

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Capacity Building Program 2015 fourth webinar on the topic IANA functions stewardship transition on the 1st of April 2015 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call as it is a webinar but if I can please remind everyone on the phone bridge, as well as computer, to mute your speakers and microphones, as well as state your name when speaking - not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on other language channels. We have Spanish and French interpretation. Thank you for joining, and I'd now like to turn it over to our moderator, Tijani Ben Jemaa. Please begin.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Terri. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. As Terri just announced, it's the webinar about the IANA functions stewardship transition, and [unclear 01:15] three speakers - two from the ICC - the IANA Coordination Group - and one from the CCWG - the Cross Community Working Group. I will give the floor to Jean-Jacques to start with the first presentation about the IANA Coordination Group.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening all. Thank you Tijani, but I wish to defer to Mohamed, my colleague, who is the Vice Chair and who has prepared a presentation. I wish to complete his proposal or presentation if necessary, and I'm available to have a discussion afterwards or answer questions. Is that all right? Thank you.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Mohamed, please go ahead. We'll start with the ICG and then we'll speak about the CCWG. Go ahead please.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much Tijani. I will be providing you with an overview of what ICG does and its [membership 03:25]. Can I have the presentation on the Adobe please? Thank you very much Terri. As you all recall, in March 2014 NTIA announced the US Government's intention to let go of its current oversight role within the IANA functions. ICANN's started the process of the coordination of [unclear 04:52] the community to produce proposals to the US Government. The outcome of that result was the establishment of the IANA Transition Coordination Group, or ICG.

ICG, in a nutshell, is a group of representatives from different Internet, technical operation communities, and from media communities and Internet organizations involved in Internet governance. ALAC is represented in the ICG by myself and Jean-Jacques and [unclear 05:40] [inaudible speech] organization. The GAC is represented, as is the ccNSO, the gNSO, the ccTLDs and the international charters of [unclear 06:09] as well. One Member from IANA staff as a Liaison and one Board Member, and [unclear 06:19] from the ICANN Board. Those are the communities represented within the ICG.

The role of the ICG is to coordinate and liaise between the three operational communities to submit a proposal. This proposal [unclear

06:45] and have [a conversation] on that proposal. It's not the role - and [unclear] to develop a proposal from scratch. The proposal will be a result and outcome of the different community proposals. The focus of the transition is basically the core IANA functions, which are the protocol parameters and [unclear 07:14] management. The IETF is the standard body that writes [parameters 07:22] for the Internet, and protocols that are listed with a registry listed within IANA - all the protocols that we know.

IANA as well has a critical DNS root zone management function, besides Internet numbers registry management, which is distributing numbers to the regional Internet registries. So the transition does not cover any policy component. The policy is developed in the different operational communities. So within ICANN, the main [unclear 08:02] is developed within the different constituencies within ICANN, and for the IETF it's [unclear] standard protocol policies within the IETF. But the IP address policies are done on the regional Internet registries and coordinated globally by the [unclear 08:24] organizations, [NARALO].

So the proposals are coming from the three operational communities. Those communities are [customers 08:34] to the IANA function [unclear]. The naming or the names community is represented by the CWG - the Cross Community Working Group on IANA, which is basically a community within ICANN - and the IETF community - the Internet protocol community - and the regional Internet registries. They're the three communities that are in it. This community...

TERRI AGNEW: Mohamed, pardon the interruption but it's difficult to hear at this time. Are you able to speak a little closer to the mic and a bit louder?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes. Can you hear me now clearly?

TERRI AGNEW: Much better.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I think as well I will slow down and try to be clear. Three operational communities are going to present, and maybe some of them presented their proposals to the ICG for review, and combination of a final proposal from those proposals. So what are the steps the ICG will take to combine the final proposal? The first step, iCG will go through an individual proposal assessment. It will assess every proposal from the three communities. It will review it in terms of its completeness, and the requirement of the RFP, which is issued by the ICG.

