where we need to sort of end our engagement with ICANN on this issue aside from documenting when we're being ignored, when we're being disrespected by ICANN the organization. And I think our priority needs to turn to helping data protection (commissioners) and data protection of who have (unintelligible) who have different tools at their disposal to ensure compliance with this law. I think we need to be helping them to build a case.

But that is just my support. It's clearly something that as a community we need as a constituency we need as a stakeholder group we would need to discuss it we think that is the appropriate approach to take. It's just something that I'm putting out there. But to answer your question as to what is happening in this internal passport I think is the honest answer. There has not - there's been - has not been any (unintelligible) lost. So I sent many emails to the mailing list to that are not being returned.

Similarly the IPCs sent an email to the mailing list which are not being answered. So who knows what is happening there. We - it's only (unintelligible) and they have no idea. Thanks Rafik. Oh wait I just - I haven't been in the chat. I was going to check later comments.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Ayden. I can't say that was quite a short answer. So yes so as discussion with GDPR is it's now going on since Copenhagen and there are so many things going - I mean coming in different places and are not that kept in the loop. And that's one of the issues that we need to raise. And for the letter to you shared it and you mentioned in the policy committee list yes I mean

having (unintelligible) not's the problem. We can tweak that. And so we need to put also more substance in how we can express more about our position and stress that ICANN has to comply at some level.

And when I went through the two letters the one from IPC and BC it's they are kind of somehow encouraging ICANN to not comply and they are trying to advocate their other side in the discussion about what they call those who are using the Whois. So we can work on this letter and hopefully to send it as soon as possible. So we need to finalize it in the coming days in the way that we can weight in the discussion.

With regard to the alliance and maybe try to respond to Kathy here usually our allies here is that the contracted party in particular, the registrar. And we will have I think a meeting with them in Abu Dhabi and if it is one of the topics we can discuss with them. But I'm not sure. Maybe I didn't know more. I'm not sure what they - if they are aware about the letters and if they want to respond. It's the kind of I mean the behavior of the contracted party can be somehow battering regarding all the Whois so maybe we need to discuss with them more. Anyway so I see that we have now several folks in the queue. And starting with Nick first. Net yes Nick please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Thank you Rafik. Yes and just initial reaction to Ayden's points there I think I would say maybe we just need to be cautious about sort of criticizing ICANN immediately. This whole issue to me still seems very fluid. So I just think we - I just maybe to add a little bit of caution at this stage in sort of publicly criticizing ICANN albeit there's clearly some issues around sort of communication and sort of visibility on some of these things.

I think maybe we've got – maybe we should look to raise this with the GAC. They obviously are the representatives here of their sort of various

government departments within their own jurisdictions including sort of all the DPAs. So I think it would be prudent probably to raise this with them if you're able to schedule a session with them in Abu Dhabi and sort of get their views and maybe encourage them to pick up on these issues as well. I think that to me it seems like it might be a – might may be a better first step and then have sort of a response letter teed up to go at the end of that meeting. But at the end of those discussions when a lot of this stuff might I'm sure is going to be sort of discussed in the open and ICANN may well sort of be able to provide some answer and feedback.

Rafik Dammak: Nick, yes Farzaneh please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes I just wanted to brief you on at – I will send a report but I had a chat with the ICANN CEO yesterday and I actually told him we are not happy with the level of communication that's coming from ICANN (unintelligible) and that we need more transparency. And his response was that of course he's sorry and he will try make communication more transparent and more forthcoming than it is right now for now. And for the GAC (unintelligible) we have a half an hour NCUC meeting with the GAC on Monday in Abu Dhabi on I see Monday 28th? And then and so we can put that forward and talk to them about the privacy.

