

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
February 10, 2017
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings have been started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Gil. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the NCSG Open Policy meeting on Friday, the 10th of February, 2017. On the call today we have Joan Kerr, Mathias Hounbo, Stefania Milan, Ayden Ferdeline, Rafik Dammak, Arshad Mohammed, Julf Helsingius, Tapani Tarvainen, Ed Morris, Avri Doria. On the phone bridge we have Dorothy Gordon, Akinremi Peter Taiwo. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Maryam. So this is Tapani for the record. We have a bit longer agenda than usual today and I have a few AOB items to – not at this point already, first as you have heard, Amr just resigned from the Council having joined the staff, has some repercussions we might want to talk about.

And I'd also like to bring to the table just as a discussion item here, we'll take it to the Executive Committee AC later that status of the candidate constituency – Consumers Constituency, in particular this point is we have Dorothy on the call. I wanted to make sure, will you be at the end? If not then I'll take that early on as an item because there are some points I want to discuss. Dorothy, can you confirm you'll be at the end of the call?

Okay, maybe she's not hearing but...

Dorothy Gordon: Hi, are you talking to me?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Dorothy Gordon: Yes, and you said you wanted me to be on the end of the call for what purpose? I'm sorry, you're not that clear in my line.

Tapani Tarvainen: I have a – well I'm going to move for the terminate of the Consumers Constituency, that's been a candidate constituency for a long time. So I'm going to make a motion that we'll terminate it. This is not a decision item on this call, this is a discussion item the Executive Committee will talk about it, but if you have any comments to say on that I want to hear and this would be a good time.

Dorothy Gordon: Has this been discussed before with the membership?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Dorothy Gordon: Hello? Did you hear me?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, what did you discuss with the membership? Okay, let's put then this AOB item now since we are talking about it just quickly. Do you have any problem if we simply terminate the – your candidate constituency status because it hasn't really...

((Crosstalk))

Dorothy Gordon: I think if it was for me, I mean, it's for a group of people if I understand what you're talking about. And so if that is the case it should be discussed with the group.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I don't even know who are in the – that Consumers Constituency so it would be nice to hear...

((Crosstalk))

Dorothy Gordon: ...who is in it. And then we have the discussion with the people in the group. And then if the – whatever the group agrees to that should be tabled at the meeting on the basis of the discussion with the group. And then it would be endorsed. But I think it's very difficult to have a meeting and the people in the group have not been consulted, and then we come to a decision. But I will be very...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, I will...

((Crosstalk))

Dorothy Gordon: ...interested in hearing your arguments as to why you believe it should be terminated.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I'll ask you then to be in touch with that group and let me know what happens. But let's move on with this agenda then as that was (unintelligible) and the any other business category.

So the standing selection committee discussion is the first item here, Avri, you hand up, was it about the candidate constituency or something else?

Avri Doria: Yes, no, I had my hand – this is Avri speaking. I had my hand up about the previous discussion item, but when you moved on I took my hand down. But I was going to say something on that previous issue.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, please say it.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. I think – I mean, I was definitely on that group – on that group's list. There is no group. The group has not talked. The group has not had any interaction. But if I understand the charter correctly, it's really NCSG Executive Committee action to basically do a review of the candidate constituency, say oops, there's nothing here. Okay, and it's candidacy, I think is the procedure that's defined as opposed to taking it to a larger vote.

Now of course, if the community disagrees with that EC decision, then they can petition for a larger community vote on it. But at this point I believe, if I understand the way the charter is written, bylaws, it is that the EC basically was supposed to review them after six months, decide whether the candidacy was viable and whether it was about to become or not. So have your six month review. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, but the thing – the reason I brought it up now is because I put on the agenda for the next Executive Committee meeting and I noticed Dorothy was here and so I decided to ask sort of (unintelligible) that this is about to happen.

So but you're absolutely correct about the process except that we are way past the six months now.

Okay, so that's for the Executive Committee to decide, but this was just a note here to alerting you that it's about to happen, the constituency review in general. But moving to the agenda, standing selection committee discussion.

Ed, would you like to pick this one up?

Ed Morris: Yes, sure...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: Okay, thank you. And good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. Okay, we're going to have a discussion, at least it's on the agenda – for the Council agenda of trying to create a standing selection committee for GNSO appointments.

A little background on how I got involved with this, back when we were selecting a candidate for – Lord knows – what – sorry, GAC – the GAC liaison, I had to recall what it is. Avri, for example, was one of the candidates, and I felt very strongly she was the most qualified. And we had a selection process that went to the chair and the vice chairs of the GNSO Council and it was sort of like the election of a pope. It came out with white smoke; this is the person we're going to select.

We had no knowledge of the number of candidates, who they were, their qualifications. So Susan Kawaguchi and myself were a bit upset at the lack of transparency and quite frankly, of the process. So we started talking among ourselves, we started talking with James Bladel and the vice chairs. So Susan

and I were assigned the task of coming up with at least an initial draft of a selection standard; how we could appoint people because with the empowered community, the GNSO is going to have a lot of appointments. So we wanted to create some sort of standard procedure for appointing people to positions.

So about two months ago, Susan and I came up with a proposal creating a standing committee. But before we could actually perfect the proposal, the SSR 2 Review Team endorsements were to be made. So we more or less stopped work on this. Susan and I were asked to join Donna Austin, Heather Forrest and James Bladel on the team that selected the SSR representatives.

And I'm happy to note, I think we did a fairly good job. We used the procedure Susan and I had designed, not strictly but more or less as a resource to take a look at to guide us. And the NCSG did quite well. We had two candidates of the 13; one of them, James Gannon, received one of the guaranteed slots. He will be on SSR 2. And Naveed was the other candidate and he was in the next set of four candidates who were to be considered for any open slots.

And I know they had a meeting on Tuesday. Tapani, I don't know if you've heard the results. I don't know if Naveed got it or not, but I think overall the procedures worked well for the NCSG.

