ICANN

Coordinator: Maryam Bakoshi
July 8, 2016
8:00 am CT

Operator: Excuse me, the recording has started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Austin. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG ExComm meeting on Friday 8th of July, 2016. On the call today we have Joan Kerr, Poncelet Ileleji, Robin Gross, Tapani Tarvainen. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

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

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Maryam. So this is Tapani speaking. First thing on the record I'd like to welcome Joan Kerr and Poncelet as new members of the Executive Committee.

Then without further delay let's get on with the agenda. We have our member applications to approve of not application (unintelligible). Do you all have the spreadsheet open so you can see the pending applications?

If not, let us know and we'll get the link to you. Joan? Okay now you got the link. (Unintelligible) so you can (unintelligible) so I don't have to read them out loud, all of them. Okay, hope you are ready and (unintelligible).

The first applicant is (unintelligible). He says he wants to join the NCSG for study and development. He wrote proficient as programmer and register my own domain. And very little other information. But…

Joan Kerr: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Comments anyone? Okay Joan, please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Hello, it's Joan here. I had a question. I didn't do any development by looking up any of these members. I'm so sorry, I should have done that. So I just want to say that I should have done that beforehand. Is that correct, we're supposed to do that?

Tapani Tarvainen: Please repeat. I didn't get that.

Joan Kerr: No I was just saying that I had not investigated any of the membership organizations or people beforehand, so my apologies.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well it's not essential that you do that, although it may - it can cause you - not that we don't think you need more time for review some of them if they look - something we want to check before we can - we cannot postpone the decision in some cases. But if you think that we can vet them well enough from now that's fine as well.

So you can see it now anyway if you think you could approve Mr. Hupsel at this point on the basis of what we can (unintelligible) we wish to postpone one more time to decide in him. Okay Poncelet please go ahead.

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes thank you Tapani. Poncelet for the record. I just wanted to say the first one underneath (unintelligible), the details are very scanty. So can we ask for further information from him? Because what he did in the (unintelligible) and they have stuff like that is really very scanty so I will suggest that he should at least provide a more detailed information as compared to the next on the list, Adeel Sadiq, which has very useful information and also a reference. So I don't know what that actually holds for (Atal) if we can get him to supply more details. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Poncelet. Do you wish to suggest a specific question (unintelligible)? I see nothing what he said is problematic but as you say it's very little information. (Unintelligible) on domain and that is the reason for (unintelligible) policies but we can ask for more information. Any other opinions here? Of course since we are (unintelligible) by consensus, one vote saying that we need more information is enough.

Anybody wish to argue otherwise? So for you (unintelligible). Okay, Joan? Are you indicating approval that you also want more information so we'll postpone him?

Joan Kerr: Yes that's - perhaps we could ask him the nature of his study and how NCSG would help him. That would be very helpful.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay so we will ask him what is his interest in gTLD policy (unintelligible) like that (unintelligible). So we'll ask for more details.

Okay, let's look at the next one – Adeel Sadiq from Pakistan. Comment from him or her - I don't even - can't even tell. I see Robin has indicated a yes vote. Reading the description it looks very convincing to me. Let's see, Poncelet indicating (unintelligible) as well. So Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes there is enough information there for (unintelligible).

Tapani Tarvainen: So we are agreed in approving Adeel Sadiq. Let's look at the next one – Mika Honkanen from (unintelligible) connection to (unintelligible). He's also an activist (unintelligible) even though he doesn't mention it. He was in the (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) that way. Any comments there?

I see Poncelet approving it. Robin also indicated approval. Joan of course we have to wait for Monika's approval. Without her because we have a full consensus. So also it's approved pending Monika's (unintelligible). Joan, your point on Mika?

Joan Kerr: Yes it looks fine to me.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay so Mika also approved pending Monika's approval. Next is (unintelligible) who you might guess I know because he's a (unintelligible) board member. And I would recommend him but he's part of (unintelligible). Also active in (unintelligible), Finland as well. Comments there?

I see that Robin is was a yes after (unintelligible). I think Joan's comments have indicated (unintelligible). So okay again (unintelligible) approved, pending Monika's (due).

