

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
March 12, 2015
9:00 am CT**

Grace Abuhamad: The recordings have started so you can go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Great.

Grace Abuhamad: The recordings have started so you can go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. We have an echo so I'm not sure all what the cause of that is. Maybe someone's got a mic permanently open.

Grace Abuhamad: I muted (Josh)'s mic and that should help because his mic was open.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, great. Thanks Grace. So we - just to give you a brief update we had a call of the full group this morning - a two hour meeting of the full group; went through various things.

It had a pretty productive tone to it and a key point we discussed with them was - or at least I put a poll to the group seeking interest in your attendance at - in Istanbul and there was an overwhelming support for having at least one of you in Istanbul.

We assume that would be Holly but that's to be discussed. But, you know, obviously we've had separate email - we had a separate discussion when we first kicked this off about the possibility of it being - depending on what the - what was going to be covered, it being more than just Holly.

So there were really two themes within the group. One was I think there was a sense and that was my sense in any event that we would like one or more of you present, and really would like to hand it over to you to suggest who you think from a kind of skill set point of view if you've had the opportunity to discuss that you would propose to send along.

And I guess subject to sign off on the financial side we, I mean, this is a bit new to us. We haven't really - but I'll hand that over to Grace to get the final sign off on financial commitment to do that but then we would respond to your suggestions.

So let me put the ball back in your court Holly just to check who you would ideally like to send along both from the point of view of generally engaging with the group and providing the kind of specific input we would seek.

Thanks.

Holly Gregory: Certainly. So I can certainly make it. I'll be in London. I'll - I can easily come on over. We were thinking in terms of sort of priorities that it would be really helpful to have one of our California corporate lawyers come for - and for - and so Sharon Flanagan has said that she would be able to come for this trip.

If I could add a third it would be someone with sort of that broader Internet governance knowledge: either (Ed) or - and a very senior associate who works

with (Ed Vivik). But that's what we were - that's along the lines that we were thinking.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Holly. Greg do you have any thoughts on that? I thought you might. Go ahead.

Gregory Shatan: Yes thanks Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. I think that that sounds like the right approach. I think we, you know, definitely the overarching corporate governance concerns as well as your role as the hub make you Holly the ideal primary.

And I think that the concerns about California law and practice and California nonprofit law and options available under that are, you know, also bubbling up and clearly as we discuss systems and models and proposals, you know, that - those are I think key.

Not sure I would extend it to the third person. In an ideal world we would have a lot of people there but that's maybe overkill. But, you know, we'd certainly want someone like, you know, (Vivik) or (Ed) if not coming to, you know, do some, you know, remote participation and in general would hope that people could be available as it looks like their specialty areas might come up.

For instance there's going to - at some point we're going to bring up trusts and no reason to send a trust person to Istanbul. But at the same time if we can map things out so that we know when the trust aspect is coming up, we'd want to have the trust person available and also not have them come in completely cold so we'd have to figure out how to do that.

So, you know, part of it is how many people, you know, will really look and feel productive and how many people will ICANN feel like paying for before they start feeling like it's too many?

So I guess, you know, I'm definitely down for two and kind of undecided on the third. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Just note for the record that Holly says she's lost audio at the moment.
Maarten did you have anything you wanted to add at this stage?

Maarten Simon: Actually no. I think I agree with both of you that one is needed and the group was quite clear in that. A second one would or could be helpful depending on the questions.

Also I don't think the third one would be needed and might be overkill also in the fact that I don't think we will debate very specific legal questions. If - they usually can be answered on the fly and I'm not sure if you want to have that.

We need some directions and that can be given by people who got good knowledge, and I think if Holly and the Californian lawyer - what is it, your specialist, it'd be nice.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Maarten. Let's take that as then a decision and a recommendation that - Grace do you feel comfortable being the messenger to take that back?

Grace Abuhamad: Sure Jonathan. And (Sam) is also on the call.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh I hadn't realized that (Sam) was on the call so that's - I'm sorry, that's my error. All right, (Sam). Great. That - (Sam)'s obviously picked it up. So our - it feels to me like our request and recommendation on the back of the

meeting today and the discussion we've just had is that both Holly and Sharon participate in person in Istanbul and coordinate with resources at their end for remote participation should they be required.