So moving on with – we – these same five people then came back and had a meeting last week to try to fine-tune the proposal that Susan and I had made. Unfortunately, I had a power outage, Susan had a conflicting meeting, James Bladel had a funeral to attend to, so only two folks were on the call but what came out of that call was a refinement of the proposal Susan and I had made. Some of the stuff was needed, a definition of consensus, things like that. But

there were – one major change that I'd like to talk about but also something we were going to leave for the full Council initially. So let me get to that first.

There is disagreement over who should be on the standing committee. We all agree on our small team that the Council chair and two vice chairs should be part of the selection committee. Then the disagreement comes down to one of the traditional disagreements we always have with the CSG; the CSG reps wanted to have the constituencies each to appoint one individual to be on the selection team.

I, on the other hand, said, no, we want to do this the way the GNSO is designed, one representative per stakeholder group. And we knew, Susan and I knew from the start we were not going to be able to come to an agreement, so we proposed and was accepted by the larger group, to lead that for the full Council.

The traditional NCSG position always is to do things by stakeholder group and not by constituencies on Council. If you look at a post I made yesterday in response to some questions from Rafik, I gave you the numbers. We would be disadvantaged by going to the constituency model. The Contracted Party House would be eviscerated by doing that.

So I think it is in our interest and it's also in the interest for a functioning GNSO to have the appointees to the standing committee be done by constituency and not by stakeholder group.

But Number 2 was the change that was made by the two folks who showed up to the meeting and staff. Susan and I believe very strongly that we needed to have a very diverse appointment policy where all stakeholder groups were

represented equally as best we can on our appointees. So the initial plan had two parts of what we called our stakeholder group rotation.

For review teams where you have three endorsees who are guaranteed slots on the review team, we simply wanted to have a rule that stated that no more than one of the three guaranteed slots should go to any individual stakeholder group. So the practical matter, three of the four stakeholder groups, would have appointees on any review team.

Now for the one that got left out, we also wanted to have an additional rotation that that stakeholder group, which was not part of a guaranteed appointment for the review team that was currently being considered, would be guaranteed a slot on the next review team.

So for example, on the SSR 2, the Registrars did not get a guaranteed appointment, so then they would be guaranteed an appointment on the next review team who will be appointing people for. I'm not sure what it is, it maybe ARTR 3, I'm not sure. I know we have one coming up that we have to discuss at the meeting.

So in other words, we were trying to get a rotation so no stakeholder group would be left out for two straight review teams and that every stakeholder group could have a reasonable chance of having an appointment for each and every review team.

I think it's particularly important for the NCSG to try to press this policy and get this – anyway this was left out to a general diversity statement in the reformulated proposal.

From an NCSG perspective, I can tell you on the SSR 2 review, and our deliberations, if it was not for the stakeholder group requirement, James Gannon would not have been selected for one of the three positions, and Naveed would not have been selected for one of the seven – the next four – one of the seven positions. We would have been shut out.

Largely because what I find, and I found in the past on some of the other work they've done in this area, noncommercial applicants, we have a different skill set. So for example, on the SSR 2, one of the requirements was, gee, you have to have experience in corporate security. Well guess what, folks? Naveed, when I looked at his CV, I was astonished at how much work this man has done in the computer security field. The guy has a PhD in the area from the university in Prague, is well qualified. But guess what? He's an academic, he hasn't done corporate security.

James, on the other hand, had a lot of experience in the area, but they wanted someone with a little bit higher educational background than he did. So what I found is when you look at the Contracted Party Houses or even the BC in this case, they have folks that are employed full time in this industry and as such, folks from the BC, from and particularly from Contracted Party House, my belief is that over time they'll be presenting more and more candidates who, on paper, will out-skill our folks largely because they do this professionally.

So I think for our interest, we need to have some sort of stakeholder group rotation. I've spoken with Susan about this, she feels as strongly as I do. And so what we've agreed to do is we'll be getting together in Reykjavik early on, we're going to try to come up with some alternative language to that which has been proposed for the discussion that reinstates some semblance, maybe a little bit different, of the stakeholder group rotation.

So we're guaranteed that no stakeholder group is shut out two RTs in a row and that no stakeholder group has a monopoly on any one RT. So once we get that out we'll post it to the Council list. I hope we'll have a chance to talk to all of our councilors about this in Reykjavik before the meeting on the 16th and try to reinstate some sort of rotation. And as well, we need to go in understanding we also have to talk about the composition of the committee, do we want it to be by constituency or as I think we traditionally would have preferred, by stakeholder group.

So that's what's going on there. I'm happy to answer questions and would love to hear some views on the topics I just spoke about. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you, Ed. Has anybody have comments or questions about this?

Okay, sounds like it was so comprehensive description of the events that everybody's happy with it. So thank you, Ed, also for doing the work and not just for explaining it to us.

Okay, seeing no hands...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: I'm sorry, one additional thing, Tapani. James has the desire to actually have this triggered for the next review. I don't think that's going to be practicable so we may, on Council, have to decide how to handle the next review. And secondly, once we have the review team up, we'll have to wait to find out whatever constituencies or stakeholder groups will be appointing our representatives. It's designed for councilors to actually be on the committee, but I made quite sure that we could use a non-councilor if that was what we wanted to do. But that's something we have to think about within the next month or so; we're going to have appoint people for these positions. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you for that, Ed. Anybody else on this topic? Okay, let's move on then. The next item we have some discussion about, the CCWG Accountability Working Group proposal for limited scope of the ATRT 3 review.

Unless – nobody else volunteers, Avri, would you care to pick this up? No? I think you're pretty much the expert here. Stephanie asked for it to be on the agenda but she's not present.

Avri Doria: Okay sorry. Sorry, my attention had wandered. What – oh okay, so we're on the CCWG Accountability Working Group proposal for a limited scope on the ATRT 3 review. Yes, if I had read the agenda I probably would have known you were going to call on me. Apologies.

Okay so it's time, I mean, it's – according to the MOU it was time for ATRT 3 a couple years ago, but because of the whole transition it was pushed off until after the transition. It was pushed off until like the year after, so we've hit that. Also, the way the bylaws are written, it needs to happen within five years of, you know, the previous one so it's time.

