

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 26, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. This call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this point.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much. So the recordings are started, and welcome everyone to this debriefing call of the legal sub-team in the CCWG on enhancing ICANN's accountability.

We have held our second call with a different law firm. We had a call with Sidley Austin, and then we had another call with Adler & Colvin. And this will of course be our chance for expressing our concerns or likes for either of the law firms. So hopefully we can get to engage with either of them by the end of this call. We really wish to have a decision.

I'm reading David McAuley's comments in the chat. He says he likes both firms, (unintelligible) complex. Maybe best approach is Sidley with Adler as adjunct.

Okay, so now the floor is open for anyone to comment on both calls we had with each of the law firms. So please feel free to raise your hand and express

all your thoughts. Anyone other than David? I see no one raising their hand. I see Ed Morris. Ed Morris, can you please take the floor?

Ed Morris: Thanks, Leon. I was actually thinking almost the inverse of David, in that we would need expertise, we would engage Adler & Colvin. We'd need expertise on anti-trust, international jurisdiction, a few things like that. So I was actually thinking the reverse -- Adler & Colvin the primary, with Sidley backing them up.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks, Ed. Anyone else would like to react to this? Yes, Greg Shatan, I see your hand up.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Leon. Based on the calls that we had, and kind of my own evolving thinking, my gut reaction is closer to Ed's than it is to David's, that the central question of governance and structures for governance under California non-profit law, and getting the most out of them in terms of accountability, what I think the - you know, squarely in the wheelhouse then is both of Adler & Colvin, it seems to be our job one.

One of the things we need to do -- and it's hard to say to do it carefully and quickly at the same time; we all know that those are almost impossible to do at the same time -- is to look at kind of our full boat of questions.

And I think that, you know, one of the things that, you know, strikes me is you would look at what is actually being discussed on the list. There's, you know, discussions about things like setting up review panels and arbitral-type bodies, and things like that.

We didn't really get into that with Adler & Colvin. That's not necessarily a not, and doesn't necessarily mean they can't set those things up, and maybe

they'll also tell us that, you know, there may be less complicated and less structural ways to accomplish what we want to accomplish.

But I think that, you know, Sidley might be useful in those areas, too. So, you know, maybe a bit of an organic question. But I think, to my mind, the kind of Adler first fit seems to work better at first blush, to me. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks, Greg. Next in the queue is Robin Gross. Robin, could you please take the floor?

Robin Gross: Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

Leon Sanchez: Yes, we can hear you.

Robin Gross: Great. Okay, so first I was really impressed with both of the firms that we've spoken with so far. I thought, you know, they both had some really impressive expertise. And I think we might want to consider, as others have said, perhaps some sort of hybrid between them, because they do sort of seem to have somewhat of a complementary nature to each other.

The firm we spoke with today, Adler, does seem to have a good bit of California non-profit, corporate governance structure experience -- real sort of boots-on-the-ground experience on those specific issues. And that's really impressive.

Whereas the larger firm, Sidley, also very impressive, could have a broader expertise and be useful to us on the international jurisdiction questions that people have, and some of the anti-trust questions that people have.

So I like the suggestion of trying to utilize a hybrid of the two, depending upon what their expertise is in relationship to what the specific questions and issues that we're trying to get at are. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks, Robin. Anyone else wants to share their thoughts with us today? I see Ed's hand is up. I don't know if that's an old hand or a new hand. That's an old hand. Greg? Greg as well. Robin?

Okay, well my feeling is that I pretty much agree with what has already been said. I mean I was amazed with both law firms. It strikes me as Adler & Colvin have a very amazing experience with regards to California corporate law and non-profits.

The example they put on the table on this transition they made with this other corporation, seemed to me not precisely what we're looking for, but pretty much a good example of how they could fit into our process.

And I think Ed's approach would be something that we could use in the CCWG. I mean maybe engaging with Adler & Colvin as first counsel, and then have Sidley Austin as adjunct. And please forgive me if I choose any wrong terms or words, since I am not real familiar with legal words in English.

So I don't know if first counsel is the right word to do, but definitely a hybrid of the two law firms would be helpful, since I think that Adler & Colvin was just an outstanding law firm with regards to competence streams.