Okay so and then the other thing that I wanted to talk about was the GDPR and cross community session that's going to happen in Abu Dhabi. And I - so this is a session that was proposed by Business Constituency but cross community sessions are normally sessions that should be done by the community. So I'm kind of fighting there to put a comment there and also have our representative. So if you can comment on that the description I've shared than on the mailing list I'm going to send it today so hopefully we would have someone that can talk about our perspective. For the – and I think

we should definitely document what we think is the way forward and what is our opinion on this on GDPR and Whois and privacy in Whois in general. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Farzaneh. And I suggested so we may use the NCUC GAC session to address this issue. With regard to the Cross Community I think what I observe is that whoever suggests those Cross Community sessions has more influence on shaping the agenda as well. So maybe for the meeting let me take in the quarterly because there is Cross Community session we should submit our proposal so we can have more influence on the agenda so something maybe we should – okay. So Kathy please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Great thanks. I've heard some great ideas. One is cooperating with talking about this with the GAC. The other is Ayden thank you. Thank you for your leadership and responding to letters sent by the IPC and the BC that I think it's really important. And, you know, everything you're doing I know it's taking an enormous amount of time, thank you for what you're doing.

A question for you, can we align with other stakeholder groups, the registries and registrars rather than fighting ICANN? And ICANN has assigned to Americans to handle this, Theresa Swinehart and Becky Burr. And American companies by nature fight European data protection regulation. It's in their bones, not all Americans but American companies particularly large companies.

But one way or another the registries and registrars want to comply. What can we do to help them comply with the GDPR because they've got it do it and they've got to do it before May. So is there a way we can just work with them on implementation even if ICANN is not a board? Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Kathy and so yes Ayden can respond to this.

Man: Hello hi. Thank you for (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry for that today. Thank you.

Ayden Ferdeline: Hi. Welcome. Hi (unintelligible). This is Ayden speaking now. I – thanks for the question. I'm going to respond to Nick first and thanks for your comments Nick. My response is this is not a first step and the issues that we're facing are not inclusive of communication. And also the situation in relation to privacy is not fluid in the slightest. GDPR is not a rapid change to status quo. The only difference is that there are signs available now and (more) compliance. ICANN has not complied with existing data protection laws for over 20 years. They have been receiving letters from data protection authority directly.

                  I – Stephanie has put together a list. There's at least 13 letters since 2001 onwards which either has not been addressed or not been responded to. So my desire is not to (discover) to ICANN any longer. I review point that Theresa Swinehart made in Hong Kong last week and she claims that in relation to GDPR as a community asset that we civil society are heavily involved in their effort to comply with data protection law. That's something I reject. And he might be allowed to speak but we are not heard. We have just been used as ICANN's pawn here to justify their own noncompliance with the law.

                  So I think we need to be pushing back making it clear to the data protection authorities that we are not being listened to. And that is why I think our strategy needs to be making sure that data protection authorities who have the

- who have legal authority - sorry, who have legal tools at their disposal which they can use to enforce compliance with the law act.

I'm not someone who's going to be looking to engage in further conversations with the ICANN directly myself. I think it's a waste of time. I've been doing this for 18 months. The others have been doing it far longer. And from conversations that I've had with them it's not getting anywhere is it?

In terms of the comments that Kathy made you would think that we have natural allies in the registries and registrars. And certainly the comments that I've heard in Johannesburg from them and that I've heard in the internal task force would suggest that we, different concerns but that ultimately we all disagree with how ICANN has been handling it's compliance with data protection laws. So I think they are natural allies but how we can strengthen our relationship with them I'd be open to hearing ideas. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Ayden and I guess I agree with you about the allies and I'm not sure we are on the same page with the contract party was. We tend to we need to have common grounds on different topics so I mentioned we can have a discussion with them on Abu Dhabi in our joint meeting. And definitely we need to continue the discussion to see how - what's the best strategy here in addition to perhaps the letter that you're proposing. Yes Nick please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Thanks Rafik and thanks Ayden for that follow-up. I think it seems to me like that we on the next Generation Whois call next week which Ayden was on as well he'll note that it was (unintelligible) call. It went on for ages. There was some heated debate but I thought there was some really interesting stuff that came out of it.

And it was particularly around the clear recognition that that working group needs to consider before it can probably move forward effectively it needs to consider the issue of the data controller is in this space. And there's a, you know, there's a very strong argument that the ultimate data controller may well be ICANN. And ICANN's got it's, you know, all its own work that's this review that it's doing on GDPR on stuff and they're the strong sense that they will probably look to try and avoid that obligation as well. And but it seemed to me coming out of last week IBS meeting these things really need to move together quite closely and quite quickly. And personally I think that's something that we should encourage but where it's ultimately sort of led by the community or, you know, the community has a very great strong input I'm not sure that necessarily that kind a small group that's involved in the – in ICANN's review of their current liabilities or obligations under GDPR is sufficient.