Next Rachel Pollock Ichou. Okay, Rachel Pollock Ichou from France. Commission (unintelligible) by Ayden, (unintelligible) and seems to have

been – with her background information here. Robin also already vote yes but others, Rachel…? Joan and Poncelet both have (unintelligible). So Rachel also approved, again pending Monika's (unintelligible).

Then we have Michelle Fenty from the United States who found out about us by word of mouth. The long description here that looks enough to me at least. I don't see anything problematic, although let's hear your comments. Anybody have any problems or questions or concerns about (Michelle)?

Okay Robin's asking what's the non-commercial interest. That's true, there is no real description on that. So from description of her and her background but very little of her interest in the gTLD policies or ICANN even. So I guess we'll ask for verification at that point. Any comments, Robin? You want to expand on that comment about (unintelligible)?

Robin Gross: This is Robin. Can you hear me okay?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes we can hear you.

Robin Gross: Okay yeah I just – like you said there – there's some information about her but not really information about what her non-commercial interest is, like she's interested in joining (NCIE). So I think I would just like to know a little bit more information about what the non-commercial interest is -- and same for the next as well, the next applicant for the (unintelligible). Just want a little bit more information. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you Robin, and I see that Poncelet and Joan are agreeing so that's just clear enough. We'll ask more to explain what's their interest in gTLD policies and in particular what non-commercial interest it has.

Okay, next is Romella El Kharzazi, hoping to pronounce it even close to correct. It's a long explanation but trying to find out its relation to gTLD policies I struggle a little here. I guess that would be Robin's concern as well, what the non-commercial interest in gTLD policies here is something we would like more details in. Is that what you had in mind? Anybody? Did I get your point right, Robin, of basically same as above? Okay.

And I see Poncelet concurring. And Joan as well. So agreed on that one, so we will have to ask Romella also for more details on their interest in - non-commercial interest in gTLD policies basically is what we want to ask.

Okay that was the individual member applications we have this time, and then we have one new organization – Youth for Social Welfare Nepal, it's stated mission being (all kinds of women), people with disability (unintelligible), children, young people (unintelligible) consciousness, raise the level of secondary education, (unintelligible) this combination to unite the young people for the development of a better society.

How this relates to ICANN something I'm not quite sure. Individual donations, cultural (unintelligible) funding. Government organization. Also a big challenge. Robin you have - and yes, have you looked at the organization better or like to comment otherwise?

Robin Gross: Yeah, I'm looking at the Web site now – Youth for Social Welfare Nepal – you know, and it looks like a pretty legitimate social welfare organization. You know, it looks like a pretty standard organization that would be someone that we would want to reach out to and try to encourage to participate at ICANN in Nepal too. You know, we don't have a lot of members from Nepal so that would be nice.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you Robin. That's a valid (unintelligible). Actually Joan you want to speak. Go ahead.

Joan Kerr: I have a question regarding approving organizations. I mean it's one thing to look at obviously a Web site. Do we have to have any paperwork to say that they are legitimately a legal entity or anything like that's not required?

Tapani Tarvainen: We have not had any formal requirements to that effect. So there is no rule requiring them to be for example something like a non-associated organization would be formally acceptable. We have not done any systematic legal checking of organizations. So as far as I know there is no legal requirement to that effect.

Okay, Joan is your hand - you want to continue? I see your hand is still up. Okay, Poncelet.

Poncelet Ileleji: Poncelet, my hand is the one up. Yes, Poncelet for the record. I just wanted to - I mean, I'm technically okay with them, but it would also be good – I don't know whether we have the mandate to do that -- to ask if they have any registration of the charity or are they not-for-profit in Nepal? I don't know whether we can ask for that but it would be good to know. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: We have application we ask for that when they have been (unintelligible) that they are actually something like government funded and sort of like, but if you look at the Web site about us, it's just a non-government organization.

Legally it's (unintelligible) could be – at least they claim to be legal non-government organization since 2010 so not a new one either. And the legal structure, the (unintelligible) looks also (unintelligible) NGO so I don't see any problem in that regard.

And I don't think we have any easy way of doing a formal legal check there. Okay Joan you want to comment.