Now, within WS 2, there's a concern about overlap between the work that WS 2 is doing and the work that the ATRT 3 would do. So they've recommended a limited scope, a limited scope basically, for those things, one of the duties of an ATRT is to review all of their previous policy recommendations and the implementation results then decide was it done, was it not done, to what degree was it done, is any improvement needed, etcetera.

So a recommendation that they essentially limit themselves to that and before, you know, as opposed to going with the bylaws stated wide purpose with a

review pretty much anything that has to do with accountability and transparency within ICANN. So I think that's the current situation.

Now I think what's going on is that trying to get the AC/SO leadership or councilors or what have you to sort of make – now the one thing that I question, and here I think I was reporting neutrally up to now here I'm entering more in my own viewpoint area, I think that the bylaws scope of ATRT is defined in the bylaws and I don't think WS 2 or even the chairs or even the combined councils or perhaps even the enhanced community can change that without, you know, some major efforts.

So I think though that they can make a recommendation that that be done that way. But I think ultimately it's a decision that will need to remain with the ATRT 3 itself. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Avri. And I see Ed has his hand up already. Ed, the floor is yours.

Ed Morris: Yes, yes, thanks. Tapani. Yes, Avri stole my thunder at the end. I thought it was a little bit ironic that the first accountability review we're going to do in some ways initially was structured to ignore the bylaws. We'd start accountability by not having accountability. But I do think there's a way to massage it. I think that the limited scope – I initially – we went back and I think it was Morocco when we first started talking about this. And there was even an effort to do away with the ATRT – what is now ATRT 3 entirely.

Fortunately, I'm happy we didn't do away with it. But we could see some interesting work there if we actually have a full review between the WS 2 work and the ATRT work, both duplication and then Lord knows what happens if they actually disagree on outcome. So I think this is a reasonable approach.

I do hope that those – I guess this is a plea to Avri – that those who were involved with ATRT 2 would very much consider serving on ATRT 3. I think continuity in that regard given the special circumstance, would be very, very important and certainly when we select our members, I certainly would place that, to the extent I'm involved in the selection process, very high in terms of what I'm looking for in folks to serve.

But, totally agree, we should go ahead with this and maybe reduce some volunteer fatigue as well. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Ed. Anybody else? Okay. Do we need to make a decision here at this point and just note that Avri and Ed explained the situation well enough at this point and we move on? Okay. Sounds like everybody is satisfied with the explanation. Again, thank you, Avri and Ed.

So the next thing on the agenda is the next Council meeting next week. Maryam, can you get the Council agenda on the screen? Okay thank you. A bit small but – okay that's better.

Let's look at the agenda there. The first decision item or consent agenda item there, Item 3.1 is the confirmation of continuation of James Bladel as the interim representative to the empowered community administration. Ed, you want to comment on this one? Please go ahead. Ed. Hello, Ed. You want to speak? Certainly can't hear you if you are speaking. Okay, sounds like Ed lost connection for a moment or something. Does anybody else want to comment on the...

Ed Morris: Can you hear me now, Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, now we can hear you. Please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Oh good. I gave a brilliant speech that was lost. Okay, yes, basically what this is, is until we have the new bylaws that we worked on in the – bylaws drafting team, and thank Amr, on the record for his contributions on the drafting team. But until we get that done, we have to keep reappointing James as the interim representative to the empowered community because we don't have the procedures in place for the permanent representative.

I would suggest, at least as a discussion point when this comes up, we should inquire as to whether we can just make this a longer-term appointment so we don't have to keep coming back to this every few months. We're not going to have the bylaws in place for half year to a year, so why not appoint James for the duration? Just a suggestion. But I don't see any obstacle to this, the EC hasn't met. I don't anticipate it meeting any time soon until we get done with WS 2 at least. So again, I think this is more or less or a pro forma action, but we will have to vote on it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you, Ed. So certainly this is not any controversial anyway. So this – we don't have to talk much more unless someone else wants to comment whether we should make a motion that (unintelligible) but I don't expect the Council to spend much time discussing it anyway so it's not a big deal either way. Anything else? Ed, your hand is still up, is it an old hand or you want to continue?

Okay, seeing no other hands up, moving on, the Item 4 on the Council agenda is actually only real – a second real item we may have to vote on, approval of final report from the Whois Conflict with National Laws Procedure Implementation Advisory Group.

Does anybody want to comment this one? I see Stephanie is missing from the call unfortunately. Anybody else? Okay, my understanding is that this report is likely to pass and that's not really problematic as such, even though I'm not really an expert on this one. Anybody else want to comment here? Anybody planning to vote against it? Ed again, please go ahead. Can't hear you. Still making great speeches that nobody can hear. Okay, I guess we have to do without Ed's comment on that one for a bit.

Ed Morris: I'm sorry, Tapani, is this – I'm having some trouble with my phone. Can you hear me now?

Tapani Tarvainen: Now I can hear you. Please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, I'm awfully sorry, guys, about the phone. Yes, what I was trying to say is I read the report last night, really for the first time. And it's not perfect. There are some issues. So you asked if anyone's going to vote against it. I don't intend to vote against it but I want to talk to Stephanie, I want to talk to Kathy Kleiman. I mean, there's a chance I could abstain. I just want to hear from those folks who more or less are experts on this field as to whether they're satisfied that the report is the best we could get.

But I still – there are things in there which I think are problematic from a legal standpoint. It no longer puts the (unintelligible) in jeopardy, but, you know, there are problems. And again, I'd like to talk to Stephanie and Kathy to see if there – there was any realistic chance to make it better or if there still is a chance to make it better before I would commit to voting for it. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you Ed. Yes we really do like the experts on this agenda. So we can't really talk much on the substance. Let's put in the counselors present that

please be in touch with (Stephanie) and (Kathy) about that before the meeting. We can actually discuss it in Reykjavík before the council call I hope.

Okay moving on (Eric) did you leave your hand up again? It's an old hand. Okay the next item is discussion item only proposal to limit the scope of the upcoming accountability and transparency review. Well that's what we actually talked about on our call already. Anybody has any think right at this point? No?