It will look at the clarity - is it clear, with good description about the functions of IANA? Does the proposal meet NTIA criteria? NTIA have set a number of principles. One of them for example is that the transition should not happen to an intergovernmental body or a commercial company, for example. The transition should maintain the openness and security of the Internet, and also, does the proposal include the comments received from the community or members participating in the proposal development? If there was a concept among that

community, an approval, an acceptance to that proposal. So those are the elements the ICG will look at in the individual proposal assessments.

Then the ICG will combine, from the different proposals, look at the gaps, see what's missing, propose elements that are missing, and then bring a new proposal from the three proposals. That final proposal will go through a public comment period where the whole community, the Internet and global community will provide its comment, and they will make changes after that consultation period. The final proposal will be submitted to NTIA through the ICANN Board, and that was a request from NTIA due to legal [professional 12:28] alignments with ICANN.

So the final proposal will be submitted to the NTIA through the ICANN Board. So the previous slides were about the ICG and its mandate. In the coming slide I will go through quickly the current status of the ICG and the status of the proposal. We have two proposals received so far - the protocol parameters community, and the IETF has submitted its proposal to the ICG on January 6th 2015. The RIRs have submitted their proposal as well on January 15th, and the CWG is still developing their proposal, and the CWG has met in the last few days, and the Chair of the CWG has put a statement with a tentative timeframe of delivering the domain names community proposal.

Currently we're looking at early June for the final proposal to be submitted, but the draft proposal will be put for a comment period earlier, before that, and I guess it's the end of this month. This is the current status of the proposals. Two have been received and one is pending. In terms of how that will affect the timeline of the ICG, the

original timeline was that the ICG would submit the final proposal to NTIA by July, but currently the ICG will review its timeline and will do its best to try to complete this process hopefully in a reasonable timeframe, bearing in mind the target deadline, which is September.

NTIA has expressed many times recently that this is a target, and the target date could be shifted if the community is not ready or deliver it on time. But the ICG will try its best to try and finalize on time. Currently, we have finalize the individual assessment process for the two received proposals, and we compared the two proposals received from the IETF and the RIRs. The only issue that was raised and communicated back to both communities was an issue about IANA trademark and ownership of IANA.org domain.

The IETF proposal included a suggestion to have IETF Trust to be the entity that will own the IANA trademark and the rights of the website. So we assessed both proposal in terms of accountability. In the summary, the two proposals did not propose any arrangements. The two proposals have stated that there is no need for any external oversight or control or management; that ICANN could replace NTIA in its current role, with some changes in terms of the accountability of ICANN after the transition.

This slide has some useful resources. You can go through those websites to check the materials of the ICG. ICG now have a new website, which is www.ianacg.org. It has an independent secretariat, [unclear 17:26], the mailing list is publicly archived and available. All documents are available also in Drop Box and are made publicly available. Recordings

and transcripts of the meetings and the teleconferences are also publicly archived and available on those links. So recently at the ICANN Meeting in Singapore, the ICANN Board issued a statement which is clarifying the process that the ICANN Board will take in terms of submitting the final proposal to NTIA.

And the board has reconfirmed it will participate in the process with the communities and it will review the final proposal, and if there is any comment from the ICANN Board on the final proposal it will be submitted as accompanying comments to the proposal, and it will not change or alter the proposal that will be submitted to the NTIA. I'm sure you're all following the recent developments. There were hearing sessions at the Congress about the transition, which is NTIA and ICANN that have participated in this session. There is extensive work currently going on regarding ICANN accountability, and there's a stream dedicated to that, and it's currently looking at options and proposals for future accountability mechanisms.