So any other thoughts? And then of course after we've all raised our thoughts and concerns, I would like to call for an agreement. So anyone has any other

thoughts on this? Okay, so Robin signals that she would like also hybrid rather than deciding one is main to be.

So I don't know if anyone has any other thoughts on this. I think Par is agreeing to Ed's proposal at all. I don't know, Sabine, do you have any thoughts on this? Or could you signal us on your thoughts? Athina? Athina's also agreeing to having a hybrid (unintelligible).

Okay, so I think we're pretty much all on the same page. So now I would just like to add certainty to what we're discussing here. I see Sabine's hand is up, so Sabine, could you please take the floor?

Sabine Meyer: I was struggling with the teleconference for a moment. I think the two firms actually really complement each other from what I've seen and heard, because in terms of just getting the actual transition to (Dave)'s firm, I think, might prove extremely helpful in what they can do under California non-profit law with, you know, the other firm being more suited to check out contingencies like, you know, international law or anti-trust and so on.

So I would also be very much in favor of like one and the other model, not deciding for one or the other. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks for this, Sabine. And well now I would like to call for an agreement. If no one else has anything to add to what we just said, I would like to call for an agreement on the - if I capture the team's opinion well, the agreement would be engaging with Adler & Colvin as first law firm, and having Sidley Austin engaged as support or second or adjunct - as you say in the chat, as adjunct firm.

Is that correct? Would we be agreeing on this? Okay, so Robin says no. So, Robin, could you please elaborate on that?

Robin Gross: Yeah. I thought we were just saying we wanted the hybrid model rather than selecting one to be primary today, and the other to be adjunct, given the diversity of experience that they have, and the complementary experience that they have. I thought we were saying we wanted to do some sort of hybrid, and didn't want to decide today to pick one as primary for - so I thought we were heading in that direction.

Leon Sanchez: Okay, how would that work? I'm just not getting the right idea here. Would this mean that - and of course I don't know how engagement letters work in the US. Would this mean that we would be having an engagement letter with both firms at the same time? Is that right?

Robin Gross: Yes, yes. It would mean that we would engage with both firms at the same time, but it also means that we would send the questions about international jurisdiction, and anti-trust questions -- the questions that are more appropriate for one firm, possibly for Sidley -- to go to that firm for that firm to work on answering those questions.

Whereas the questions about California, non-profit, corporate governance structures, and those sorts of really specialized California legal issues would be sent to Adler.

Leon Sanchez: Okay, now I get it.

Robin Gross: So we would...

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: You know, yes. Sorry.

Leon Sanchez: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Sorry. So just to double-check if I'm getting this right, we would be entering into two different engagement letters, one with each firm. And then we as legal sub-team would be channeling the different questions to the appropriate law firm, with regards to their experience, right?

Robin Gross: That's my understanding, yes.

Leon Sanchez: Okay, okay. Does the rest of the legal sub-team agree with this view? Or with this working method? I see Greg's hand is up. So, please, Greg...

Greg Shatan: I think - well first off, you know, whatever model we follow, I think we need to have an engagement letter with both firms, or two engagement letters, one with each firm.

The management - puts a little bit more management complexity on our committee, and also on the two firms to work together and to try to decide kind of, you know, whether we decide, you know, what we're going to use each one for, and how we're going to manage things where we have both firms on the calls, and where we have the firms talking to each other and the like.

So whether the firms are more equally in charge, or one is kind of the lead counsel and being directed, and the other one is being directed by the lead counsel, you know, either way we have to kind of work out the logistics of this relatively quickly, so that we don't have the firms falling all over each other. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks, Greg. I think administrative complexity is something we could be handling ourselves. But what concerns me would be maybe having - I mean if I understand, no single questions would go to both law firms. And that would, of course, diminish the room for what I'm going to say.

But if we did pose the same questions to the two law firms, and we get back different advice on the question, that would create, of course, a conflict in views. And how would we resolve that conflict within the legal sub-team? That's something that would concern me.

But I really don't see difficult happening in our future. So I mean what's in the group with regard to that concern? Do you see this happening? Or do you see this feasible, with regards to having conflicted advice? Yes, Greg. Could you please take the floor?

Greg Shatan: I think this is where, you know, rather than just having conflicted advice, I think this is where the firms would need to talk to each other and to us, or all of us on a call together.