And it is then incumbent on this group generally to specify as best as possible what - in advance what the, you know, which topics we're going to cover in which area and we'll work on that over the next week to ten days prior to Istanbul.

Holly Gregory: Thank you Jonathan. That's very helpful. One - this is Holly. I'm back on. We - one of the things that we are working on currently is sort of a FAQ type response to the questions that have been posed, and our hope is to be able to provide that to you shortly before Istanbul.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great Holly. Well it's sort of - the sooner the better but obviously you need the time to do things properly and thoroughly and we'll - we have yet to shape up fully what the agenda looks like in Istanbul.

We know we've got eight sessions. We know we'll take up to four of those sessions and up to one day in total - may not be the same day but up to four of those sessions to deal with the issues in and around your work and it will be a minimum of two sessions.

And that will be influenced in part by our discussions with you and how much substance we feel we can cover.

Holly Gregory: Okay. In terms of our approach to the questions that have been put on the table so far I just want to manage expectations. Again we're going to take them at a fairly high level.

We think that some of the questions indicate a need for some real grounding and education on some of the broader topics. And so we're going to try to take a high level approach to them, otherwise we would be writing a treatise.

Some of the questions have multiple parts and ask for perspectives from multiple jurisdictions, and we're going to defer some of the jurisdictional kinds of choices to a later date because we think first it's important to get a grounding and sort of what an approach would be under a California - a U.S. general state corporate law approach.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. That sounds like...

((Crosstalk))

Holly Gregory: We wanted to just put that out there and make sure that that was okay with you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Greg your hand is up. Did you want to respond or comment?

Gregory Shatan: Yes. Couple - I - first I think that sounds like a good overall approach, and obviously anything that I or we can do while you're in the process of answering to help sort things out, you know, available any time; at least I am.

So secondly, with regard to - I think it's a good idea to keep the jurisdiction question, which has been generally a rat hole for years if not since the dawn of ICANN, you know, the multiple jurisdiction question.

I think it is important to be able to speak to some of the, you know, individual issues or unique issues under California not for profit law and not just answer

with regard to kind of the, you know, the generic kind of, you know, U.S. corporate law kind of...

Holly Gregory: No. Absolutely Greg. We intend to be able to speak from a California perspective as well as a - sort of a general state law perspective.

Gregory Shatan: Yes. So I think that's - it's just an, you know, an observation that a lot of people have hammered very much, you know, on the California issue and there are a few amateur experts.

I use the E word - amateur more than expert on the issues of California public benefit corporations and the like. So I think the observation that an education and grounding is needed.

My original response was going to be a little bit more earthy in the chat, but I decided not to go there and so I think overall sounds right. I don't know if we need to in any way memorialize that.

I think one of our rules of engagement was to try to memorialize even if it's in a couple of sentences. So maybe wouldn't be a bad idea if you just sent kind of a confirmatory email to the list of what you're doing so we kind of have that record for transparency's sake.

And sometimes transparency requires a little bit of awkward record keeping and - or if we could just note it in the notes here but I think it's probably best to put it on the client list just so we have that there for kind of - for the good of the order. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point Greg. I would call that the sort of provisional scope of work between now and Istanbul and we - the - that seems like it would cover it. I'm mindful it's 15 minutes past the hour.

We've got 15 minutes of Holly on the call. I'm not sure how much beyond the half hour point we'll go. So it's a question of what our priorities are to cover and whether there are particular questions or issues in relation to the briefing or issues document, or whether there are any specific questions or issues to be raised by our colleagues from Sidley.

Gregory Shatan: Jonathan it's Greg. I just wanted to come back with one other point and kind of a heads up. In addition to the four models that you see here, you may have heard some mention of kind of a fifth model and I wanted to bring that more to the fore here.

Currently that's being called the integrated hybrid model for lack of a better term, kind of an attempt to synthesize some of the aspects of the other models and avoid the things that seem to have set, you know, certain group's teeth on edge.

There is such a plural of teeth. And the subgroup that's been working on that is preparing kind of a latest and greatest iteration of that model to send to all of us very shortly, along with a few questions along the lines of those in the back of the scoping document.