Testing the workability of the proposal is an important task that NTIA will do, and the deadline currently is still there as a target, and hopefully if the proposal is received from the CWG, ICG will do its best to try to deliver the proposal to NTIA through the ICANN Board hopefully in the timeframe, and we'll all be looking forward to doing that. Thank you very much. I hope I was clear and conveyed useful information. I'll be happy to answer questions. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Mohamed. Are there any questions for Mohamed? Any comments? I see, Mohamed, that there is no [unclear 20:47] the naming function [unclear]. As you said, the tow other communities submitted their proposals. They are harmonious. They have almost the same approach. I hope that the CWG will come up with something very soon so it will be good for you to define that, because if they too different, it would be [imperative 21:14] to analyze it. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Mohamed, I was going to ask if there was any indication in the ICG that it would not be able to make the deadline time that was originally intended to have? Basically because the naming proposal has been so late into arriving into its hands - was there any thinking about this so far?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Olivier. Just considering the original timeframe, there was a period of three months for NTIA of reviewing and testing, after receiving the proposal. I think that with the current timeframe, that will be maybe not possible. If ICG has received that proposal from the CWG according to the recent proposed date by then, ICG will do a couple of things - just giving options. The review process and the proposal development will be expedited - that means putting more effort into finalizing the work in a shorter timeframe.

One of the challenges of doing that, initially we had a proposal for one month comment period, which might be challenging due to time constraints. That final comment period might be squeezed. I'm just putting those options out there in terms of those might be options for the ICG to do - to try to achieve the target date, which is September. We don't know if NTIA will be able to review that in a shorter time than the initial plan, but from the ICG's side everyone is willing to put in extra effort to try to deliver it in a reasonable time for NTIA to review.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Mohamed. Are there any other questions for Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think Jean-Jacques might be able to provide more comment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I had a question before from Abibu. Then I'll give the floor to Jean-Jacques. Abibu, please?

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: I have typed the question in the chat. Basically I was asking if there was a new timeline for the naming group to submit their proposal, since they are late?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Abibu, thank you for the question. For the ICG there is currently no new published timeline that would be considered from the CWG, and I'm sure Tijani and I could elaborate more. There is a new tentative timeframe already set, and I think the first draft is expected the end of this month. Thank you.

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Mohamed. Jean-Jacques, if you're ready to speak, you can add something? If Jean-Jacques is not ready, we can have Olivier first. Olivier is a member of the CWG and the CWG is about the naming function only. Olivier, please give your presentation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I'm just going to provide you with a quick intro of where we are with regards to the naming function. As Mohamed has said, and in fact you can see on the present diagram that we have, the NTIA had made its announcement and criteria, sent it over to ICANN, and the following organizations were created. The ICG was created on the one hand, and on the other hand you'll notice three other groups there. The CWG Stewardship, sometimes known as CWG IANA, that's a CCWG on IANA transition that deals only with the naming. That's what we're going to be dealing with now.

The CRISP is the group that's producing the RIR coordinated proposal, and the IANA Plan Group is the one in the IETF, who is providing the input for the protocol related input. Aside from this, you'll see on the diagram there's also a CCWG on enhancing ICANN accountability. That's also within ICANN. That runs in parallel with the CCWG on Stewardship, but because it has one part of it that needs to deal with ICANN accountability in regards to the stewardship transition, there is this linkage between the proposal of this CCWG here and the proposal of the CWG. CWG IANA, CCWG Accountability, and from now on I'll refer to them as CWG and CCWG so as not to make any confusion between them.

The proposals will all go to the ICANN Board and that will be sent over to the NTIA. I think Mohamed did mention the ICANN Board is not going to change anything or amend anything, it's just a channel by which it needs to send the proposals over to the NTIA. That's the first slide. That's how the whole thing works together. Now, the goal of the CCWG or CWG is to present a consolidated transition proposal specifically for the IANA functions relating to the DNS. That proposal must meet three different main needs. That's the scope of it. The naming community in general needs to have its needs met.

There are all of the CWG chartering organizations. On this, the chartering organizations were the ccNSO, the SSAC, the gNSO, the ALAC - as we are really deeply involved in this - and the GAC as well. This proposal also needs to meet the needs of the direct consumers of IANA naming services, including the gTLD registries and the ccTLD registries. One has to remember in this that as far as country codes are concerned,

some of them are part of the ccNSO, but some of them are not. So the proposal itself needs to meet the needs of people who've got nothing to do with ICANN, but are registries that run country codes. Very important to note this.