Okay moving on the next discussion item also proposed charter for the Standing Selection Committee which we again discussed a separate item already. So no need to return to that either. Okay Ed you want to add something at this point please go ahead. Again lost your sound.

Okay let's since Rafik you have your hand up please do see take the floor while we wait Ed to fix this area. Rafik please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So Rafik speaking. With about this for the RDS or the whole use Review Team I think it's also somehow related to the selection process. So while it's mostly about degree of the timeline I think it will include a discussion about the session process that it was introduced it in the beginning of the call. I think also we have some candidates from NCSG and so we need to get at least one in the review team. And I think if we can tweak the selection process and get it done we have a chance to have a representative there in the review team.

This is one of the important like the ITRT and also I think it's related to the ongoing work in the RDS working group. So yes just even if it's just discussion for now at the council level it's something we have to follow closely and to ensure that we have representation there. Thank you Rafik.

So actually jump to the Item 7 about the Whois Review Team. But that's fine because at this point Ed can you - does your audio work now? Do you still want to speak? I still can't hear you Ed. Okay. I guess your - Ed's phone is broken forever or something. Anybody else want to comment on the - well actually if you want to go back to the Selection Committee Team but rather the Whois Review Team here to Rafik's point which is good we should get someone in there. Nobody else wants to...

Rafik Dammak: Tapani. I think we - yes. I think we covered the discussion about the selection...

Tapani Tarvainen: I agreed.

Rafik Dammak: ...process in the beginning. It was an item in the first agenda item so...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes I - just was the possibility if somebody wanted to go. But Whois Review Teams now anybody on that one apart from what you Rafik just said that is fine. Anybody want to add anything? We can't hear Ed so presume we lost him.

Okay let's move on. Look at the preparation for joint meetings at ICANN 58, a discussion item again. Does anybody want to have anything to say about this just the discussion item. And I guess there's nothing we need to talk about now then.

The next Item 9 and council discussion proposed council discussion response to letter from Thick Whois Implementation Review Team. And again I wish we had (Stephanie) in here but we don't. Anybody else want to comment on this letter? Okay I wonder who that was. Okay so I'll just hope all councilors

will be in touch with (Stephanie) and (unintelligible) group before just in case there's something we're missing here.

Okay than the final item there is council discussion of finalizing their meeting schedule for ICANN 58 just five minutes discussion. Anything here we should be bringing up or anybody other comments? No? Okay is there anything, any other business on the council agenda that somebody'd like to raise? Ed your hand keeps going up but I can't hear you speak. If you can audio works please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Okay let me test my audio first. Can you hear me?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes now I can hear you. Please.

Ed Morris: Fantastic. Yes I can – yes I think this is a good place to do it because we're going to - those of us, those counselors who will be in Reykjavík which I guess is everyone except for my dear friend and colleague Rafik will be able to coordinate this a bit. And Avri will be there because it was her intervention in India I believe that leads to what I'm going to try to bring up under any other business.

Council now meets on the day before the council meeting in a so-called informal session. We close the doors. We don't record anything. We have beer and wine. And we do all of our real work. We've had amazing debates and a lot of victories for the NCSG.

Part of the reason I don't like this set up as I don't get to toot my own horn. I've done good there. Stepania - Tapani when you're - you've been in the sessions you've participated because we allow the SG chairs as well as with the constituency chairs to participate. But it's all done behind closed doors.

And then we get up to the dog and pony show the next day where it seems like counselors are very homogenous, very boring and uninteresting place.

So Avri basically went up to the microphone in India and said, "Hey this isn't what you're supposed to do." You've got to at least vote in closing meetings before you start closing them. And so I intend to bring this up under any other business because we get some pro forma yes you're right we have to do something but in reality I don't believe our leadership really wants to do anything.

I always feel confidentially the reason the rule is in place is because of the NCSG that we used to be passionate used to have disagreements that were in public view. And that was not desired by some. I suggest we want to have things open in public. It might create interest so people will actually want to be counselors for example.

So I intend to bring this up. I intend to talk to my fellow counselors about the problem, listen to their responses but frankly in my view we need to start voting to close the meetings or we need to start opening them up. We need to start recording them. We need to start making this part of an open transparent process of policymaking within the GNSO. I haven't been able to get this on the agenda for some reason so I'm going to use AOB to be able to bring this up. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Ed. I guess that's really been NCSG leadership wants it. That's why that's news to me. I certainly had not – would have no problem in making them open and recorded and everything and it would be...

Ed Morris: Well my apologies Tapani. I said NCSG.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: I meant to say GNSO leadership. My apologies.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay you suggest leadership I guess so but and be clarified it certainly shouldn't be NCSG leadership. You did say that NCSG's been - being I guess you would - but it's reason that because some people don't want to see that dirty laundry in public or something we've been discussing but say the kind of things may be okay. But either way I'm happy you will bring it up. Anybody else or anything else for the Council agenda? Rafik please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: No, sorry I'm just asking for a clarification. I'm not sure what are we at Item 8 in talking about the client for a meeting in Copenhagen and raising concern about the GNSO Council preparatory meeting or something like that?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes you're suggesting that this point (unintelligible) start to make myself - it's Item 8 instead of as an AOB.

Rafik Dammak: Okay because also we still have and - so I'm not sure. Now are we kind of - okay so I think because we still have Item 8 in the agenda with regard to prepare the joint meetings and then Item 10 both the finalization of GNSO meeting schedule and still in Item 9 there is - it's quite important about counselors just a letter from the (unintelligible) Implementation Review Team so this element. We (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: I did ask for opinions on that. I guess you missed it. But if you want to speak on these items please go ahead. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: I don't have okay, so sorry. It sounds that we just quickly hit the item. That's why I miss it. For item 9 and for that it was more an issue that is followed by

Amr but he just resigned today. And so we are working for (unintelligible) and it's (Edicon) or who took the lead I think with (Michele) to draft. And she sent an initial draft a few days ago and I think with that to regard. And now we are asking about the legal, again the legal because a lot of change happened later in particular. And now your opinion yes.