And I really do think that we need to engage the GAC on this. I do think that they are the conduit for raising these issues broadly across their countries in all those jurisdictions. That's why they're there. That's why they're here in ICANN. I don't think – I don't – I think they've got their foot off the gas. I don't think they're on the ball. I think they're having a cup of tea in the lobby and not paying attention to this and it's going to hit them slap in the face. And then I fear at the night that at least in the 11th hour then we're going to start to get some stuff on them when it's too late and causes problems down the line. So I do think yes that that session that's Farzi mentioned that will be happening in Abu Dhabi I think would be a great opportunity to really lay it there to them and get them engaged on this. And I think, you know, they could be a huge support.

And I think it's good for the community, you know, if we can get rather than necessarily sort of going out to sort of individual groups and trying to get

them involved if we can bring the GAC along with their full weight to bear on this I think that might be a better example of community engagement and also potentially more production and probably more – and probably a bit scary for ICANN as well. I think if they see the GAC are putting pressure on these issues they might be more likely to sort of get their act together.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Nick. I guess we need to give it a try and see if we can get the GAC to help us on this issue anyway so nothing to lose. And I understand the (unintelligible) particular for those who are participating in the RDS Working Group. But here's the - we need to keep pressing. And so the coming weeks we need to organize ourselves and to use - take the opportunity of Abu Dhabi meetings really to press and advocate more and what about our position. Okay.

So I'm not sure if it's (Anik) that's an old or new hand. Okay otherwise I want to move quickly to another item. So we are already one hour into the call but I want to really that if we can talk about the consumer safeguard for two reasons is that there was the Webinar last week. And thanks for those who attended and tried to report. I'm not sure if it was last week or the week before. And oh, and (Scott) is leaving us. (Unintelligible) or going to talk about consumer safeguards. But on the other hand are so we have it as a question for the board for the NCSG and the board meeting.

So, you know, we raised this issue several times is that we are concerned about let's say the involvement of ICANN on this call, DNS reviews and in relation to its mission and training. So we kind of always encouraged that about committed ICANN involvement on this matter. So this is the subject matter expert is going to leave. I think I'm not sure how we can elaborate more on this topic but this is something that we should have on mind and something we need to monitor.

So there will be also I think a session I'm not sure if it's Cross Community or not, but there will be at least a session in Abu Dhabi about consumer safeguard and I think another one about DNS abuse. And so okay any question on this or comments?

Okay seeing none – oh thanks Tapani for sharing the report. So some NCUC members attended the Webinar and there was some report that it's really useful so to get an idea what's – what they are presenting. So it was a benefit I think from the Consumer Safeguards Office which is new. And I see that Farzaneh's in the queue. Yes Farzi (unintelligible).

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you Rafik. I just wanted to say two things. One is that (Brian) from the Consumer Safeguard Office was asking whether the community and us wants a meeting in Abu Dhabi with him. I have told him that because also because of Kathy's concern I told him that we are concerned that too many meetings we might not be able to attend so many meetings and then in the end might not be able to engage with how your office is shaped.

So I did not give him that like a clear answer of yes or no. I said I will talk to UC and NCCG. So we could potentially have a meeting with him if there is interest. If we don't have time then we can just be in touch with him. And after the Consumer Safeguard Working Team they asked for a meeting at our Constituency Day at NCUC is very (packed). I don't know if they reached out to Tapani but if we can give them like a half an hour to talk in NCSG open meeting that would be good.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Farzaneh. We will check with Tapani if we can have that in Constituency Day. But just to clarify I mean you talked about Consumer

Safeguard work in and also about (Brian). I think he's the consumer safeguard work. So did you get like two request for meeting or it's the same?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes it's really, yes it definitely (unintelligible). So it's like two requests. One (Brian) did not ask for a meeting. He said now that he had this Webinar do you want to also meet in Abu Dhabi? Do you think that's a good idea? So I'm asking you is that a good idea to meet with (Brian) again about the office or, you know, what is going on on the NCSG mailing list about the office and that we want to have the time contribute and get engaged with it. So I don't know, if you want I can tell him that we are – we will be able to meet with him at the time that is suitable for people from NCUC and maybe NCSG. I don't know. I don't know if they reached out to Tapani. But I need to know an answer so I can tell him yes or no.