Therefore the CWG Stewardship actually has members inside it that are not only people chosen from the ACs and SOs of ICANN, but are also external to ICANN. It's open enough to be able to embrace it. When you look at the overall list of what needs to be drafted, there are 11 points. I'm afraid there a little small on that page here, but out of the 11 points, the CWG is focused on points 2-9 and 11. I'm not going to read through all of them. The slides are available from the Agenda page and you can read through those in your own time. I'm mindful of the amount of time that we need if we're going to go through each of these.

What's important is that there's a linkage between the CCWG and the CWG, as I said. There was a meeting last week where the Accountability Group met in the first part of the week, the IANA Stewardship met in the second part of the week, and the Wednesday was used to somehow bridge between the two, because of the fact that some of the accountability measures from the Accountability Group will feed directly into the Stewardship Group. That's what actually happened last week.

Where are we now? The progress until now has been a little slow to start with. As you know, the announcement from NTIA was made quite a while ago already, and so initially there was a few months spent to develop the Charter and to get the agreement from the different SOs and ACs of ICANN. So that's taken the summer months, and that's

normal, because in the summer there's less work that usually happens, due to the summer break in many countries. After that there were initial meetings during ICANN 51. That took place in LA.

Then shortly afterwards there were some separate Working Groups that were defined to look at each one of the aspects of the proposal, such as the principles on which the proposals would be based; such as the definition of the current functions, and how they would have to be transitioned, such as the solutions that might be used to replace the current stewardship that the US Government exercises over the function. They work with [unclear 34:45] some time. A face-to-face meeting took place in Frankfurt, and then a first proposal was sent to the community. You might have seen this in December for public comment.

That was an important moment because the feedback that was received showed there was no consensus in the community with regards to that initial proposal, and a lot more work needed to be done to address many points that were raised there. So in January there was a significant amount of movement. You can see here Washington D.C. being a time when the Co Chairs of the Working Group met face-to-face. There was also a heavy work weekend that took place in January. Then in February there was another meeting at ICANN 52 - that's the last meeting that we had - and that took place in Singapore.

There was some work done there, and it was clear that the structure, by having RFP teams working separately at large chunks of work had somehow come to a standstill, due to several reasons. One of them was that many of the teams were waiting for legal advice to be provided to

them, and the chunks of work were just a little bit too large when everything was working with everything else. There is a high level of connection between the different segments of the topic there. This is where Design Teams were launched. A law firm was taken in to provide legal advice, and also the draft proposal was re-drafted and worked on in parallel.

The Design Teams are there to look at small chunks of work that typically would take a week to work on, and come back to the overall group with a n answer. You'll notice the number of hours we spent on conference calls, working hours, mailing list exchanges - it's been quite a flurry of activity going on there. Now, the interdependencies between the Design Teams, the legal advice and the CCWG and CWG are very important. In Istanbul we managed to bring all of them together and to go from the number of proposals that we had here - seven of eight proposals, internal and external options, mixed options between one proposal and another - and it was a very difficult position to be in.

There needed to be some kind of decision made. Thanks to the expert or co-chairing of both Jonathan Robertson and [Lee Hurst 37:45], the Co Chairs of the Working Group, we managed to focus finally, and also due to the help of the legal team, we managed to focus down on a main proposal that would have a mix of internal and external processes that could take over the stewardship of the IANA function. I'm not going to dig into the proposal itself yet, because it's a work in progress. I think we'd probably need another webinar in the future when the meal is fully cooked. At the moment the meal is not fully cooked. There is still a

number of points we need to work on and focus on, so as to produce a final report.

What's important is that the Design Teams are working in parallel with the overall team that's working on the solution; internal, external or hybrid. So what we have in the near future, the next steps are as follows: there's going to be a flurry of activity until early April, by which time we'll have a draft proposal, version two. A public comment period will open. It says 30 days here. It might actually be 40 days. That's still to be worked out. One has to obtain clarification if the new system of having 40-day comment periods will be applicable to the current process. We're likely to get further input from legal advice, and a further version of the draft proposal - draft proposal version three.

