

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chuck Gomes**  
**June 3, 2015~~June 2, 2015~~**  
**10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: This call will now be recorded. You may now begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. This is Chuck Gomes and this is the Design Team M, CWG meeting on the 2nd of June, 2015. We have Avri and Staffan and myself along with Marika from staff on the call. I don't know if anybody else will join but we'll go ahead and proceed and get the call started.

I don't even know how many members we have so that makes it even harder to define a quorum but because of the timeframe we're dealing with my opinion, and you can counter it if you want, is that we will make, you know, come out of this meeting with some recommendations and then it'll be considered by the full working group.

So I don't think we can approach it any other way just because of the short time constraints that we have. It looks like we have six members plus but - so probably that wouldn't be a quorum, Avri, but I don't know what else we can do except for the - those of us that are on the call grapple with the issues we have in front of us, try to reach consensus among ourselves and put forward the recommendations to the full CWG.

So I put an agenda out. If anybody has any concerns about that please speak up now otherwise we'll just proceed with that. And I thought we'd start by just having Marika talk about where changes have been made in the draft final proposal that she circulated with regard to the sections that relate to Design Team M.

And in cases where there were no changes made like I don't think there were any made in Annex K, for example, that's fine. So, Marika, could you do a quick update on that?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Sure. So basically what you see on the screen is the final transition proposal version 1 that Grace sent out late last night. So basically on Page 25 you'll see the escalation mechanism section of the Section 3 of the proposal.

And I think the only change I made here is just to add a reference to the flow charts that have been added as an annex that basically provide a better overview of how the different steps and the relationships between the customer service complaint resolution process and the problem resolution process.

So that's the only change that I made here as I didn't believe there was anything else that needed updating in relation to the brief summary of what is contained in this section.

If not we may be move on to the annexes, I'm just trying to see - it started on Page...

Chuck Gomes: Seventy one.

Marika Konings: ...71 so just moving there. So the changes I made here I think the first change, and I'll just move along, in Phase 2 the first sentence to reflect that Phase 2 is available to direct customers, the IANA functions operator, and the ICANN ombudsman, that was one of the changes I think that came out of our discussions of the flow chart. And it's also reflected in the flow chart so that change has also been changed throughout then in the 2a as well to reflect that.

Then there's as well the updated footnote. I believe we discussed - and I note I think Chuck commented on that as well that in relation to mediation, which I think actually comes up in the next one or maybe that's actually - I'm just seeing, where is that footnote. I probably need to zoom in a bit because it's very small at the moment.

So Footnote 36, yeah, so in Phase 2 Point A we make a reference to mediation. We originally had there that that was something that needed for the implementation work. And that has not been updated to I think reflect as well the discussions we had on one of the previous DTM calls to note that this is an area where the CWG Stewardship recommends that staff does a bit of further investigation on what may be possible in this regard looking at, for example, Section 5.1 of the base gTLD registry agreement with a reference to that.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Let me jump in here. A question comes to my mind in that should we say a little bit about timing in terms of when additional work of this should be done? And I'm throwing this open to everybody. So, I mean, is that work that should start as soon as we, you know, as soon as we get past this June 8 target and say that here so that the work is done before any transition would occur?

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I believe there is also - and I haven't looked at that in detail yet. I think in - I think it's probably Section 4 I think there was discussions as well that that would include I think implementation related issues and possibly also timing.

So it may be worth - and I said I haven't looked at it so I don't know if this is already specifically covered or it's more in a general sense. But it may be worth looking at that section to see if it's worth, you know, calling it out there if all implementation related issues are going to be gathered together instead of, you know, maybe hiding it here in a footnote. That may be more difficult to look at. But so as said, maybe its worth checking what is there already or suggest that something along those lines is added there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I mean, that sounds like a good idea to me. Any other thoughts on that? So we may just deal with that in Section 4 which I suspect would be an issue that's come up. If it's dealt with in Section 4 that seems okay to me. Anybody think differently? Okay so our action item there would be to check and make sure that it's included in Section 4.