And I obviously urge them to proceed, you know, with speed but I did want to give you that heads up as well that that's really, you know, equally a part of the discussion as the four models are. Thanks.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. And on that topic I'm not brilliantly familiar with that model although I did read it and then we just - and then we later discussed it on a call.

But one of the things - at least one of the elements of that model or variants of that model are the potential to integrate some form of overarching solution with participation by what has historically been independent participation in the IANA function of the naming people/participation by the numbers and protocols groups.

And that has not been in any sense agreed. That's just - and always it presumes to be possible to occur, so I just think it's worth flagging that currently the work of this CWG is on a naming proposal.

That integrated model goes a little bit further in some areas and seeks to integrate some of the governance aspects together with protocol and numbers groups and that there is no kind of remit for that.

It's a proposal. It's an idea but it's not driven by any knowledge that that will even be acceptable to those groups. That's worth just putting that on the table.

Let me pause and make sure that the - that people from Sidley have an opportunity to talk even if there aren't hands up in the chat - in the Adobe Connect room.

Okay so it was mentioned and maybe you've already covered what you needed to there Greg that in Item 2 I'm assuming that we've covered what we can at this stage on the deliverables and expectations for Istanbul as we

continue to work on that but flag me if we - there is something outstanding there.

And then Greg you mentioned and sort of proposed Item 2, which is closing the diligence discussion. So I suggest we move on to that and see if there are any other outstanding items or areas that need to be given new or additional detail to. (Josh) go ahead.

Josh Hofheimer: Josh Hofheimer: Thank you. Can everybody hear me and is my mic working well enough now?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: All good.

Josh Hofheimer: Excellent. I think I figured out how to work the volume a little better. Just one question about - and this - we touched on this a little bit yesterday but still thinking about it on this end.

Assuming for the moment that we adopted some sort of an MRT whether by committee or board or structure, but there was a multi-regional stakeholder group that had some responsibility for ensuring that the IANA functions was carried out in a manner that was sort of consistent with the mandate and the mission, is that going to be the scope of the remit or the mandate for the MRT?

Or - so will it just be monitoring the performance of ICANN as the IANA functions operator at a high level perhaps, or will it also be reviewing the sort of policy and administrative decisions on the policy side as well?

Or would - or is the intention and the way the CWG has been thinking about this is to limit the MRT's remit to the implementation by - of the IANA functions as determined to be necessary by, you know, ICANN under its mandate?

Jonathan Robinson: Good question (Josh).

Josh Hofheimer: Perhaps I can give you an example of what I'm...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I have some thoughts but I'll defer to Greg...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yes go ahead.

Josh Hofheimer: Let me just give you one quick example. So - because there was some discussion, you know, about that functional separation that needs to sort of be maintained within ICANN.

Here's an example. If at the policymaking level certain recommendations were made to ICANN, the ICANN Board decided to take an action that some viewed or, you know, a group viewed as contrary to those policies and not necessarily to take an action but just in its interpretation and implementation of that - those policy recommendations, it instructed the functional group of ICANN, the group responsible for administering the IANA functions to, you know, behave in a certain way and to act in a certain - with respect to the Registries.

There were some - so in that instance ICANN is fully functioning in accordance with the directions of the ICANN Board and there's no debate whether or not it was - it is in compliance with the direction of the ICANN Board.

But the issue really is at the policy level for how the ICANN Board interpreted the policy guidance that was given to it and decided, you know, what steps were necessary to implement that.

Is the intention that the MRT would be available or would be a forum that people could revisit their policy concerns with how the IANA functions are being administered, or is it - or should its - or is its role intended to be limited to providing some oversight into whether or not the IANA functions are being administered in accordance with Board direction, regardless whether some people agree or disagree with that Board direction?

Jonathan Robinson: (Josh) I want to make a point of clarification before myself and Greg give you a better - a fuller answer on that. Could you mute your mic? Thank you. So there is - there are many functions carried out under instruction of ICANN's Board.

All sorts of functions take place many of which impact directly on in particular so-called Contracted Parties, the Registries and Registrars. There is a limited subset of functions under the broad ICANN umbrella that are carried out by the IANA function itself.