That will need to then be sent to the chartering organizations - as I mentioned, the ALAC, the SSAC, the gNSO and ccNSO - because anything that comes out of a CCWG needs to be ratified. So that's going to come back in our community, probably at the end of May. Then there will be a submission to the ICG made in the middle of June of so, when the proposal will then be sent, and then at that point it's Mohamed's group that will have to work on what people drafted together. The process is way longer than we originally envisaged it to be, and so we are several months behind schedule.

But as Mohamed said, the amount of time in the summer is probably going to be enough for the overall proposal to not be delayed. AS far as we're concerned, the naming proposal is such a complex issue in many respects that we prefer to take the time to do it correctly rather than

doing it hastily. The use of the Design Teams is interesting. Each one is dealing just with a very small chunk of work, and if you look at the overall proposal, each DT is then going to be slotting in its little chapter in the part of the proposal where there's something still missing. So we end up with a very full proposal indeed. That's the current status of the DTs.

We've got IANA service level expectations, we've got appeals for delegations and re-delegations, customer standing committee, which is a committee made up of the direct customers of IANA, the authorization function... There's a long list of these, some of which are very technical in nature, some of which are less technical in nature. There's one more that's been added in. It's Design Team O. It's empty here, but I was just on the call just now.

That one will deal with the budget issues relating to the IANA functions. As you know, everything costs money and the IANA functions has a budget. We need to identify what that budget is exactly and other issues relating to the running of that budget, and making sure that any proposal does not increase the IANA functions dramatically, because ultimately the money comes from end users, and that's you and me. That's all I'm going to go through at the moment. I'm open to questions and comments on this.

One more thing perhaps. The proposal itself is going to be significantly large, and there are therefore plans to have several levels of proposals. There will be the large proposal, which is likely to be in excess of maybe 100 pages or so. Then there's going to be a summary proposal with the

bare bones that are really important, and then finally there will be some explanatory notes. If Terri can swap to the other document I submitted, it gives you an idea of the kind of notes there will be. ICANN has engaged a company called Explain. It's able to put complex systems into simple words and drawings.

This is an explanation of what we did on the first day of work in Istanbul with the different DTs working with each other. So there will be some diagrams of work and details that will also be transmitted for the general public and for everyone to be able to consume, without having to dig into the technical and complicated details. Thank you. Open to questions of course. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Olivier for your presentation. Any questions for Olivier? Otherwise I'll give the floor to Jean-Jacques to add something about the ICG.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Tijani. Mohamed made a full account of where the ICG is today. I'd like to offer a few additional remarks, which are more personal - less about the mechanics and perhaps a bit more about the political framework in this this is happening, and to look especially at the challenges ahead. I have three sets of remarks. The first one is about the debate that has occurred since the inception of the ICG. I would like to remind us that there was initially, right from the start, a differentiation, which was called the input and proposals.

We are still in that regime, which is that everyone is allowed input, but the proposals have and will come only from what is called the directly affected communities - meaning the numbers community, the protocol parameters community and the domain names community. A second remark is the simultaneous nature of the proposals. You remember that initially it was expected and hoped that the proposals would all come at the same time. As we know, and Olivier has made very clear, new requirements came into the picture with the necessity for much clearer rules of accountability and mechanisms for accountability concerns to be addressed.

That is why the timeline has become more complicated than was initially thought. It has in turn brought a different timeline for the numbers proposal particularly. The second point I wanted to take up in my presentation was the current status. Yes, there is some slippage in the timeline, but from where I stand, that's still okay. As someone mentioned a few minutes ago, overall I think that we should be able to present the proposal of the ICG to NTIA roughly in the next [several timelines 47:30].

The other point I'd like to outline on the current status is that it's very important that the ICANN Board has said it will transmit the ICG's plan to NTIA, but without making any modification. If the Board feels that it has to agree or disagree or proffer further ideas, it has to do so in a separate letter to the NTIA, but not interfere in the actual draft of the proposal, which will be submitted by the ICG. My third and last topic was challenges ahead. Mohamed has described very accurately all the mechanisms.