And I think there's kind of two levels of advice, in a sense. One is what's possible, and the other is what's preferable. So I don't expect as much conflict on the first as I do on the second in terms of, you know, how each law firm might arrange the pieces that they recognize in common.

And so that's why I think it's important to kind of define a lead, but ultimately it's going to come down to us about what advice - how we'd like the advice we're getting, or what advice seems to be most useful and also most prone to working under the circumstances we have, where at least in terms of Workstream 1, you know, we're going to get - you know, we get sucked into the whole IANA transition morass - or hopefully not a morass, but circus.

And then for kind of more longer term issues when we don't have that pressure, but at that point we're also looking at perhaps more the types of things that have to be developed over a longer term.

So again it just, I think, points to the level difficulties we're going to have in terms of handling the two firms. I think it's probably something I would initially think we should have a good idea of.

But then we should also have a call with both firms to decide how we're going to work with - how they're going to work with each other and we're going to work with them, so that we kind of get the - so we kind of get it right and have a common understanding across the firms, and a good working relationship of the whole team. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks, Greg. So yes, a joint call would be something that sounds like a good idea. Ed also signals that he agrees with the idea of having a joint call. Well that would lead us to having this hybrid formula that was discussed just minutes ago. And then this joint call would be only to fine-tune the details on how we would work with both firms. Is that right?

Greg Shatan: I think it's a little different. Sorry for just responding, but I think ultimately we are going to need a little bit more of a lead, as between the two firms, or at least a division of labor. But ultimately I do agree with what David says where at least, you know, one counsel - the buck stops with one of the two counsels to make sure that there are no gaps, and that the advice we're getting is all fitting together.

And obviously the firms will operate collaboratively. I'm not thinking this is going to be kind of a master and servant type of a relationship. But the less

that we have figured out who's kind of - who the buck stops with in terms of kind of completeness of legal advice, the more the buck stops with this committee to be the manager.

In other words, we end up more as the general contractor and less as the client, the more that we're managing the two firms, and the less that one of the firms is kind of managing the relationship and the contributions of the other. It doesn't have to be decided immediately, but if we proceed managing, you know, two separate counsels, we're going to be managing that relationship on top of managing everything else.

You know, clearly we're going to have a managerial role regardless. And maybe we do just take on that role and not worry about kind of which firm is responsible for kind of keeping, you know, the advice coherent between the two firms. Something we have to feel out over time.

I think, you know, we will next kind of decide where our division of labor's going to be, regardless of who - whether we're looking to one firm to kind of manage the other firm, or whether we're just going to manage them both.
Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks, Greg. Robin, would you like to comment on or react to what Greg just said?

Robin Gross: Thank you. No, I'm really in agreement with what Greg just said. I think that it is going to require some management and some time on our part. But, you know, that's what we're here for. That's what we've signed up to do.

We've got significant legal expertise within our own group, so I think we're well-positioned to do that. And I think we can manage the process without any problem, so I'm just really in agreement with Greg.

Theresa Swinehart: Hi, Leon. This is Theresa. I'm on the phone line. I'd asked Grace to raise a hand.

Leon Sanchez: Hi, Theresa.

Theresa Swinehart: Hi. It sounds like it's been a very useful discussion. I just want to highlight something that Greg was touching on. I think that there's two elements here really to be considered. One is adding any level of complexity to already the work going, and any potential issues around clarity of the respective roles of any of the firms, right? And the scope of their work, and clarity around the scope of the work.

But I'd also flag the economic factors of this, you know, and ensuring that, you know, the groups are, you know, cognizant of the economic aspects of this and the costs, which obviously we'd want to be very transparent about, and whether there's really a need for two firms, or whether there's a value in one and then contracting out for specialized areas that maybe the firm can't cover with regards to any areas where there may be a gap.

I just wanted to flag these two points. You know, there's a huge amount of work going on, and obviously, you know, as Robin and others point out from the community's standpoint, you know, roles and responsibilities in managing that.

But there's also very practical aspects to all of this that I think Greg was also touching on, that I just wanted to highlight, you know, from both a managing

the different things, ensuring that there's not - that there's clarity if there's two firms. And then, you know, also if the groups consider that, you know, from an economic standpoint, they're comfortable with, you know, that additional justification.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Theresa. I see a question from Robin on the chat. How much did ICANN (unintelligible) to Singapore?