Rafik Dammak: So the clarification. So I understand that he's asking about kind of consternation about after the Webinar but also about meeting. I think it would make sense since we put the topic and kind of we are asking several questions in relation to that (option) and about our consumer safeguard for our meeting between us and the board. So if we can have the meeting before that will be really helpful for us, just maybe you can elaborate more. So I think it would be a good idea to meet him and his team too.

Good thanks. Okay so I think we've covered this topic and I would like that we come back to page to council agenda. Hopefully won't be too long but let's see. Maryam can you please share the council agenda? Sorry Maryam can you switch to the council agenda? I'm not sure you heard me are not.

Okay so we don't have a motion but I think there are several topics of interest and at least if we can raise some discussion and have to build some position around that.

So the first items as usual, administrative, just to approve the minutes of the last call since one and update of Statement of Interest. The other one is the consent agenda and this is to approve the appointment of Cheryl Langdon-Orr as additional Co-Chair for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process Working Group.

And that - to replace Avri as Co-Chair since Avri is going to I'll say more greener place with the ICANN Board so she can start her term in the Board in the Abu Dhabi meeting.

So – and here we wish to thank Avri and wish her to do well in her new role in the ICANN Board. So – okay so this is kind of – I think quite straightforward item.

It's just we – as the Council just we will approve that unless there is kind of any concern, right. So the next agenda item – it's about the Standing Committee on Draft Budget Cycle.

So this is – was an idea proposal in Johannesburg meeting – is to get I'll say kind of Standing Committee from the Council to work on the budget, because previously the GNSO tended kind of to work on ad hoc basis and we really had to draft it quickly and didn't go enough in details and - with regard the whole ICANN budget and operating plan but also with regard to the budget – official budget request.

And so the GNSO Council as the manager of the policy development process we have to do more planning and to push more to get resources for a policy development process, and in turn to get more resources in the different working group.

Like for example last time we had the request from the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group to get support for a survey, so this is the kind of thing we need to plan beforehand.

So the idea is to have this Standing Committee and the discussion will be about the charter and also maybe a call – a draft call for volunteers. So we didn't really discuss a lot about this idea first proposed in draft board meeting, and we didn't even have time in develop session to go through.

So personally I don't have strong position about this; maybe something we can discuss but I think also we can maybe be somehow cautious about this. But anyway it's now up for discussion and we – one concern is that the Council is now starting to have more and more Standing Committee and somehow is delegating its – some tasks to smaller groups even if it's, I mean, somehow it can be formed by councilor or not.

So the question here - and to which extent the GNSO Council can delegate many task or work to other volunteer so this is something we should discuss. But anyway – so this is something now for – on the table and see how it will goes.

So any question on this or comment? Okay. I know that operational issues are not – don't elicit usually so much comment. But anyway the next agenda item is about the future ICANN meeting planning.

So as you know the last year's – I think the last year yes we started to have a different format for ICANN meeting with the three format, A, B and C. And now it's kind of time maybe not necessarily to review but - because there were

different part of the community expressing concern and complaining about the current format and rising issues.

So my understanding is that the community that – which means the chairs of the different SO/ACs – they called a group's constituency and stuff. They had discussion about possible changes to the ICANN meeting and also the meeting session process.

And there will be a paper for public comment with regard to the meeting format change, so it's supposed to be available soon but it's still not yet and so it seems that maybe it will be during the ICANN meeting in Abu Dhabi.

My – also understanding the changes are just really not to change the whole format but maybe doing some adjustment around the current format, maybe trying to reshuffle between the days and so on.

So maybe if - at least if we can hear from our membership and those who are intending to attend ICANN meeting, if they have any thought or concern that you want to rise and to see how we can improve the current format and the way to make it more – the meeting more effective for us.