Maybe with a reference - are you thinking, Marika, that we would have a reference in Section 4 to this - to annex - to this annex and - Annex I and the issue of mediation. Okay.

Marika Konings: Yes, I think that makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. All right, you may continue. Sorry to interrupt.

Marika Konings: No problem at all. Anyone feels free to interrupt me. Just scrolling this, I don't think her were any further - oh yeah, there is - so there's also a change to 2c. And I think, again, that flows out from the conversations we had last time and also the updates that were made to the flow chart to really make clear as well that of course at any time the complainant has applicable legal recourses at their disposal should they not want to use this process or maybe not happy what the staff's proposed here. So it's just I think calling that out again here which I think was also already in the body of the report but it's just another confirmation of that.

Chuck Gomes: So before we go to - this is Chuck speaking - before we go on to Annex J does anyone have any comments or suggestions here on Annex I? Okay, go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: So then moving on to the next section, which is Annex J, the IANA problem resolution process. I think all the changes in here or at least that first paragraph up to systemic problems but I think actually the next one as well, all follow the suggested responses and changes, I think, as you sent around, Chuck, to the DTM mailing list, I believe over the weekend I want to say.

So basically those are the ones that respond to the comments from AFRALO, ALAC and the CDT.

Chuck Gomes: And so one of them - thanks, Marika. This is Chuck. And so one of them is obviously the suggestion to escalate to the PTI board and we're going to talk about that I think in Staffan's comments. So let's hold off on discussing that right now.

But note as it stands right now, and we can change that today, that this problem resolution process has the added step of putting the PTI board in

there as the escalation step and then following that the escalation to the ccNSO and/or the Registry Stakeholder Group. Now note that change here as well and that was from public comments as well.

And before we look at systemic problems anybody have any comments on those? Again, those will kind of fall out of our discussion today on the public comments. So we'll have more chance but if somebody wants to say anything now that would be okay.

Staffan Jonson: Well, Staffan here. Yeah, should we wait with talking about this - the PTI board escalation or - I was a little surprised seeing it at all because I thought the PTI board would - escalation to the PTI board would actually be instead of ccNSO and Registry Stakeholder Group. But this is both actually so to me that makes it different compared to what I wrote before.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: No, I'm glad - thanks, Staffan, this is Chuck. Yeah, and that - let's talk about that further after we go through the kind of overview...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...of the edits that are there now. But let's keep in mind that obviously this section - this Annex J is going to, you know, how it ends up will depend on our discussions today. So - what's in there now is not in concrete, okay?

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And then the changes then under systemic problems was also based on feedback from public comments that I threw in there. Again, we don't have to

leave that as it is, it just basically - you can see that the IANA review function - and, Avri, please jump in here since you've been spending a lot of time on that. So the IANA function - IANA review function team could initiate an SIFR which of course you've done a lot of work on so I think that's consistent with what you're doing. But if it's not, if there's anything wrong there, please speak up.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Hi, I'm confused. This is Avri. I'm confused. And hopefully I'm not breaking up. If I am then I'll try calling in with the phone but that doesn't always work either.

Chuck Gomes: Sounds pretty good right now.

Avri Doria: Okay, so in this revision I don't understand where there is going to the ccNSO and GNSO that then can be the ones to initiate the IANA function review, the special IANA function review or if as Staffan has said, it's just going to the PTI board and not also to the ccNSO and GNSO.

Because if it doesn't go to the two naming SOs then I'm not sure what mechanism we've got for initiating the SIFR, the PTI board does it? It would not think so. So I'm not sure how that would work. I got confused.

Chuck Gomes: No, and that's - you're rightfully confused if I could say it that way, because I think these are still issues we've got to work through. And you raise a very good point on that. And I'm probably leaning the same way but let's hold off just a second and we'll get into that discussion in detail. But these things that we're talking about here in Annex J are all kind of interrelated including the paragraph that says systemic problems. So your confusion is well justified.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And I think that's where the flow charts, you know, may or will help because I think it may show clearer the relationships and the steps. Although of course Steps 3 and 4 I've modified are not in there yet but at least as I understood them were that it's a kind of sequence. So, you know, first the CSC determines that, you know, things are not happening as they're supposed to and then they actually go to the PTI board and say, hey, you know, we've already spoken to your staff, people in the team. We're not getting - we think this is a big issue, you know, can you take responsibility for it?