Theresa Swinehart: Yes. I don't...

Leon Sanchez: (Unintelligible).

Theresa Swinehart: ...know that answer right now. I think my main point is in looking at getting the legal advice how it's going to provide the clarity of the scope of work for each of the firms. And then in the context of that, I'm just flagging the economic aspect of it. So it's obviously for the working group and for the leadership to make that decision. But I'm just flagging these two points.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Theresa. Any reactions to what Theresa has just raised here? No? Okay. So I think our next would be to hold this joint call. Is that right? I see Greg's hand is up. Greg.

Greg Shatan: I think we're going to need to probably go back and talk to ICANN legal so that they know what we're up to. I guess they would help us schedule that joint call anyway. But - and I think they probably already had some idea this was a potential outcome and they may have some ideas on how to help manage it as well. Always walking that, you know, thin line between whether ICANN is helping us or helping themselves.

But to the extent we can get them to help us - and we need to make sure that they feel, you know, that - we need to, you know, be comfortable. They need to be at least somewhat comfortable. The general statement they made about cost is that while cost is no object - if cost is not no object that they, you know, think this is important and they want to get it right with us, so.

In terms of Sidley, you know, (may be) in Istanbul I think they have, you know, Holly Gregory is in London that previous weekend so I think she'd probably get to Istanbul at least for the second day of the CWG meeting. Just I'm not - obviously can't promise her since I'm not her keeper. But just a thought, you know, in getting A&C to Istanbul.

You know, sounds like, you know, it's doable too - and obviously (are) designing, as Robin said, the global governance organization and or renovating one extensively. So, you know, this is very complex stuff. And the more expertise the less likely we are to have a bigger problem later on.

You look at things that were done for instance in setting up the new gTLDs. How come nobody thought that any of those rights objections would need appeals processes or any form of coordination or coherence across different decisions in the same regime?

Maybe because there were no real pros involved. I don't know. I wasn't there for that particular set of decisions. But it's just the more help we get the more likely we are to end up in a better place faster. That's my thought. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Greg. Anyone that wants to add to what Greg just said? I mean we of course need to be mindful of the cost but the other thing that we need to be very mindful of is the time. So I'm not sure - I mean we're just days ahead from our meeting in Istanbul. I'm pretty sure it will be very useful for the

CCWG to have already whatever law firm we're engaged with present in Istanbul.

So how - I'm posing this question to the group. How should we address this challenge with regards to the timeframe and of course having to make a decision in such a short timeframe to engage with the law firm that will provide the advice for us? Any thoughts on that. Okay.

So Robin says she thinks we should seek to retain both. Any other thoughts on that? Maybe if - do you have any comments on this? David agrees with Robin.

David McAuley: Hi Leon. It's - yes. I think we need both firms because as good as Adler is in California on corporate law, they don't have the global expertise we need and the reverse is true for Sidley. So I think Robin's right. We do need to retain both firms in some way.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. So Theresa, are you still on the call?

Theresa Swinehart: Yes Leon, I am.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Theresa. So could ICANN staff of course help us or guide us through how we could accomplish this proposal of engaging with both law firms to have them provide legal advice for the CCWG?

Theresa Swinehart: Yes. I'll take that back over to the legal team to help make that possible. Is there - just on the scope of work, would there be a difference in the scope of work for each of the firms? I just know that they're going to ask that for clarity purposes to be able to proceed forward.

Leon Sanchez: Yes. Thanks Theresa. I think that regards to the scope of work if I understood well from the rest of the team what we will be doing is to pose those questions with regards to California corporate law to Adler & Colvin and the rest of the questions that of course need a more global point of view to (seek that answer).

Theresa Swinehart: Okay. I'll let them - I'll let them...

Leon Sanchez: I don't know if that answers your question.

Theresa Swinehart: No. That does. Absolutely. So I'll provide that clarity back to them and then just have them work directly with you and the team on how to move that forward.

Leon Sanchez: Excellent. So just to double check on the rest of the team, we are in agreement that we will be looking to engaging with both law firms and dividing the scope of work into corporate law or California corporate law to Adler and Colvin and the rest of the questions that need to be addressed on a more global basis to Sidley & Austin. I see Ed Morris' had is up. Please Ed, take the floor.