Any comment on this? Any question? So okay speaking for myself here I don't have a strong position about the current format. And I think the concerns coming from the community or posed by the community itself – so my feeling is that we are – many times we are still trying to cram so many session regardless which meeting.

For example the Meeting B, which is the policy forming charter - but many groups are still trying to have so many internal meetings, and so it's quite crammed and there is the feeling that it's busy and overwhelming.

So I guess it's more like a question how to do planning and to be mindful and how to use the available slot. So – but it – this is kind of my personal thought and it's coming from my own experience when I was a Chair of NCSG and NCUC in term of planning schedule.

So there are different perspective but I think we – anyway we need to start and try to collect – yes collect more feedback. Responding to answer, no there is no way to get seven days to Meeting B because the session is not to change, to extend or shorten the meeting.

So it's more like trying to play around the current format, so maybe for example to have let's say Cross-Community session in the beginning or at the end and – or for example having all PDPs and working group session in the beginning or at the end, something like that.

Anyway I want really to hear from others who – that want to speak more on this topic from my side. Okay. And moving to the next item I think it's also quite straightforward.

It's just – we will discuss quickly about the planning for GNSO on the Abu Dhabi meeting, and you can see in the link the schedule for GNSO so there are several session.

As usual the most important is this Sunday, which we have the working session for the GNSO Council and everyone is welcome to attend. Those will have several updates from different working group and also preparation or for – preparation and a joint meeting with the board and also with the GAC and so on, so it's opportunity to see what's going on.

And also you can see there in the schedule the plans for the working groups and also stakeholder groups and constituency. And then the other agenda item is quite – it's just related and this is about the planning for joint meetings with the GAC, ccNSO and ICANN Board.

Usually the meeting with the board is quite interesting in term of the topics discussed but the – I think the most fun one and exciting is the – with the GAC.

Usually – and I'm not going to say we have tense relation with the GAC, but there are some area of disagreements regarding several policy and usually it's quite tense in the meetings between the GAC and the GNSO.

Okay so, you know, so as you can – as you see it just - really kind of planning item and then any other business. So we will discuss about – to prepare for GNSO Council strategic planning session.

And this meeting is planned for next year, I think end of January and it's the first time to be held. And the idea is to get the whole council to do a kind of planning or preparatory work for the whole year, so it will be kind of a first experiment for us and even for councilor.

And the idea is we then – the GNSO Council do more planning because there is feeling that we are- we tend to be kind of more reactive and trying to respond to what's coming.

And so here we are trying to be more proactive and to have better – I'm not going to say a strategy yes provision to do better planning, and how to manage the work and the workload for policy development process.

Any question on this? Any comment? Okay. The other agenda item under Any Other Business is a discussion about the ICANN Organization consultation process on community resources.

And this is about the ICANN community travel upon deadlines, so the staff is soliciting input from SO and AC groups and need to get some input in how to update the current guidelines.

I think that's the first time that happened and so there is a questionnaire about – need to get feedback about the current guidelines and where are the area for improvement.

So we – as a group we can submit comments on this but here in the agenda is also – it's a topic for discussion for the GNSO Council. So we'll try to report later what's – kind of what are the ideas or concerns shared by other groups on the matter.

Okay so I know that I tried to go quickly through this topic but I'm really looking for your comment or question. And I see Ayden. Yes Ayden please go ahead.

Ayden Ferdeline: Thanks very much Rafik. I have heard there might be a few more of our councilors on this call, and this is on the last project that you just mentioned, which was the community resource consultation that the organization has recently launched.

I would like to know what messages our councilors might be taking and sharing with council. I started this conversation on the Policy Committee list over the weekend and I'm really glad that Tatiana shared her views.

And lastly, I think I'm in agreement with her. For those who are not subscribed to the Policy Committee list, what I said was that I think we need to have a conversation around this to understand all of our perspectives on this issue.

And I sort of laid mine out on the table and I said I think that this is a significant line item in the ICANN budget. I think we need to look at a radical scaling back of some programs and I was thinking particularly of the fellowship program, which has now ballooned to I believe 80 participants at the coming meeting.

So I think that we need to really reassess whether we think that this is working or whether those resources would be better allocated to back that policy work perhaps to something else.