So kind of I think we – you'll get more to discuss in the coming days. So as far as I recall the first draft was like sent one or two days ago. Yes but for the about the items related to the meeting I think we get the draft schedule for Copenhagen. And I think it's a good idea for everyone to check and me particular if they find any kind of clash or an issue there. And so we can highlight it at the council. And also it's good to if I'm not sure if the – for NCSG meeting we are fine with the schedule slot or no for our own meeting so...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you Rafik, make good points there with that should keep in mind. Anybody else on anything related to the council agenda? Rafik your hand is still up. You want to continue? Is that still an old hand? Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. Oh where's my microphone? There's my – Avri speaking. One question I had on that and here we're talking about the overall schedule for the upcoming meeting if I understand correctly. So I'm not sure. I don't understand the way we've hit conflicts all over the schedule where we have PDPs are having meeting against each other. And it's really quite awkward to have people that may be involved in several because that's just the way it happened and unable to make them. So I'm quite

concerned about the schedule I saw. And I don't know if that's part of the discussion you're having but the number of conflicts in that schedule are problematic. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Avri. Okay see Ed you have your hand up again.

Ed Morris: Yes. I just wanted to let Avri know when I saw the initial schedule particularly what you referenced in terms of the PDP conflicts I immediately contacted Donna Austin. She's been alerted. She's trying to specifically for that area is trying to do something because it is absolutely mind-boggling that we're actually having PDPs competing against each other in the same time blocks.

And I think it's again Donna has been the council person who has been involved in meeting strategy. I think she's done an admiral job. She certainly has tried. But I'm starting to question whether the meeting staff even is listening to the GNSO like they should. I think it's something we do need to continue to talk about at console but hopefully by the time we get to the meeting the PDPs will not be competing against each other. At least that's the goal. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Ed. Rafik you have your hand up again.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so happy to hear that Donna is looking maybe to fix this issue but my understanding is maybe it's coming from the GNSO in first place because in the initial block schedule they put, they kind of allocated the slots in Saturday and I think in Wednesday morning for the PDP. And there was I think from the beginning some expectation that there will be some clashes between the different PDP Cross Community Working Group or other GNSO structure

that I mean the group that they will have the meeting. So I think it's maybe somehow there was some expectation there will be some clash there.

But happy to hear the Donna maybe and the expectation that the GNSO leadership and the chair or vice chair they are going to work on that. So I think the problem may be started from the beginning with the block schedule which kind of put some limitation of what the PDP Working Group when they can have their own session or meeting.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Rafik. Ed you raised your hand again.

Ed Morris: Yes. Very quickly Tapani for counselors on the call on Saturday night the 11th there the last item on the agenda should still be or at least was a fireside chat with Glen who is you know is stepping has already stepped down is now just a consultant for ICANN. We will be having our council dinner at beginning at 7:30 that night. I've set up the restaurant where we're all good to go is going to be a special council dinner that we're going to try to celebrate in honor of Glen's career right after our fireside chat so I hope everyone can come. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Ed. I'm sure everyone will be eager to participate in any dinners you organize. Anything else on the council agenda in Copenhagen or anything else? Ed I'm assuming that's an old hand just in case you want to speak more. Okay I guess were done with the Council agenda then.

Let's have a look at the public comments next. There are only four open at the moment. The first one is a proposed charter amendment the Business Constituency. I'm not sure we have anything much to say about those unless somebody has read the proposal and found something interesting there but

somehow I don't think it's really our business how the Business Constituency does their business. Okay Ed please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Just - I just want to note they seem to have made it easier to join and the dues are going to be lowered. So I don't think we need to comment but just so folks understand they do seem to be opening up a bit and I think that's a good thing. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you for that observation Ed. Anybody else? Okay the next one is the release of a country and territory names a long list of them ICANN now 60 or whatever. It's - do we have anything to say about these? We don't have any (Walters) here would complain about that, (Walter) I think. I guess this is not something we have much interest in either.

The fourth one GNSO initial report on the IGO INGO access security rights protection mechanism policy development process. Does this raise any passions among our counselors or anybody else? Rafik please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. Maybe I'm not I think I'm not chairing or whatever for this but if I not mistaken I think there was (reading) error about this process and maybe it's worthy to find the record listen to it. So and it's kind of - have been an issue for a long time now and I think something we may want to place a comment but it's we also need to find a volunteer to do so. And I see that it's quite to have a short time to do so to feel a comment so...

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Rafik. Yes I thought this might be something we might want to comment on but finding anybody willing to dig into it and draft one in fairly short amount of time we have left may not be so easy. Anybody else want to comment on this? Even if you don't, feel free to comment even if you don't

want to volunteer to draft anything. Rafik your hand is still up. You want to continue or is it an old hand?

Okay seems nobody has much interest to say more. And I suspect the last open comment isn't one of our key interest either, the reference Tapani's label generation rules for the second level. I don't think we have anybody here who speaks Japanese or wants to comment on this otherwise.

So that's about it for the public comments. The only one okay, oh yes of course Rafik. You speak Japanese you would have all sorry. So you have an opinion on the Japanese label generation rules? Okay and I see Ed you have your hand up.

Ed Morris: No...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: ...actually it's for the next one. We – I didn't know if you were concluding but I I'm sure we're going to want to weigh in on the At-Large reviews since we're mentioned in it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, yes the Japanese one I just note that if Rafik promises to take a look if there is something we want to comment on. Thank you Rafik for that. But the next one is indeed the At-Large review draft report. So Ed you wanted to speak on that? Go ahead.

Ed anybody on the At-Large review draft report? Hello? Ed did you want to speak about the At-Large report? Does anybody else? There's lots of interesting stuff there but okay Rafik please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Tapani. I think there was some interest expressed by several members before on different the noncommercial mailing list about the At-Large review report. So I think it's still worth maybe to check. I said if I didn't read it yet so I don't have any position but think it's always good to read and to see if we have anything we want to submit for the comment or is something that may concern us directly.