So we shouldn't assume that all functional activity takes place only within IANA so I just wanted to make that point. To the substance of your point, my view is there's a pretty bright line between these two and that the area that you were talking about is beyond the remit of the MRT as conceived here, and that

that work would be done via ICANN's accountability track and it would - but that's not per se within the scope of this group and therefore the MRT.

And I'll curb my answer at that point and pass the baton over to Greg who's been patiently waiting.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. I think you...

Josh Hofheimer: Let me jump in real quick Greg.

Gregory Shatan: Go ahead Josh.

Josh Hofheimer: Sorry, because I lost Jonathan. I lost Jonathan right as he was about to speak so I apologize but if somebody could just briefly summarize what was stated. And then, Grace, could you mute me because when I try to do it it disconnects me entirely.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Greg, forgive me then I'll just come back again and do the quick repeat. So, Josh, I really made two points. One that there is - that there are many functional activities carried out under the broad ICANN umbrella and therefore ultimately under the direction of the ICANN board.

There are a limited set of functions under the broad ICANN umbrella that are carried out within the IANA function and that limited set of functions is what we are concerned with here. So that's Point 1.

And then Point 2, therefore, is that to the extent that there was an appeal about the substance of a board decision relating to policy matters or the like, that's, in my mind, well beyond the scope envisaged for the MRT and the MRT

would be very much constrained to the oversight of the IANA function and performing consistent with its limited and very tightly scoped remit. Greg.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks. Josh, do you have any sort of questions for Jonathan based on that? I see you're on mute so I don't know if you're speaking.

Josh Hofheimer: Can...

Grace Abuhamad: You're unmuted, (Josh). There you go.

Josh Hofheimer: Okay. I understand, Jonathan that ICANN is obviously much broader but I was referring to a specific issue, you know, were an issue to arise in connection with the IANA function. So in other words there was a policy recommendation made to the board regarding the implementation of which would require some conduct or activity by the IANA functions team.

And the board interprets that policy recommendation in a particular manner, instructs the IANA functions team to act in a particular manner. And someone takes issue with that interpretation by the board, would there be - is the intention that the MRT could be a forum to appeal the board's interpretation or is the function of the MRT - is the form of the MRT a narrow remit that is limited only to IANA's conduct in, you know, its acts or omissions in implementing board direction?

Jonathan Robinson: I would say the latter.

Josh Hofheimer: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful.

Gregory Shatan: And, (Josh), and, you know, kudos for hitting kind of a very tender area which is the kind of - looking at board action which we've looked at the IAP rather

than the MRT to some extent as being a potentially - an avenue for that. And as well it's been swung over largely to the accountability group as opposed to our group to deal with kind of board level activity.

So as to what the MRT is supposed to be doing, I think the general view is that it is - and just - you can drown in acronyms at ICANN. It probably takes a couple of years to learn them. And then we make up new ones just to befuddle people. So MRT stands for multi-stakeholder review team. And by and large most groups in ICANN don't break up regionally, though a few do.

So in any case the MRT I think was seen, you know, primarily as a kind of second level of recourse above the CSC for dealing with performance issues and also as perhaps a - and remember it was originally named the periodic review team - as a group that might look at the annual and longer term types of reviews and sight visits and things like that though the divide between what the CSC takes care of and what the MRT takes care of, you know, is gray.

And to some extent, you know, issues of whether there are things that should be done by a group that's composed almost entirely of registries versus a more multi-stakeholder group, drive those as well. And the MRT was also, you know, viewed as a group that if there were a - that would generally - if there were a contract kind of enforce the terms of the contract or, you know, using whatever means are necessary if it's a contract or if it's a standard, an internal standard.

So I think those were kind of the - and also would conduct any potential RFP or search for a different provider or even an RFP just for the purpose of keeping ICANN on its toes, as some have proposed, which is another controversial subject; some have advocated for mandatory periodic RFPs.

Those may be people who have never gone through an RFP. In any case I'll stop there. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. I'm going to hand the baton straight over to (Cam) who has a follow up point or question. And (unintelligible) you may be on a mute on your phone or device. (Cam), I'll leave you to toggle with that for a moment and I'll come...

((Crosstalk))

Cam Kerry: Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: There we got you now, Cameron. Go ahead.