And if that not happens then it goes to the ccNSO or the Registry Stakeholder Group which is as well one of the changes that I think that were discussed on Thursday and Friday and I think is specifically in response to the comment from the ALAC which would then decide what are the next steps.

And I think one of those could be an SIFR as a potential avenue as well as I think - and I think again it's in the flow charts I think we tried to work out how in more detail that escalation through ccNSO and, you know, in this case the Registry Stakeholder Group, could go in case it would be decided that there was indeed an issue that needed further addressing.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. This is Chuck again. So I don't think there are any changes made in Annex K, am I right on that?

Marika Konings: Yes, that's correct. I'll just scroll down.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: And just to note on the flow charts I did include them but I did mark them obviously updates need to be made depending on where we settle in the process because, for example, if the PTI board is added that will need to become another row in, you know, the problem resolution process steps to show that, you know, where they fit in. Similarly if it's the Registry Stakeholder Group instead of the GNSO that would also need to be clarified.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marika Konings: And one thing I'm just realizing as well is that - and I don't know if that is coming back in the C work or whether that actually needs to be updated here because I do remember that in response to the punch list we did talk through this, you know, how would the ccNSO and GNSO actually handle if people would come to them with issues.

So that is maybe something as well that needs to be cross checked to make sure that it's reflected the agreement that I think was reached between DTM and DTC on how the ccNSO and GNSO would handle those that, you know, someone could come just to the ccNSO or just to the GNSO for assistance.

But if escalation beyond that, you know, through IFR or IRP would happen that that would need to be a joint action of the GNSO and the ccNSO. And, again, something that will then need to be considered as well how does that - is that affected by potential change to the Registry Stakeholder Group instead of the GNSO because presumably, you know, in the accountability mechanisms it would be GNSO that would initiate that.

Or it doesn't matter because any individual can presumably start an IRP so there's other things that I'm not sure and maybe Staffan knows if that is

something that DTC is actually incorporating in their work or whether that is something that is supposed to happen here as well.

Chuck Gomes: Staffan, do you want to comment on that with regard to Design Team C?

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, I should be able to - I'm not sure I followed you fully, really. Maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: ...you will come back to me. Yeah. Could you please?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So on the punch list there were a couple of items that we discussed on our last meeting and formulated responses to. And I think one of those was, you know, can the ccNSO and GNSO can they initiate an IRP? And also how would that kind of, you know, how would the GNSO and ccNSO get involved in the kind of problem resolution management situation?

And we developed a response for that, I think it was the notion of if someone has an issue they can come, you know, like the ccTLD they would go to the ccNSO and if the ccNSO would initially discuss and try to understand the issue maybe, you know, try to work through it.

But if that then would not be resolved then there was a feeling that it would need to be escalated further. You know, GNSO and ccNSO work together and would have to jointly decide that, you know, the next step would be taken whether that's, you know, an SIFR or launching an IRP or...

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...think we spelled that out. So the question is is DTC dealing with that in, you know, the DTC charter? Or is that also something that we need to be foreseeing here in our work? And I'm not 100% clear on that.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. So what was discussed and this was discussed a bit in DTC a while ago and that is how will the escalation or rather if we call it escalation how will the CCs and the Gs together notify the community that there is an issue going on here?

And we were talking about that maybe the ccNSO and the GNSO together would be given the discretion to figure that out internally within themselves and post transition they should need to develop some kind of a process for doing that. But when we spoke about this early on we did not foresee the exact mechanisms for doing that.

My interpretation of that is that the ccNSO and the GNSO together need to find some consensus of actually notifying the rest of the community. And that - by that I mean that they need to agree on that there is a problem. So that's my best recollection of the initiation process if we call it that, for flagging an issue.