The challenge is just that at least some of the midline just after the Copenhagen meeting and so on. So if we want really how want to submit a comment maybe just we're (unintelligible) to get volunteers from that. Now and I want to say that we will see at the policy committee level in term of planning and try to follow-up with all these public comments so into and ensure at least we can respond to some of them if we can get volunteers to make an (unintelligible) drafting for this statement.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Rafik. So I take it the Policy Committee and your leadership will take on and try to find volunteers for drafting a comment on this one. Anybody else? Okay that was the last public comment, open public comment at the moment. Anybody want to return to any of these? In case I've been going too fast now is a good time to remind me of something I missed?

Okay. If not let's move on with our agenda. The last item before AOB I had there was the intersessional meeting preparation. We don't have too many of additional participants here but still a few. And others might want to weigh in as well. So as I presume you all know that next week from Tuesday and Wednesday and actually on Thursday as we'll be in Copenhagen with all our counselors. The only one who wasn't except Rafik and Amr who's no longer a counselor as well as the executive committee most of them of both AC - no, NCUC and NPOC apart from (Farzi) who can't make it because the US Visa policies.

I don't have anything specific here but that - because the people I would want to have on to talk about or not present but so at this point I think the agenda for that is public. Maryam can you dig up the link to the intersessional agenda? And anybody who wants to have an input there is welcome to do that.

So we will have a session with (Göran) about whatever we want to talk to (Göran) about. And there is I already called for suggestion on the list. We can of course surprise him but if we want him to prepare for something we should do so. We will have also access to a couple of board members and of course the actual substance there that we will be discussing with our CSG counterparts like the compliance board selection board member selection procedures. And we actually should be already talking about who will - the people we are we want for the board even though this point not suggestion I don't expect able to be voting about that yet there. I hope we will get the procedure decided.

Yes Farsi is talking to (Göran) on a Monday, I understand. And I actually will be talking with (Göran) before the intersessional as well, so if you want something, notes passed to him, by all means bring it up. Yes I will be - (unintelligible) to something that we may want to talk about as well. So if you have something you want to bring to him, right now it would be a good time either here or on the list or whatever.

Okay now we get the agenda coming up. Can you scroll it down? Okay. You'll note that there's also a community overview where we're supposed to outline our goals and priorities for this year. Okay, Matthew, I see your hand up. Are you - I hope you have something to say about. Please go ahead.

Matthew Shears: Tapani, can you hear me?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, loud and clear.

Matthew Shears: I'll certainly hopefully contribute something. I think we have a unique opportunity between Farsi, yourself, and the intersessional into reinforcing who we are and what we stand for and believe in. Because I think it's - we don't get this kind of face time, we don't necessarily have an opportunity to review who we are and what we do and why it's important that we're a part of this community and why our views are important to the success of ICANN.

So I think a lot of this - I mean we have quite a period of time at the intersessional with Göran. I think it's a good opportunity for us to restate in relatively clear and I suppose simple terms what our value-add to ICANN and the ICANN community is. So I think that's, again, it will be interesting to see what comes out of your and Farsi's discussion because I think that will help us a little bit to understand. But at the same time, I think those of us who are going to be in Iceland probably should think about highlighting maybe three or four key things about this community, about us, that he needs to know and why he needs to know we're important. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Matthew. That's a very good point. Perhaps people would like at this point to suggest what those two or three key items would be. Do we know what we want?

Ed Morris: Yes hi thanks, Tapani. Yes I think between you, Farsi and the group we have lots of time with Göran. We need to make an impression. I do think it may be valuable to take a minute or two and say, "Hey, we've been around for, what, 16, 17 years. Here's some of the contributions we've made." But I also don't want to waste the time and just talk about us because he's been in office for a bit. Bluntly, I think he has not been a good steward.

I think there are some things going on in terms of staff, the (unintelligible), the contract - policy by contract, things like this that I know I've talked to Kathy about it and we all need to talk before we go into the meeting and get this thing set up. But I do think we need to take - we've been reading the list and let's show him the NCSG. We get the CEO for 70 minutes. You and Farsi have him for a combined 60 minutes. I think when we get together as group, we can do both. We can tell him who we are but we also need to start expressing our concerns about what's going on under his stewardship.

He just appointed somebody to the Anti-Phishing Working Group. They're going to be getting involved in content. By definition, when you get involved in phishing, you're getting involved in content. So I think we need to start having a little bit of a policy discussion with him as well, not only tell him who we are and what we've done but how we're looking at what he's done and what ICANN and ICANN staff are doing under his stewardship because there's going to be some pushback.

I can tell you that the CSG, at least some members of the CSG, intend to bring up the policy by contract and some other issues which basically state they're starting to ignore the multi-stakeholder model a bit. And I think we need to coalesce with the CSG. Because if we do any of the policy issues, if both the CSG and the NCSG bring up the same issues, I think it will be all that stronger and more important.

So I guess what I'm trying to say in my rambling fashion is when we get to Reykjavik we should hear, Tapani, from you and from Farsi about what you discussed, what sort of response you had. We should also talk to the CSG colleagues and see what they intend to bring up and try to have a balance

discussion that includes both hey we're the NCSG, this is what we've done, give him some actual data.

He's a regulator from the telecoms industry. State that we did X, Y, and Z. We prevented ICANN from doing this that would have injured the corporation, but then say, "Hey, we're seeing some of this other stuff going on since you've been here. We don't understand it. Can you maybe explain a little bit about what your thinking is?"

I want to give you one example from India. Milton brought up the problem, the perceived problem or potential problem with the complaints officer. And he gave us a very good response that really reassured me that the complaints officer was going to stay strictly into a narrow operationally define area. Now I'm seeing the complaints officer, at the suggestion actually of our ombudsmen, is now being brought into reviewing the IDP denials.