Cam Kerry: Okay good, thank you. So I think some of my question was just answered but it's a little bit in the same vein as (Josh)'s in terms some of the stakeholder concerns more broadly - I'm certainly familiar with a number of the issues surrounding the top level domain policies and some of the broader policy issues.

I guess my question is how much those concerns are specific or get into the IANA functions contract. And, you know, what some of those stakeholder issues are. And as Greg just alluded to the question about putting out an RFP (unintelligible) others. But are there other things that we should be aware of there?

Jonathan Robinson: Let me try and come back on that, Cam, with a simple - perhaps simplistic answer. But there is a requirement, I mean, a core mandate of ICANN is obviously to develop policy in particular significantly in and around generic top level domains and that may be the operation and running of how those

domain names function or indeed the creation and implementation of new top level domains.

When those - the recommendations in and around those are made they're obviously made to the ICANN board who then will make a decision whether or not to accept those recommendations and all of that follows well specified pathways and so on.

The board at that point - let's say it was, for example, the creation of a new top level domain, the delegation of a new top level domain. One issue that then makes that decision and makes a - and on the back of that decision an instruction would be given to the IANA function to implement that. One issue that the group is still working on is the so called authorization function where at least hypothetically the NTIA in its role as oversight body, could have rejected the placement of a new top level domain name into the root.

There is no precedent, to the best of my knowledge, for that happening, but we call that the authorization function. So that is one of the functions that is falling away and that our group needs to determine. I'm not sure if that answers your question but it felt to me like you were getting at or around that point.

So as a matter of general principle, the policy is made within ICANN and plain and unambiguous instructions are given over to IANA. And to the extent that IANA performs well, IANA - there is no interpretation and IANA implements those instructions expeditiously and effectively and there's no cause for complaint.

So I don't know if that answers specifically your question or give a little bit more color or picture around what you're asking.

Cam Kerry: No, it's helpful. And I think it certainly sheds some light on what the, you know, where the top level domain issues spill over into the IANA functions contract and/or the IANA functions more generally. I guess my question was also whether there are other sets of stakeholder concerns, you know, with respect to the IANA functions.

And I guess as a follow-up to what you said, there's may be getting into the weeds a little bit much but, one of the reasons NTIA has never exercised the authorization authority is a reluctance to have government and the US government override ICANN decision-making in that way. It's conceivable I guess that a nongovernmental multistakeholder group would be willing to do that. Is there a sense that that may be something that you'd want to include in the MRT authorities? That's the end of my questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I would imagine explicitly not. I think one of the key questions we are dealing with here is really the assumption, I think, that things are working well presently and the issue being what to do if they are no longer working well.

So I guess one has to work with that working assumption, it's really about building in actions and capabilities should things no longer function as well as they do now. Greg.

Gregory Shatan: Yes, I would say, you know, first kind of echo that the idea is - and I think I mentioned this before, the RFP basically says we should try to keep the status quo or explain why it should change. One aspect of the status quo and, you know, talking with, you know, Fiona Alexander who's at the NTIA and, you know, and also to the - at least one of the people who actually exercises kind of the authorization validation function at ICANN, it's viewed as a very

ministerial function and, you know, is part-time work for one person with a backup.

And I think there is a concern that the authorization function, you know, in the wrong hands could somehow become more activist. You know, technically it is supposed to check off whether policy has been followed, and at least in the delegation authorization. And there is usually a more or less standard paragraph that appears in those gTLD delegations that states that it has been followed. And usually that's kind of taken as honor code sort of validation and not revalidated.

So there's, you know, certainly a question about whether there should be a validation or authorization function at all, and if so, you know, who would carry it out. But I think definitely - I wouldn't say definitely but, you know, I think fairly - I don't think there's much idea that it would go to the MRT to do something like that.

And another concern of course is that - is speed. And service levels, you know, are basically time and accuracy related. And one of the concerns is that sometimes the IANA function process doesn't, you know, could be faster, could be more automated. So I think the idea of getting a part-time body of somewhere between 11 and 27 people the authorization function would probably not go too far. Thanks.

Cam Kerry: Thanks, that's very helpful in understanding sort of how we map the functions.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other questions or comments in and around building up a better picture of the diligence or the - I think one comment I wanted to make is that we talked about, you know, you asked questions reasonably of things like the MRT, the CSC, the composition, the scope, the remit.