Theresa Swinehart: And Leon, and if I could just add one more thing. Sorry. Go ahead Ed.

Leon Sanchez: Yes, of course Theresa.

Ed Morris: Thanks. Yes. I don't think we can divide all issues neatly between California and non-California. So of the governance issues for example that Greg and (Rosemarie) talked about today probably should go to Adler & Colvin. But I'm not sure that it needs division that we said in terms of California and non-California. I think it's a bit more complex than that.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Ed. Yes, you're right. I was just trying to create a basis for us to see where we're standing at. So I see Greg Shatan's hand is up. But we have Theresa who'd like to add something to what we just said.

Theresa Swinehart: Leon, why don't you let Greg go ahead and then I'll say something after that?

Leon Sanchez: Okay. Thanks Theresa. So Greg, please take the floor.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Leon. Thanks Theresa. I agree with what Ed said. He took about 90% what I was going to say. But clearly, you know, while Holly is a corporate governance guru, you know, applying corporate governance principles within the boundaries of the California public benefit corporation and all of its nuances, you know, seems to be in Adler & Colvin's wheelhouse.

Though it's really - the difficult question is going to be how Holly's general and for profit plus non-profit corporate governance strength where, you know, she is a, you know, a leader in the field will dovetail with Adler & Colvin's more focused expertise but still focused on the concepts of governance.

I don't have a neat answer for that. And that's I think where the kind of need to manage so that we're not double - doubling up is really the point. I think that, you know, another possibility and I think maybe this is what (Sabina) is saying in the chat I guess is having Sidley to stick to the issues that A&C flagged, which would be antitrust and I guess international.

But that's really not the team that Sidley assembled for us. That doesn't mean Sidley can't handle that. Obviously they do have antitrust folks and I think they've, you know, mentioned that they have them, you know, ready to drop

into this team. But I - and that kind of makes Adler & Colvin the lead by definition in what we're doing.

So it's - there's no - it may be too soon to say but part of it comes down to whether we're going to have a hybrid or not. And maybe this is the kind of things that needs to be worked out.

But I think maybe another way of answering Theresa's question is that I would hope that the instructions to the two firms interlock so that they form a cohesive whole with as little overlap as possible and we're not doubling up on any kind of advice in any particular area.

It's clear that areas like antitrust are international or say intellectual property if that ever comes up are not going to be Adler & Colvin's to handle. But when it comes to a corporate matters and governance matters, they have a competency there that specifically revolves around California non-profit or non-profit in general in California particular and Sidley has a more broad based governance expertise.

And pinning those two together is not something we can decide on this call, not something we should decide on this call. But I think that is, you know, kind of the overlap area, which is going to need to be worked out so that we get the right advice from the right people. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Greg. I see we're already 17 minutes past the hour. And I think this discussion may keep going. I have Robin Gross on the queue. I don't know if Theresa you want to jump in right now after Greg or do you want to listen to Robin and then ask what you need to speak?

Theresa Swinehart: Actually - sorry Robin. Unfortunately I need to be stepping out for another meeting. But I think Greg highlighted, you know, really the - one of the areas around ensuring clarity of the scope of work for the respective firms and how they might be working together in the right way.

And so I think the suggestion of doing a follow up call and, you know, obviously we could have the folks from legal on there as well to help look at how we could make that feasible with regards to the scope of work and, you know, the clarity around that and the suggestions that have been made also in the chat room and these discussions. So I think that - the way Greg was suggesting is a good way to go forward.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Theresa. We have Robin on the queue.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Yes. I just wanted to very quickly point out that I agree that in addition to this particular subject matter expertise that one form or another might be more suited to. I still think there are broader sort of perspective and breadth of issue - perspective to bring in even on those areas where for example something might be a question about a California non-profit corporate law.

I think having a more global perspective on answering an issue like that could be helpful although it wouldn't be sufficient perhaps in and of itself. But I think that having the diversity of perspectives and the diversity of experience that the two firms have really complement each other in a lot of ways.

And it's - I feel really lucky that we've found such a nice complementary fit. So hats off to Greg for that. I guess you found both of them.

Greg Shatan: (Try).

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Robin. Greg, do you want to react to that or...