Joan Kerr: First I want to say I like that organization so I'll say yes to approve them. But regarding the legal entity, one of the - we don't have to do that today but I think it's something that we can put on the table for consideration at a later time because when I asked Maryam to clean up the NPOC database, there were many organizations that supposedly organizations but they were actually projects under another organization.

And so yes they answered the question that they were a legal entity but it was a project, and that's why we had so many members that were under another - for example a church. There was – I remember this one very specifically. There were three projects listed separately, although it was the only when you asked or when we attempt to validate that we discovered that.

Tapani Tarvainen: That is a good point. We should try to make sure that these organizations are actually organizations and not just short term projects as a general principle, definitely. And (unintelligible) considers (unintelligible) kind of standard Web presence we have to review before approving any but I don't see any problems with this one.

Although actually one question I would like to have they usually do is to see that we can have who is actually or currently on their board or something like that so as not to make sure it's not a one-person organization.

Let me see if we can find that there. They do have contact addresses, both e-mail and Web site and phone numbers and everything also. It looks good enough to me in general. That's actually something we might consider putting

on the application form, the addresses to the director or something like that for the organization so that we have more than one point of contact.

But in this specific case it looks very good. So I see Poncelet agreeing. Robin is voting yes. Joan, you want to ask more of them or do you agree that we accept them as a member or what we can ask for more? Okay, let's go - we all agree that we approve them again pending Monika's approval or objection.

Okay, that was for new applicants. We have something under review. I see two members in the review and the two individuals that have been basically – asked for information early on. So (unintelligible) we (unintelligible) pending because we noted that he's a member of (CSG) which is kind of problem.

Have we received any more information from them? There was (unintelligible) provided this (no longer with us)? Maryam, have you heard any extra information from (Defilla)?

Maryam Bakoshi: This is Maryam for the record. No, I haven't. He really hasn't come up (unintelligible) as well.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Then I don't see that we can approve him at this point. We do select (unintelligible) for the director at least information because it was delegated to Rudy who is no longer with us. So we can either drop them now or ask them again directly (unintelligible) request. Opinions here? Anybody feel like dropping him without further discussion? I don't think we want to wait for Rudy anymore because – or he's not likely doing any more with…

So any comments on (Defella)? Ask for more questions or reject. Okay I see two – Joan and Robin saying drop him and that's enough. Actually even one rejection would be enough so we drop him and Maryam send him rejection

letter noting that we do not accept (CSG) members. If that's an error then he can reapply.

Okay the other one – I see Poncelet is typing something, okay. (Unintelligible) rejection.

The next – the other one is (White Cub) (Unintelligible) something difficult to pronounce name. He claims to be a member of GNSO already. Now what that means I'm not quite sure. I think we asked about that. Maryam did you send him a question about that?

Maryam Bakoshi: My apologies. I was coming off mute. Yes I did. I haven't heard back from him.

Tapani Tarvainen: So we asked for clarification and got no reply. Policy has to be basically in both cases that we reject them if they don't reply to us, then…

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry Tapani, that's an error (up to) the slide. I had – one second – I had put that down. I'm not sure where it's gone. I'm going to look.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay we want to see who replied before (unintelligible).

Maryam Bakoshi: Yeah replied on the – under the additional inquiry required to comment.

Tapani Tarvainen: So it's part of the working group, which is not a problem for us I think if we (unintelligible). So looking at this description here I don't see any obvious problem although some of that (diversity) is very confusing. But nonetheless, membership in the GNSO PDP Working Group is – that's a problem before us.

So opinions? Shall we approve, reject or ask for even more clarification? Okay I think we have actually seen him in some mailing list into the CCWG okay. Anyway a quick poll. Robin do you think? The truth of the agency of CSG article I think for the (Richard P) team but how about (Fipub) as well I don't see him (unintelligible) the commission.

Robin Gross: This is Robin is…

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes?

Robin Gross: Did you say he wasn't - this isn't the guy, the study CSG. I'm looking at his application now and it says he's in the GNSO also but he doesn't say specifically where in the GNSO.