And that is also why I later in the comments mentioned that the more the merrier, the more that need to get consensus the more complicated we will actually be have to raise an issue. So there is a - there is probably a positive upside of just being two parties having to agree on - to raise an issue so to say.

But this has been turned over - I think we left it by that just to - by the charter in itself. So there main term here is the discretion for the two organizations internally to handle this.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Staffan. And it seems to me, and Avri I'm going to come back to your questions and comments in the chat. But it seems to me this may be another implementation item for Section 4 of the proposal. Am I right on that, the work of the ccNSO and GNSO that Design Team C has talked about.

Staffan Jonson: It might be, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So...

Staffan Jonson: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...I'm sure Marika got that. Now, Avri, no, we have not as a design team decided that it should be switched to the - just the Registry Stakeholder Group. That was a comment I think from the ALAC. So that's another thing we need to try to agree on today in that regard. So you're right on that.

And we're going to talk about whether the PTI should be the one to cause an IFR as I indicated earlier. So I think now what I'd like to do - we're going to come back these issues, we haven't resolved the ones that are open now. But I'd like to go then to our discussion on the public comments and in particular to Staffan's comments that he was kind enough to put forward.

And Staffan, what I'd like to ask you to do - let's start off with the comment by AFRALO that said that the CSC should escalate to the PTI board who may ask for a review. So there's actually two parts of their suggestion there. And one of them is that PTI would be in the escalation path; the second one is I think a totally different issue that we need to discuss and try to reach consensus on is whether they can ask for the review or whether it comes back to the CSC.

As you can see the way I did it in the edits I proposed over the weekend or whenever I did it, I assumed that PTI board would not be the one that escalates it further, that it would go back to the CSC and the CSC would be the one that escalates to the GNSO - or ccNSO and GNSO or Registry Stakeholder Group which we'll come back to and talk about that.

So, Staffan, can you just maybe...

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, sure.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...orally give us your thoughts on the AFRALO suggestion.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, I turned this over and over a couple of times actually to understand what is happening. So I started with writing the three possible scenarios as I could see the blue text.

So CSC can escalate to the ccNSO and GNSO, it could escalate to the PTI board or it could escalate maybe to the SIFR or at least maybe there are several possible options but these are the - to me this is an issue if escalation should take place within ICANN. And at least gathering from discussions Thursday and Friday I perceived that the PTI is coming inside of ICANN and being a limited board. But I'm not sure of that yet but that's how I interpreted the discussions last week at least.

So if the CSC should escalate to the PTI board it would be an inside solution. And it will also be financed within ICANN remit so to say. And that would be the pros of having this process. The backside would be that PTI and the CSC

would show limited independence from current process and organization meaning that it would be quite closely connected to ICANN per se.

So what I perceived there as the alternative route that's more outside of ICANN and that is Alternative A, CSC escalates to ccNSO and GNSO which are supporting organization but they are - and have an ability at least to stand outside of ICANN. And here the pros would be the CSC external to ICANN and indicating more independence from ICANN. And the backside is of course that this independence from ICANN indicates costs and it raises the issue who should finance it, etcetera, etcetera.

So my thought in point is actually what will the PTI board be? Will it be internal or external? I would - if I would have to bet on it I would say we will end up with an internal and a small PTI board but I don't dare do that yet.

So if you step up a bit on the picture you'll see that I had two paths in the red describing if CSC report to PTI board and the PTI board is a broad multi-stakeholder community representation then it would be okay in my eyes at least for CSC to report to this multi-stakeholder fora.

But if CSC report to PTI board and PTI board is limited in scope and numbers, which maybe I heard this last week, CSC might have limited ability to escalate issues within ICANN sphere because well there are mechanisms for ICANN not wanting to hear this.