So I guess what I'm trying to say is where is he coming from? Is ICANN getting involved in content through the phishing group? Are we getting involved in operations? I mean one of the reasons Rod Beckstrom was canned was because he got ICANN involved in some cyber security stuff in operations. So I guess what I'm trying to find out is where does he intend to lead and take us and does he understand that the community, the bottom up, multi-stakeholder process is supposed to define policy, not him and his staff, because I'm not sure he does. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you for that. And yes it would be actually nice if we had a nice documentation of our achievements somewhere or even just a few items, I think we can come up with something there. So we want to (unintelligible). Otherwise on the - yes, Matthew, good question. Do we have this priority (unintelligible), and we don't, not yet, that I know of anyway. So we should

come up with that because that's one session we are supposed to make goals, priorities, and plans for this year. We should put together hopefully a presentation.

Matthew Shears is typing. I hope you have a list of priorities you're typing in at the moment. So I guess that means a little weekend work for some of us trying to come up with that. But yes, we have our own session on - well every morning there and we'll have to use those effectively for planning the sessions up ahead. Rafik, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks, Tapani. So just for clarification, because I think we have the Tuesday meeting, which is more like for constituency or stakeholder group level and then the Wednesday and Thursday sessions. I think there is expectation to have the remote participation for them, so at least for myself since I won't be in Iceland. I'm thinking - I'm trying to attend as much as possible, having in mind the timer difference with is plus nine hours. So just, I want to be sure that I can attend some of them.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes we will make sure that remote participation is available.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. For all sessions, okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. I understand it should be available for all. Okay. And I noticed that Stephanie has indeed joined us and we did skip a few items here briefly because nobody present knew about them. So, Stephanie, okay - I see Avri is already asking you to tell anything about your PDP craft, I guess PPDs. Stephanie, you want to speak?

Stephanie Perrin: Hello. Stephanie Perrin. Can you hear me?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Good. I'm in a - I'm outside the library so I can't shout. So let me know if I'm dropping my volume too much. We have finally managed to get a slot with the data commissions, which you will see on that draft that was sent around. It's on the opening day. It is now a high interest topic. We are, as predicted, getting some pressure to put different people on the high interest topic representing some of the other viewpoints, notably intellectual property and law enforcement.

They have proposed, or somebody proposed, Becky Burr, and I'd be very happy to have Becky there because she has a clue. I don't know whether, you know, what - how that's going to end. James Bladel was pushing us to try to meet these concerns. He's not really showing much leadership, frankly, if I may say so.

But we have a number of folks already coming. The EDPS is coming, the special (unintelligible) for privacy is coming. There will be someone from the Article 29 working group. I thought it was (Isabelle Hulka), the chair, but I'm not actually sure. I haven't checked with (Peter).

Our principal problem that we have at the moment is I'm not sure who's staying till Wednesday. And our slot is supposed to be Wednesday morning, the NCSG slot. And so I'm trying to get at least the EDPS briefer, namely (Askam Kabunda), to hang around and come and see us then.

In the meantime, on the RDS craft, as Avri calls it, and believe me I'm so close to walking away, it's blinding on some days, Chuck has had me and (Peter) give a little presentation the other day on what - why - how the data protection community views the matter of purpose specification because

clearly we were having a dialogue of the depth between the engineers, the intellectual property lawyers and us, in terms of defining the purpose of why ICANN collects registration data.

And, as predicted, we haven't convinced anyone, except the engineers maybe. So that will continue, that argument. And we are moving into the privacy module so, you know, this is where we sort the stuff out. We're getting quite a bit of support I would say from the technical community, guys like the SSAC guys that are there, Andrew Sullivan and James Galvin.

I would definitely love to have James Galvin on the panel with the data commissioners, so I was waiting until the dust settled and I'm going to propose that. So that's kind of what's going on. At least we finally got that session. For those who have been wondering what has been happening since Hyderabad, (Peter) was dealing with (Nigel Hickson) and the Government Advisory Committee, who were supposed to be hosting this, because after all, The Council of Europe is an observer on the GAC, and they just weren't making up their minds.

So stalling works really well, you know. All of a sudden, oh my God, there's no time left. It's too late to put in the bids. We can't do it. Sorry. So that's what's been happening. (Peter) and I were both in Brussels and the big European Data Protection conference two weeks ago end of January. We talked to many of the key players and we can get some of them to show up and help us out. So how's that for a summary?

Tapani Tarvainen: That was a good summary for those items, sure. And a couple of things we covered while you were gone was the Copenhagen agenda and of course a couple of council items we skipped because you were the only one who know about anything about them. Do you have something to say about the final

report from the Whois Conflict for National Laws Procedure Implementation Advisory Group?

Stephanie Perrin: I do. As you know, I had proposed a motion to look at the - examine the policy. There is some question as to the conflation of these whole issues. The Whois review team, we don't know who's on it yet. There is the fact that that conflicts with the law policy needs to be examined in the context of the RDS group that I'm on.

And with respect to the trigger, they're accepting the new trigger but the fact is the policy doesn't work. So, you know, Marika came up with this compromise where we would immediately, i.e. April I believe or May, start a new group looking at the implementation of the conflicts of law policy.

Now I will ask on - at the GNSO meeting how this will be different from the last time. And believe me, the last time was absolutely bar none the most stupid policy discussion I've ever engaged. And, you know, after 35 years in government I've got some track history there, you know? It was just nonsense. And we were getting nowhere. So I don't see how the charter of the new group is going to be different if we don't change the policy. The policy's wrong.

So I'm not going to hold it up. I may abstain if I don't get a good answer. But Marika seems to have cooked it up. So if she can explain it, fine. But the last time, you know, it was just a head-banging exercise. So does that help on that? I'd like to know who's going to be on the Whois review team. I actually have no time anymore, but we definitely need someone pretty skilled to be on that.

And by skilled I don't mean that someone without the experience isn't skilled, I mean you've got to have the history in your head of they're going to pull a

fast one, in my view, just saying. So it's kind of hard. If anybody's heard anything about the Whois review team, I'd love to know. I haven't.

Tapani Tarvainen: I was kind of hoping you had because nobody else seems to. There's another council item on the Whois, it's a letter from the Thick Whois Implementation Review Team, the council response.