Tapani Tarvainen: No he's not in the additional…

Robin Gross: Right yes. Let's ask for clarification on what he means by that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Did you see that additional info at the point that it's already in the GNSO PDP Working Group and that's what he meant by GNSO when you asked about that last time (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Okay. So he's - okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: I certainly don't see how the GNSO PDP Working Group membership could be a problem because many of our members are and indeed that is a good thing. So we are (unintelligible) CSG and weekly sector team already but as well (unintelligible) if any of you - have you not recommend the CCWG Working Group by the way Robin? I think I have.

Robin Gross: Well I - that name does not look familiar to me as somebody who's been an active participant but, you know, we've got so many new members joining all the time maybe I just haven't noticed him yet.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well (unintelligible) this GNSO membership is limited to that working group and then it's not a problem the second (unintelligible). But the question is do you think the description remains (unintelligible) something that makes sense to what we want to ask for clarification or basic thing on that one?

Robin Gross: Yes maybe yes I think recession might be a bit premature at this point. Let's just ask for a little bit more clarification about what his noncommercial interest is. It's not very clear there's not a whole lot of information here. It just kind of says, you know, Internet governance is a (unintelligible). I'm not even sure what that means. So I'm - I wouldn't say we should reject him outright at all but rather just add a little bit more clarification about where he's coming from and what his noncommercial interest is.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I would be happy with the but we again ask for please explain what's your non-commercial interest in gTLD policies. Their previous concern about other GNSO membership is not - that's clearing up but otherwise it remains consider we don't quite understand what it's about and what these non-commercial interests are. Everybody agree with that?

            Okay so we will ask for more clarification on his non-commercial interests here. And that was individuals and the review. Do we have any organizations in the review? We have one yet, International Centers for Leadership development material. And we asked what would be less interesting the GDSD, gTLD policies and what exactly is the funding source. And I understand we got no reply from them directly but Rudy corrected some of the information and we're sending them for Rudy comments. So I don't think we

can rely on Rudy anymore and I am a bit uneasy about having someone else like (unintelligible) Rudy correct the information.

So we just want them to apply directly for questions. In general I don't want to have members who are not responsive to email because well we will need to be able to reach our members. So we contacted them and got no response indirectly except from Rudy and it's not exactly clear what exactly said. Any opinions here? Should we ask for more…

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: …Joan for comments or - okay Robin go ahead.

Robin Gross: Yes. I would give him another chance. I would say let's just sort of start over where we were the last time when this was in Rudy's hands so we could reach out to this applicant and ask additional information and it should come back to our group directly. And if it doesn't, you know, if there's no response well then, you know, our policy has been clear all along.

If somebody doesn't respond and when we ask for more information we get rejected so I don't see any reason why we would treat this applicant differently. But I would also like I say give him another shot because of, you know, this was on (Rudy)'s (unintelligible). And then he stepped down and so in order to be fair to this applicant let's just try to step over again. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Well that sounds fair enough to me. Any objections? Okay looks like we are on agreement here. Okay Joan at least agreeing. So and (unintelligible) for the (clause) so we (unintelligible) at least because Monika was not present but asking for more information something we can do without (unintelligible).

So Maryam please (unintelligible) again that question asking for (unintelligible) things who are needed to know to clarify the interest in gTLD policies and their funding. Okay that was the end of membership applications. Let's move on to the next item on our agenda. Oh let's see, next we have elections coming up.

And ICANN told us that they want to know the names of new counselors by September 7. So we'll have to have our elections a bit earlier then. Last year I counted back from last (unintelligible) a few days and there we went through those two weeks. Now it wasn't two weeks from nomination and one week in-between. And so counting that way we should open nominations from the beginning of August for two weeks then give them a few days for make the candidate statements and then try to have a conference call.

And yes this is for both the counselors and chair and then began working by August 21 for two weeks (unintelligible) in (unintelligible) September 4. (Unintelligible) two weeks yes and give us two days to come here without just in case. And still we are one time ahead of the ICANN deadline so we are not going to (unintelligible). And everything should be in time. November 9 is the last day of our (unintelligible) meeting (unintelligible) to begin.