And then maybe I lean towards the idea that it should be raised to CCs and Gs instead to the ccNSO and GNSO to the supporting organizations. So that's my - as you might hear I'm not very firm or very convinced in either. I do see both sides. I want the multi-stakeholder representation but I'm quite keen on

isolating the CSC function as just take implementations so to say. So I'm not sure I landed here really. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Well thank you, Staffan. And, Avri, I'm going to come to you and Marika just for your thoughts in terms of the things that Staffan has just shared. But I have a couple questions that I think might be simple to answer. One of them maybe less so than the other. But based on your C option I - is it safe to conclude that having the CSC escalate to SIFR is really not an option in the...

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: No, you're right. You're right.

Chuck Gomes: And any disagreement with that? I certainly agree with that. So we can cross that one off. The second...

Avri Doria: Could you repeat that please?

Chuck Gomes: Oh yes, go ahead. What was that, Avri?

Avri Doria: No I was just saying could you repeat that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh sure, sure I will.

Avri Doria: Could you repeat the thing that there is no disagreement on before we take it off the table because I missed that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, no I will. So if you look at Staffan's point - Option C, having the CSC escalate directly to an SIFR, Staffan's opinion was that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...that should not happen because the CSC...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...is an overview of technical operations.

Avri Doria: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I had just missed that that was...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ad: Yes, I had just missed that that was the point we were agreeing on.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay so we're in agreement on that one. The second kind of - I think easier question to deal with, maybe not as much as that last one, is on B, Staffan, does it really matter on B whether the PTI board is internal or external in terms of it being an escalation step?

And my thinking there is - I'll just go ahead and share it - is that the - one of the primary responsibilities of the PTI board is oversight of the operational functioning of PTI, of its staff. And so whether it's an internal board or an

external board it will have that responsibility so giving - that oversight responsibility even though they're not involved in day to day management.

So whether it's internal or external they still could be an escalation point and give them a chance to see if they can motivate some improvements that may be needed. So my question, Staffan, to you then is does it really matter whether it's an inside or external board in terms of it being an escalation point?

Staffan Jonson: Not in terms of being an escalation point but however for maybe for other aspects that are not that measurable like loyalty, for example. So if a complainant go to the PTI staff and say this is wrong they get no help with this. They go to the PTI board and they will for sure have the same answer, I'm quite convinced about that. So it's just - I don't see a problem with it, no, except for financing but maybe loyalty yeah, but otherwise I don't.

Chuck Gomes: And I get that. And in fact our escalation mechanisms that precede this like for example in Annex I, which has to do with, you know, going through the different staff levels in PTI, in the IANA functions operator, those are all internal too. So they may or may not work. But the same argument would apply there. At the same time if they do work it avoids going further.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So my suggestion is that - I don't think we need to - at least here, I know that we're going to do this in the CWG call today, talk about internal or external board based on the agenda. But for our purposes here I don't think we need to get hung up on which one it is, we just need to decide whether we think we want to affirmatively respond to the AFRALO suggestion that we add a step of the PTI board.

By the way, another side point, one of the reasons - and I said this on the last CWG call, I think I was the only one that seemed to be concerned about it, your concerns, Staffan, are the same things I had with regard to having the PTI managing director on the board. I had the same concerns because of that.

But again, if most people think that's the best thing to do I can live with that. And it certainly is good like one commenter said; I think this was on a list comment this week, that the managing director should be a non-voting member of the board. But, again, that's not our issue so let's not get hung up there.

So let's now go back then and I'm going to turn it over to Avri and Marika to see if you have - would like to respond or ask questions in terms of Staffan's scenarios that he's put before us. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I mean, I'm probably misunderstanding, that happens to me so often these days, but I really do not see how the CSC could possibly be part of PTI. And I think that if I'm understanding correctly that is part of the proposal.

Because they represent the customer, not the entity. They have to be in counterpoint to the PTI. And so that to me seems like such an impossible situation that again I figure I must be misunderstanding. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri. Now, Staffan, do you disagree with that?

Staffan Jonson: I don't recognize that - you're saying CSC is part of the PTI?

Chuck Gomes: Well I think - this is what...

Avri Doria: That is what I understood you to be saying. And perhaps, as I say, I misunderstood what you were talking about because - and...