I'd like to add one layer, which is the political dimension, which escapes us, of course, and I mean the domestic political situation in the US, because there are several changes of some magnitude in the coming months - change of presidency, et cetera. There will of course be more and more lobbying on the hill in Washington from all sorts of communities - for instance the domain name community - and that will complicate the game. I'm saying this because I'd like to underline that whatever the intrinsic qualities of the ICG proposal, they may undergo some sort of additional delay, or perhaps even a necessity to be changed in part, but not for lack of coherence or potency, but simply because there is a political agenda for some contributors, and that of course will play out on the hill in Washington.

So my overall personal evaluation of this, regarding challenges ahead, is that this political situation, there are two consequences. The first is a possible delay, even once the ICG has presented a full proposal. The other possible consequence is that for political reasons, even if the NTIA certified that we did things in the proper way and in the proper timeline, for political reasons the proposal may be thrown back at us for some changes. That was my additional contribution to Mohamed's presentation. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Jean-Jacques for this addition. We are running out of time, so if there are any questions to Olivier, Mohamed or Jean-Jacques - any questions please? I don't see any hands. If you are not on the AC please speak up. Jean-Jacques, I understand what you said about

the political layer, and I understand that there is some pressure from everywhere, but it all depends on us, as Working Groups, whether we're strong enough to work properly. If so, I think we'll have a good proposal for the transition.

If the Working Groups are weak and don't have enough personality, this can influence it. But I'm very optimistic. I'm on the CCWG and I see that perhaps we'll have something very interesting and very acceptable. Any other comments?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, I agree with you that of course it is our duty - not only our possibility - to do our utmost to present the most complete and coherent proposal for the transition plan. I was simply pointing out that there are some elements of a political nature, which will affect us, whatever the quality of our work. I just wanted to make us all aware of that fact. I'm not predicting that it will not work or it will work. I was just saying that we must be aware that there is that possibility.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's right, and at the end, the proposal will go to the NTIA so they can accept it or reject it. They are the ones who can accept it or reject it. So the transition cannot be made if they don't accept the proposal. This is very clear. Any other questions or comments? We have two minutes left. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Just realizing there are a lot of people on the call here, I guess when we originally had these webinars that were scheduled, we thought all of the proposals would be in by now, and we'd maybe we'd have to explain what the proposals were all about and so on. Since now we're looking at a different timeline, I wonder whether it would be worth asking if people would be interested in another webinar in the future? I don't know when, and I'm sure the Capacity Building Working Group can work on that, but there could be another Working Group in the future that will then explain the final proposals? I'm entirely happy to help with that if needed. I don't know if anybody wants to show us if this would be helpful? If so, I'm happy to do it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. The Capacity Building Working Group will meet soon and we'll see if there is a possibility to do another webinar about the transition. I'm sure there is, but not now - at least when all the proposals are done - when the CCWG has finished, when the CWG has finished, we'll do a good call to summarize and explain everything to everyone. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: July or August, for example. I know it's the summer, but maybe that would be helpful. Then people can just download it and listen to it whilst they're relaxing on the beach somewhere.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Yes, okay. Okay, any other questions? Any other remarks? If not, we're at the top of the hour. I have a question. Alberto, go ahead please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Well, I think it would be good to have another webinar, because at least in our region we have many people who are not able to participate right now, but the fact of having the presentations and a Wiki page, that will bridge that gap. That would be useful for us. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alberto. Thank you very much. Alberto, any time you have any need for capacity building, don't hesitate to contact the Capacity Building Working Group. We're always ready to make any effort to satisfy your needs. Thank you. If there are no other remarks or question I thank you very much for your participation. Thank you Mohamed, thank you Olivier, thank you Jean-Jacques, and thank you to all staff, the interpreters, and all of you who participated in this webinar. This webinar is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]