There may be some - one date I have very (unintelligible) August 18. But it doesn't conflict with the conference call or something like that so we can push that to the 20th or 17th. But otherwise any concerns, comments, which counselors (unintelligible)? Let's see we have David Cake who's terminating his seat so his seat is just opened. Ed Morris is up for reelection and Stephanie Perrin also up for reelection and the chair is reelection for every year.

We have regional restrictions. There are actually some that I'm not quite sure of because Marilla has actually moved to France I think so she may be work here now. And that's why it's officially European yet so that would impact that. Otherwise there that means that Europe is the one (unintelligible) we had a maximum. And of course there's the maximum of two Parisian limit so if there are multiple candidates from other regions that might become a problem. But and we might have North American although now the only North American is Stephanie I think so room for one more.

The only African we have is Amr. And if Marilla moves to Europe them we'll have no Latin American. But otherwise nothing physical. We have also gender requirement have at least two of each gender but that doesn't seem to be a problem of course depending on who is - what kind of candidates we get. Okay so I'll check that August 18 does not conflict with any other conference call or anything like that and otherwise people are happy with it.

Okay. That would be a good. Let's move to - the next agenda item I want to speak a little bit about member database project we have which is actually progressing not quite as fast as I'd like in particular given this timetable. At the moment it seems that we will not have this ready for doing this member (stoking) process but it should be ready in time to get votes released by mid-August if things go as they seem to be going.

The whole project itself raised hope. So basically this was done and ready and publishable and beautiful and everything ready by the Hyderabad. But the basic functionality should be ready in August (unintelligible) around the election. Then there are some additional features that will take a bit more time but I hope to get those ready by Hyderabad. And Joan has been involved in the project for he knows. And the others we have to have a small team doing

that and for Sam Lanfranco, Brenden Kuerbis and Rafik I think have been involved with as well.

Any questions on that? One detail I could - I had recall is we have NCSG (unintelligible) domain which Avri registered way back when and transferred over to me for this purpose now so we are going to use that.

And one thing we should be able to do better with get some data back from (unintelligible) members I think this is one thing we want to do at some point is see if she could actually remove from our member those people who actually have not been active as well have to get the (unintelligible) something along the lines that people have not been active for five years be removed from the database or something like that. But that's not for today.

So (unintelligible) restoration and (unintelligible) database that could be ultimately even not really similar to make it a little bit (unintelligible) these haven't been run as well. But now we actually have several members who don't even know which country they are from which is kind of ugly (unintelligible). But we can rescind to that later.

Okay then the next item have in agenda is how do we have our planning? We don't have much planning items at this point. But one thing is we should already talk about this at the ICANN one travel information soon as in as many travelers as possible known by August 7, I think August 5 already - something like that, yes August 5.

Of course not all of them will be known then by end of election (unintelligible) or we elect in the 1st of September but we will know that outgoing counselors should be know and of course our members from this

group we have free travel plus one (unintelligible) here and one for each constituency.

So I would like you to confirm which of you will be traveling to Hyderabad on the NCSG (unintelligible) travel slot. Yes that is soon but that also means we probably will not have another AC call before then. We should but I don't think so unless there's some specific reason to. So if this is a formal request then to simply notification (unintelligible) you will be traveling. Okay Robin I will wait for confirmation on that I think.

I'm hoping that we'll get the confirmation in time. But I assume it would be Robin unless you get another travel slot in which case Monika will take over and (unintelligible) and first select we'll check with NPOC ExCom and confirm okay? Anything else about Hyderabad? Nothing to (unintelligible) at this point I guess. I might note that I have unofficially heard that some of our congressmen might not be able to come in which case we'll have to look for alternates but nothing official yet so can't do anything else about that yet. Okay if nothing else really known about (unintelligible) but at this point (unintelligible) decide or and discuss unless you have anything anybody?

Maryam Bakoshi: Tapani?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes?