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: Okay you mean since I say if CSC report to PTI board, is that your point or?

Avri Doria: Right, I mean, yeah maybe you mean something different by "report to." By "report to" I mean...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...that they're a subordinate organization to the PTI board. I don't...

Staffan Jonson: Okay, sorry.

Avri Doria: ...mean that they can't file a complaint with them but - but so maybe as I say I'm misunderstanding what you mean by CSC reports to the PTI board.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, okay I see, Avri. No, I should have used another word, not "report to" because that has a bit of a dual meaning I guess. Not report to PTI in the meaning that CSC is part of PTI or have to obey PTI board that was never my intention.

I meant report in the meaning of if CSC is to report the complaints, not as obeying PTI but relaying complaints to PTI as an independent - my idea has all the time been that CSC is an independent entity, not within ICANN and that's why I worry about the financing of the CSC, for example. So, no, at least in my head CSC has always been separate both in structure and in...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: So you actually see they're separate - not part of ICANN either.

Staffan Jonson: No. No, I see CSC as separate from ICANN, yes. However, I suggested that the CSC should be hosted maybe in ICANN's sphere just so as practical reason in something of a similar way that the IETF is part of the ISOC. IETF is not an organization per se but it is a process at least they say so themselves and ISOC is the organization actually being host for the process.

So - but my clear picture is that the CSC should be independent from ICANN and that is quite important because if not there would be actually no meaning of having CSC at all. I mean, then since anyone have standing to complain to that PTI then we wouldn't need the CSC at all. So, yes, in my eyes CSC is independent from ICANN.

Avri Doria: Okay, I guess I don't understand that either, sorry.

Staffan Jonson: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...because I don't understand why having them as part of ICANN as opposed to under the umbrella of ICANN means that they have any less of a special job and of a special status which would be defined in the whole transition bylaw entity of reporting these things but they'd still be situated inside an ICANN accountability sphere as opposed to yet another...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...separate accountability sphere that we have no concept of at the moment.  
So...

Staffan Jonson: I see. I see.

Avri Doria: ...as I say I'm still troubled by that.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, okay so how to put this then? So anyone can raise issues with the IANA functions operations, right? Anyone can challenge the IANA staff and in order to have a more say in the complaints they were perceived almost from Day 1 that there should be a special customer standing committee to actually overview the 99% of the daily operations of the IANA functions. And for me that is...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Overview or...

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, to me...

Avri Doria: Overview or review?

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: I'm not sure I know the difference actually. But review - okay so let's say review. To me it means the CSC should almost on a daily or at least monthly basis read reports of the operations per se. Right. So they should have the...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Staffan Jonson: ...as Paul Kane says, the boring and tedious work of just looking through that everything is okay. They should have limited scope and limited power because they should just be there to do this and to raise if something extraordinary is happening. And that would be the 1T that actually complaint that is not relating to the IANA functions operations in my head at least.

And so then we need to figure out so where should the CSC turn themselves? Well, yes, it could be to the IANA staff but that is probably already been done. So if the CSC has to go to the next level where should they go? Should they go to ICANN? Well, yes, it could be ICANN and this; it seems to be coming that they could be going to the PTI board.

They would probably have, in my view at least, they would probably have little success there since they already tried this at the IANA staff. So where is the next level to go then if the PTI board and those possible remedies...

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: Sorry, yeah.

Avri Doria: Yeah, because I get lost. I guess I don't necessarily accept that assumption that because a staff function didn't do something or didn't respond appropriately to something that necessarily the PTI board wouldn't especially when you consider that it is a board that is going to be composed of non-PTI people. And so whether it's internal or external it's still going to be people that are other than the people that are doing the work in PTI.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Avri Doria: So there is - I think we have to keep a cognizance that that is a real step, that that isn't a fake step that - and that that puts pressure on those boards especially whether it's internal by the definition of the lawyers meeting a majority ICANN staff or internal by my definition which means it's a combination of community and ICANN staff. It will be ICANN internal in the broader sense of ICANN internal. So - but it won't be PTI.