I'm certainly not advocating that we abolish the fellowship program. Not at all. It has a place but maybe it has reached a size where it is not encouraging – encouraging isn't the right word but maybe it's just not being as effective as it should be.

I also think that there needs to be the recognition that – and this is apparently not a popular view but I think it's true, and that economy class travel is a chore and not a privilege and I really don't understand where this idea has come from that it is a privilege.

When we go through the consultation we need to be realistic about how much are we spending here, how can we use resources differently and perhaps we do not need to be buying the cheapest ticket at the most inconvenient time of day that goes through, you know, like four layers is on there.

Maybe we can just be a bit more – use our resources a bit more wisely to ensure that we're getting the right people to meetings and get people to meetings who are going to be contributing to the community's work, which is not just policy work.

It is also other things including operations. Whether it's engagement, whether it's outreach there are many different areas that people are, but making sure we're getting the right people from our community to meeting, making – they're not coming to meetings in the least comfortable manner possible, that we don't have certain programs seeming to scale up impossibly large while having absolutely no metric to show what they're achieving if anything.

But this is just my perspective and I really hope to hear from some of our elected representatives as to their views on this issue. Tatiana said her views on the list and again we are in sync, which is encouraging.

Just wanted to put that out there. Obviously it's important that we get feedback from more than individuals and not just our elected representatives and not as much – rather than speaking now. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Ayden. Okay so speaking as Councilor here for that topic - not being necessary to express specific opinion. First, that we hear really from other groups what they are thinking.

But back to there and the consultation itself, I think it's kind of constrained in the way that the question are about how the current support is working for us and benefiting for us as a group.

So I think maybe we are constrained by that but I understand your point about the program and – sorry – so the program and so on. I think maybe not

necessarily a question from – for this but also can be a matter for the ICANN budget itself.

So quickly – but maybe my position. I think it's – we have to be responsible in term of resources and we have to be, I mean, responsible in the way how we are using them and so to be efficient and effective.

I think many people may be know that a few years ago we didn't have any travel support and – but that time where it was NCUC it had to come from own resources to bring its own councilor.

That changed in 2009 with the GNSO restructuring and getting the support and it expanded, and also we have the fellowship. That's - also I think was 2007 or '08 so that the landscape – the whole landscape changed.

But I think we didn't put kind of accountability mechanism in the way that when someone is getting such support to attend an ICANN meeting or to participate he need to kind of - he or she need to prove that they are effectively participating because we are hearing a lot about the burnout of the volunteers and that we don't have enough people participating.

So we need to find a balance and see what - the problems here. Okay I see Poncelet and Nick so let's start with Poncelet first.

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes and thank you Rafik and thank you Ayden. Poncelet speaking for the record. I want to say I really share Ayden's view and also Tatiana's view but I would like to - on this issue I would like to add as you said Rafik earlier on that we have to look at this well in terms of accountability and what value it brings the community.

And I will want to point out to the fellowship program – it's a program. It's not that I'll negate it I want to emphasize but I feel like when you look particularly at our constituency, the NCSG, and you check over time the amount of people that's come through from civil society or academic who are now in the NCUC or join NPOC as another organization, they are really very minimal.

And so in that sense we are really not getting much value in terms of people who can contribute effectively to our policy processes which we're involved in.

So I would like to see a situation - I don't have any – I cannot pinpoint any upfront solution to it whereby some community resources are devoted towards our PDP processes that we undergo.

How do we do that? Is it that we try to advocate more that we have and more fellows coming from our – which – that fall under our constituency and we can then do during the fellowship program some sort of orientation on our PDP processes so that we in the long run get value out of this, because definitely we have a lot of volunteers that are doing a lot of good jobs and are well trained with them.

And one of – who definitely we'll call out and I note it's not everybody that's – gets committed to PDP processes and this particular – our stakeholders group – we have a lot of great people that have been doing great work.

And we need to try to see how we can engage with ICANN more in getting community resource to support our PDP processes, because at the end of the day that is the biggest bulk of our work. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay and then Nick please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Thanks Rafik. Really, really good discussion actually. I would always encourage us to say that we haven't got enough money. As soon as you say – as soon as you start to question money people will take if off you.