Stephanie Perrin: Oh, if I could jump in again, Tapani, on the thick Whois.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes I was kind of hoping you would.

Stephanie Perrin: Is Amr on the call?

Tapani Tarvainen: Amr is no longer in our council. He's not - I assume you have not heard, I think.

Stephanie Perrin: No, what happened?

Tapani Tarvainen: Amr is staff. He joined the staff as of this morning.

Stephanie Perrin: I'm very happy for him. That's probably great. But I'm sorry to lose him. That's terrible. On the other hand, we need decent staff in there so, you know, it's kind of a victory.

Well on the thick Whois, (Erica Mann) has proposed a request for a new legal opinion for council because I think there is an understanding that the new legal opinion that the Whois - the thick Whois PDP was working on was, dare I say, woefully inadequate. I mean it was woefully inadequate long before (Shrim's) and long before the new regulation and, you know, all of the core

presidents that are influencing data protection in Europe. But at least there's a recognition that this might be a problem.

And for those not following the whole thick thing, the issue is the transport of data from Europe to VeriSign in the United States in Virginia, I think to be precise, the - that is affected by the (Shrims) decision and by the requirement to keep data safe. And there is no constitutional way to protect that data. So the registrars in Europe were thinking okay we're off the hook. This personal data is now VeriSign's problem, we don't have to manage the Whois lookup. But they also are still responsible for transferring it to ICANN.

All of a sudden I would note there's a whole lot more interest in my allegation that ICANN is a data controller, because that's who gets the fines under the new regulation. And the fines are 4% of the - of your gross - I'm not sure exactly how you describe it. The 4% of earnings is the peak. And some of the European data commissioners are starting to give some serious signs already, the Dutch one in particular.

So the whole thick thing they'll get another legal opinion, but if it's done by legal counsel at ICANN, it'll be probably as useless as the last one, in my opinion. So.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. So it's about as messy as I feared. And we have nobody volunteering for the Whois review team that I know of. I guess we'll have to call for volunteers if you are not up to the task. I'm not sure if anybody else knows even close to enough of this. Okay. That's about it then. It looks like we still have the any other business on our agenda.

And one of the items I just here that everybody except Stephanie apparently had heard that Amr told us this morning that he's joined the staff and is no

longer a counselor, so we need to replace him. I'm going to send out a call for volunteers to the discussion list to see how - if we have anybody who wants to be a counselor for the rest of the year. But that's an issue that not only having shortage of people in the council but he's also been a really effective one and been directing a number of things in the work that nobody else has, so it will not be easy to replace. Rafik, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks, Tapani. I guess for the time being, just I would say we can use the proxy vote since maybe as far as I recall in the NCSG draft charter so the executive committee will appoint someone in the next election. And so I'm not sure. So I guess I assume there will be some discussion on the executive committee level on how to proceed exactly here. For the time being, I think the proxy vote would - oh thanks, Avri. So we need to appoint someone, at least a temporary alternate. Okay. Sorry.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, Avri. I've been discussing with others already that it's not entirely clear but my conclusion is as well that a proxy would not work. So I'm trying to - and I posted on this to the executive committee already that we are going to have this in our next meeting, but I think we'll have to get a quick position to temp out maybe just for one meeting before we can have a longer discussion, but still.

That's an executive committee decision but the discussion here is - yes, Avri, you're correct. We can change it anytime. The problem is that we have to - getting the EC to want something means a consensus in the EC and that's always a big - sometimes a bit difficult.

Rafik Dammak: Tapani, sorry.

Tapani Tarvainen: Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible). Reading what Avri is saying, I think it can be in two phase just for now. Because we have the council meeting next week, we need a temporary alternate and I think someone experienced that can be a former GNSO councilor and so on so that can be appointed as, not appointed but just a temporary alternate for that council call, and then thinking more about kind of a replacement and until the next election. So there are two issues here. Just maybe for the next call and then thinking about something more kind of midterm for this year.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you for that, Rafik. That was my thinking as well. Ed, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes thanks, Tapani. Yes I mean you do have a temp alt. You can't proxy nothing. You know, an empty seat can't give a proxy because an empty seat can't function. If you recall when I took my so-called leave from council, and because of the selection stuff I actually did more work and council while on leave than I ever did while on council not on leave, but it took the EC largely six weeks to settle on someone to replace me for two months.

And as result, (Martin), who was gracious enough to step up and do it, really didn't get the full experience. We have lots of folks that will be in Reykjavik, Avri, Matt, who has been a temp alt in the past and did great job. So I mean we have enough people there, so I would suggest we do it for one meeting but then I love your idea of opening it up to everybody on list. We keep saying we want new blood. Here's an opportunity to get some.

So I - full endorsement of trying to open it up to see who out there wants to step up and wants to give this a shot. And, you know, we don't know how many seats are going to be available. I know a few of us I'm sure we'll be

continuing to - we're continuing the discussion, so, you know, there may be more than one seat available. There may just be one seat, we don't know yet. But certainly we should try to finalize that decision for. Those who are considering not, because of their own personal situation, that they may not be able to go on, I would hope everyone can reach decision by Reykjavik and then you can proceed there. So there may be more than one position and I think folks should note that. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Ed. Yes that's why I was actually going to call to the discussion list to see if there are any volunteers because this will be the rest of the year. But for - we can make a quick decision just for Reykjavik. And I think I will try to do that. It will be easier get the EC to agree on something like that first and then we have an EC meeting in two weeks and have this on the agenda already in any case. But a quick decision is needed for Reykjavik for the next week's council meeting.

Are there any other comments on this one? Ed, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand? I guess. Anybody else? Okay. So that's just for information but I'm glad to hear that you'll basically follow up. Yes, we need a temporary alt and we should try to get someone for next week quickly.

Any other business for this call? Anything at all we should talk about? Now is a good time. We still have half an hour to do if we need to. Okay. It seems we don't. In that case, thank you everybody. Let's close the call. Goodbye. Goodnight, good evening, good morning wherever you may be.

We can stop the recording.

END