I think it's really important to note at this point that these are a work in progress. So to the extent that we give you answers we describe the work of the group to date. They are not unequivocal specifications. And of course to some extent, and this is where there is a circularity to the whole thing, let's take the MRT, for example, its role, remit and scope is contingent on the corporate governance construct or model chosen.

So we have chosen to continue working at this in any event in order to not be caught in a death spiral of waiting for the model to emerge. But nevertheless, the specification of, for example, the MRT is to some extent ultimately contingent on the corporate governance framework or the mechanics - the legal and other structural mechanics (unintelligible). Go ahead.

Gregory Shatan: It's Greg. I just wanted to make kind of another overarching observation about how we're looking at these models. You know, to some extent this is editorial commentary; should be taken as such. Overarching, as you've seen, the four models have fallen into two categories, the, you know, so-called internal and the so-called external.

And in viewing the group dynamics, you know, my personal view is that there are a few diehard internalists who would not accept an external solution under any circumstances and a few diehard externalists who would not accept an internal solution under any circumstances but that most people are, you know, some were more towards the middle of the spectrum. I'm not saying there at the middle but they are not at the very end.

And that many people who advocate for an external solution would be interested in or willing to accept an internal solution that they felt had as much teeth and accountability and the ability for the stakeholder groups to

accomplish their goals or for their instructions to be carried out as would be on an external basis.

To give an example of that, one of the reasons that the external Contract Co solution seemed attractive is that everyone understands contracts and understands that contracts can be, you know, that notices of breach can be given and that periods of cure and escalation can take place and there isn't satisfactory cure that a contract can be terminated.

And that that - well obviously a party at the other end, you know, can have certain recourse if they feel it's been unfairly and inappropriately terminated. And there are obviously plenty of, you know, litigations around, you know, termination issues.

But basically it's an understood construct and that, you know, whether there were similar constructs that, you know, could be equally viable under an internal model would, you know, is kind of the key overarching question and kind of the, you know, maybe it's the, you know, the question in a sense in trying to parse between different models.

And I think, you know, some of that goes back to attitudes that rightly or wrongly are skeptical or distrustful or even, again at the extremes, hostile to whether ICANN the corporation is responsive and, you know, acts kind of according to the will of the community in any way shape or form or just kind of, you know, get ahead of and away from the community and does its own thing.

So, you know, that, you know, informs kind of both of the groups that are taking place, the accountability group and our group. So I think in, you know, we have, you know, on the one hand - or at the one level we have the actual

kind of individual aspects of each of these potential tasks that need to be carried out by some sort of operation and according to some sort of, you know, rule or procedure or documentation.

And then we have, at the next level, kind of the models. And at the highest level the issue of where are the teeth? And can the teeth work? You know, what do those teeth accomplish but, you know, can those teeth accomplish what we set out to accomplish or will there be some way for, you know, a result to be avoided? And is easier to avoid a result in an internal governance situation as opposed to issues of enforcement and termination of a contract.

So that's kind of my - I'll get off the soapbox now and that's - but I just wanted to know that kind of highest level question. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other questions, issues a clarification, points required to be dealt with before colleagues at Sidley? All right sounds like we might have answered what you need for now. I know we've lost a couple of people along the way. Thank you very much, Martin, Greg, you all set? Lise, sorry, acknowledging your presence as well.

Gregory Shatan: I think I'm set. I note that we never did 4 and 5 of that list of things but I don't think that's necessarily - I don't think we need to go there. I think we've kind of covered them in other ways, you know, I'm talking about the list on Page 3 of the scoping document. But, you know, we can always revisit that. So as long as Sidley feels like there is diligence enough for the moment, I think we can feel the same.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay sounds like a natural conclusion point. We won't keep things running unnecessarily. Thanks, everyone. Please feel free to get in touch with us by mail. And, you know, obviously this will be - just to note that there are

20 people who have now joined our combined mailing list. And the audio and detail from this will be available to the full CWG. So to the extent that we receive feedback on, you know, our representations and work with you so far we'll come back to you and we'll be available to talk with you on email.

Thanks very much.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks everyone.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks all. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you, bye.

END