                  So I would always argue regardless of how we think – of what we think in terms of how effective an allocation of funding is, always argue that we don't have enough and we need more.

                  I think Ayden came up with some really, really good points and Poncelet as well. I think this is a – I think we could do it looking at the fellowship program more broadly with the other outreach activity that ICANN operates particularly around pasty, boring stuff.

                  I think that needs to be much more closely intertwined to provide the long-term opportunities for people that come through the fellowship program to be able to engage, and link those closely together but stress that it needs to be expanded so when we question metrics we should do it from the perspective that we think we need to build on the metrics that we have to understand our – the effectiveness of this.

                  We need to build on the amount of participants coming through the fellowship program from this particular region. We need to build on the longer-term strategy of the fellowship program to enable people – to enable a consistent group of people to come through not just on isolated meetings.

                  You know, they come to one meeting. They don't come to the next. They come to the one after that. We need to make sure there's a consistent program.

Maybe that could be – the program could be expanded for sort of annual grants to assist people to attend meetings for an entire year, which will really enable them so that - then get involved in PDP processes.

So I think maybe we can look to sort of build and frame things around that, but always at the bottom – or at the bottom of the – or top of the piece of paper say, "We haven't got enough. We need more money."

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Nick. I intended to voluntell you and - you and Ayden to work on some draft and suggestion about this. So responding to comment from Ayden about the mapping, the resources - so to clarify what we are getting mostly is the travel support and it's a different level.

So at the NCSG level we have the travel support for all the councilor, the six of us, and there is travel support for three slot for Executive Committee so like nine slot for the NCSG.

And then at the constituency level there is travel support for three from each Executive Committee so that's what they have. In addition to that we have the CROP program and it kind of always changing, but it's mostly five travel support or travel slot to attend regional meeting for, I mean, for outreach and so on.

So that's what we have basically in term of travel support. There are other travel support but we are not necessarily managing them directly. For example the only representative from NCSG who is the NCUC representative to NomCom – he got a - travel support to attend three meetings.

And – but then if someone is participating in the Review Team he will get travel support but it's not managing through the constituency or the stakeholder group.

But I do think it's a good idea to try to map this and to be kind of transparent to what's going on, but it's basically what we get for travel support. On other hand in term of general resourcing we have admin support with Maryam, and she's helping us for all the kind of admin task and so on and that's a separate budget.

And we can if we want - some meet every year - what we call the special budget request and we have to make a proposal and explain what we want to do with this funding and it depends.

Sometimes they – it, I mean, depend. It's the ICANN finance team. Sometime they accept or not depending if there is – if it's relevant or not. So for example NCUC got travel support to attend IGF in Geneva because they made a proposal with two workshop and so on.

So – and yes Ayden there is also the Intersessional, which is the whole budget for the members from the Non-Contracted Party, from Commercial Stakeholder Group and Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group for three days meeting so that's why Intersessional and that's meeting between the two groups.

The strategy retreat – that's a - separate and that's at the GNSO Council level. That was a request made by GNSO Council and so it concerns councilor only.

I don't – and I think even the liaison are not included on that. But – okay so maybe now it's getting confusing because I'm – I think so many think about several points but I do agree with Ayden.

We can do mapping and write down this to explain to people what we are getting as support and what we are not getting. Okay so I think we covered all the council agenda and also our agenda.

So there is at the end what we call any other business and this is where people can propose any topic for discussion or they want to rise a point or a question.

So if you need to – if they want to ask or to comment - so please do so. Okay, seeing none. So I want to thank everyone for attending the call. I know that's not always easy since we are – we go through several topics and trying to cover so many things.

But I want to thank you for staying the whole time with us and we'll try also to continue the discussion, the mailing list and to follow up on the several items we rised (sic) and take several action on that.

So next – our next meeting should be in Abu Dhabi and during the Constituency Day so for those who will attend the meeting see you there. But also other – you can attend remotely and join us so see you soon and bye-bye. So let's adjourn the call for today. Thanks.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much everyone for attending the call. (R.J.) you may disconnect all lines and stop the recording. Thank you for your time today. Goodbye.

END