Maryam Bakoshi: (Marilyn) speaking. I just wanted to confirm that we, you know, we can begin to think about using either the ICANN approved photography or video for our sessions. And so we have a meeting with Jana from the - from communications and content. And one of the things she said we could do was ask for our sessions to be captured either by video photography and so we can use on our video screens or as an outreach tool. So that might be something

that some might want to consider. And we need to put the application in as soon as possible so they can begin to work on that. So anything concerning communications and content ICANN will support us with that. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: What exactly would be as soon as possible? The beginning of August is…

Maryam Bakoshi: I…

Tapani Tarvainen: …too late.

Maryam Bakoshi: I really - yes no - I really yes the beginning of August would be the deadline or maximum so they can fit us in their plans.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. That's kind of tight for us I mean which can't postponed this until the next meeting but we'll have to work this by online I think when but let's say that I presume none of us will object to any such service if ICANN (unintelligible) for free video recordings of the meetings. And we can give our (unintelligible) online. Everybody agree on that?

Okay I will work with Maryam in the Communications Team in ICANN to try and confirm that we want you can (unintelligible) everything we can get (unintelligible) video because (unintelligible) although without knowing how their (unintelligible) it's kind of difficult to be more detailed than that. But basically all open sessions having them videoed and photograph and put it up on the Web would be fine with me. I think it would be. Anybody object to any of that? No? In any case we'll confirm by email when we get details.

Okay so seem to be perfectly agreed on. Maryam your hand is still up. You want to - Maryam no? Okay any other business? Robin please go ahead.

Robin Gross: Thanks. Yes I just wanted to raise an issue that I think we're going to have to deal with in the next coming while in - as a result of the CCWG on accountability. One of the Workstream 2 accountability issues that we've got before us is SO AC accountability which means basically how accountable are the different stakeholder groups, are the different constituencies to the members that they serve and to the processes that we're supposed to be adhering to.

And so one of the issues that I think we can expect to be coming up in this Workstream 2 Working Group is the need to be able to have a, some kind of a recall method for accountability of GNSO counselors. When we developed the NCSG charter a couple years back we made sure that we had recall mechanisms built in for the NCSG chair position but we overlooked and really it was just an oversight at the time accountability of the - of our GNSO counselors.

So I think that all of the stakeholder groups and constituencies are going to have to start looking at their own charter and seeing where there are places that we have accountability holes -- and this is one of them for us in the NCSG -- and to start coming up with fixes for that. So I expect we're going to need to build some kind of a process, some kind of a mechanism perhaps through an amendment of our charter, not entirely sure how yet. But I think we'll need to build some kind of a mechanism and process for being able to recall how our own GNSO representatives and other leaders who are not being accountable to the community that they serve.

And, you know, I don't have any specific recommendation at this point for how we should do that, just sort of a heads up that I would suspect this is one of the issues that we're going to have to take a look at and fix in our charter as a result of the CCWG accountability Workstream 2 issue going forward. So I

just wanted to raise that and get folks starting to think about how we're going to handle that. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Robin. That's a very good point. There are also some other issues regarding that SO AC accountability might become a concern and with some other groups even (unintelligible) for example just and other stakeholder groups are not exactly open with their memberships even. But that's not something we should do but keep in mind for those who are working that (unintelligible). Anyway that's something to keep in mind and we'll have to still for me to give you a charter and do any other changes to the charter exploring if it comes to that.

Okay any other concerns? Robin your hand is still up. Okay I guess that was an old hand. Any other business, any other concerns, comments? Okay one point that this everybody's happy with this time slot. We could keep on doing this at this time. This is early morning for Robin. It's daytime for the others yes and Monika seems to be having trouble with any timeslot.

So I would expect to have the next call sometime around maybe August 12 or thereabouts. Yes there are no ideal timeslots given our geographical situation. There were some recommendation somewhere in ICANN that puts us at - from beginning saying that times between midnight and 6:00 am should be avoided. And this is exactly of the hour that works that way for all of us.

So Chantelle proposed next call for August 12. We'll confirm by email but that would be about one month from now. (Unintelligible) looking at election schedule is the time but we can confirm those items. Any other concerns, issues, any other business? No? Okay thank you everybody. It was a productive meeting and we shall continue our business for the line - online and in the next call. You can stop the recording.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much for attending the meeting everyone. (Austin) you may know stop the recording. Thank you for your support today.

END