Greg Shatan: I'll just smile. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. Thanks Robin. So well, I think Robin puts one comment on the chat says let's not (unintelligible) lead counsel will want to use. I think that (unintelligible) we should be rushing this. But we do need to make progress on selecting our law firm.

So one way I think we could go was of course to have both firms in Istanbul. And I think what's clear to me is that we want to engage with both of them. What's not clear so far as I understand is which one would be leading. Is that right? Okay. I see David saying yes.

So well - (so we will have someone) to check on how we would be engaging with both law firms. And I think that it would be helpful of course to have from Adler & Colvin at least one of them and of course keeping notice to one person from Sidley Austin.

I see that Grace has (pointed) that Holly and (Sharon) cannot arrive before the 24th. So they might be able to send another associate or a partner to attend so they can meet with us. So I would like to put into consideration of the legal (unintelligible).

Should we ask Sidley and - Sidley and Austin to send another person to Istanbul to meet with us so we can have a joint meeting maybe with both law firms in Istanbul? Robin agrees. Anyone else agrees with...

Greg Shatan: I think probably what we'd want to do is to have - see how quickly Holly can get there. If she's going to get there on...

Leon Sanchez: Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...the 24th, which is Tuesday, you know, I think she's kind of the relationship lead and kind of running the team as it were. So probably would want to talk to her about all this and probably want to, you know, hammer some of this substantially out this week given how many different things are going to be happening in Istanbul next week. And I don't know what, you know, people's travel plans are.

We have that Wednesday in between the kind of neither meeting. You know, maybe that could be used. But then again, I don't know whose - and what people's travel plans are, so.

I'm mindful that while yes we can get everyone together in Istanbul and that's great but there's also a pretty full plate of things going on. So it may not be all that much time to work these things out depending on, you know, what people's travel plans are and then obviously dinner times and, you know, cocktail times and things like that, so anyway. The more we can do before we get to Istanbul I think the better.

Leon Sanchez: I agree with you Greg. I'm noting on the notes that the first time (unintelligible) both firms, Adler main firm, Sidley (of a jump), I think that's not very accurate as we have another following note that says that it's clear that we will want to engage with both but not say which would - which law firm would be leading. So I would just like to call for a correct on the notes.

So the action items are to determine Holly's ability to attend before the 24th or at least to reach out to her and see if we could hold the meeting with her on the 24th. I know she'll be fresh out of the plane from a transatlantic flight. But if we could do that with her, that would be most helpful.

And of course trying to have someone from Adler & Colvin join us in Istanbul as well. And then I think that would - that those would be action items. Right? Am I missing anything here? Theresa will follow up on the dual engagement possibility of course.

And do you think we should have a follow up call to (unintelligible) a brief call before we get to Istanbul or should we further discuss these issues in Istanbul? So no call before Istanbul, right?

Greg Shatan: I think we need...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Sorry. This is Grace. I just think it's important to probably have a call before Istanbul because there's a few things that you may want to discuss, you know, as a group to just kind of get a better idea before Istanbul. And I don't know if the group is available for that. But I think it would be important just considering the discussions today. I think there's a lot of things to flush out.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. So the rest of the team would be okay with having a call before Istanbul so we can iron out maybe the things that we should be focusing on in the Istanbul meeting as well as any questions or concerns that we need to raise to

the law firms while we are there. I see (Tina) is okay. David is okay. Robin is okay as long as it is before Friday. Grace is suggesting Wednesday.

Wednesday. I think Wednesday would work for me as well. Why don't we just send out a very quick doodle poll having maybe Wednesday and Thursday as the two days for this call? And of course we would - so maybe the hours would be pretty much the same as the ones we had today. I think maybe a four, five hour span in between so we can pick the one that's most convenient for everyone.

So that will be another action item for the staff to send out this little poll as soon as possible so we can all answer the poll and scale our call for Wednesday or Thursday.

I see David's dropping off. Thank you very much David. I think we are pretty much finished with this call. If anyone wants to add something to what we just said or if not, I think we can adjourn. Okay. I see no one raising their hand so thank you all for your time. Thank you very much for being here. And I look forward to continuing the discussion on Wednesday or Thursday so long as the doodle poll tells us the time. And thanks staff for your support. And talk to you soon. Thanks.

Coordinator: Thank you. And that concludes today's conference. Thank you for participating. You may now disconnect.

END