So I think there is a real chance that that could be something effective. So I don't want to discount that from the start as a step.

Chuck Gomes: And if I could - this is Chuck.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri and Staffan, and I'll let you continue. But I wanted to reinforce something that you said there, Avri, and that is the fact that there are going to be community members on that board or community-appointed members that are external to ICANN, I think even increases whether they're a majority or minority I think that still increases the chance that it could be an effective step.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And mitigate against the concern that it's all internal and nothing is going to happen. So I agree with that. Are you okay with that, Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: It is - okay with what?

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, I didn't get that.

Staffan Jonson: Okay so I didn't catch all okay with what? So, yes of course, there will be other people part of the PTI board as I understand last week's discussion. And okay so the PTI board will not be fully loyal to its staff, I can understand that. But there is still, in my head at least, within the ICANN sphere and my idea is to have it beside the ICANN sphere just to have the parallel process if it makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: So let me ask it this way, this is Chuck speaking. So even if the chance of the - of the PTI board being able to motivate any correction that might be needed or any solution that might help is small. Isn't it still worthwhile to give the PTI board a chance to try and get resolution before escalating to the ccNSO GNSO?

Staffan Jonson: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And you're okay with that?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, I am. And I - as I mentioned initially that I was a bit surprised because I thought it was one or the other but actually the Annex J now says it's both.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's the way - now understand that that was my interpretation that it's both so I'm not saying that's the way it has to be but that's the way I interpreted it as both.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And you can tell by the wording that Marika put in the document...

Avri Doria: Me too.

Chuck Gomes: ...that was from me. So...

Staffan Jonson: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, did you want to say something?

Avri Doria: And me too.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Basically I wanted to agree with you that I saw that if we were going to PTI board we were then eventually going to the other; it was just adding an extra possible step, not a different final step.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, okay, I see.

Chuck Gomes: And are you okay with that approach, Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Yes then I am because then there is a possibility also escalated beside the internal ICANN solutions. Then I see - and there is - to my eyes no problem.

Chuck Gomes: And now let's go to the - I think we're okay on that. If I'm wrong on that let me know. But let's go to the second part of the AFRALO recommendation because they say that PTI board may ask for the review from the IFR. That's a very different issue. I think we're in agreement now that it's - their idea of escalating the PTI board is a doable one and could have some value.

But what about this idea of PTI board recommending a review from IFR? The PTI board itself. And before I say anything let me let others speak. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, hi. It's not something I had thought of but I actually kind of like the idea. Although I wouldn't say recommending because of the difference in reporting structure but I could see a requesting. And I could see them actually - if the CSC didn't come to them perhaps they can request it whether they're requesting it of the ICANN board or requesting it of the name supporting organizations, I'm not clear.

So I'm not sure that I would give them a one-stop ability to initiate one but I certainly like the idea of them having a path where they could present the case to let's say the ICANN board, since that's probably the most immediate, they can present a case to the ICANN board requesting that an IFR be started because. And the ICANN board with community review and everything can make a decision.

Again, we've got all the accountability mechanisms of reconsideration and what have you on top of that. And that seems to be an additional mechanism that wouldn't be awful. In fact, might actually make sense. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri. Marika, go ahead. Are you on mute, Marika?

Marika Konings: Trying to get off mute.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...right code and get to the right button. And the clarifying question I had is like we're talking about an SIFR, right, because an IFR is already scheduled to take place.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, okay just wanted to get that correct.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that is correct, yeah. And we need to make sure we say that correctly. Thanks. And some of the details of that probably became more clear after we went out for public comment but anyway good catch.

So interesting thought - this is Chuck speaking - Avri, yeah, I don't see any problem with the PTI board being able to request an SIFR. I don't think they should be able to, you know, initiate one themselves. So the question is who should they request it from? But before we talk about that, Staffan, are you comfortable with that?

Staffan Jonson: I guess so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that's all right, keep in mind you can change your mind when we get to the full CWG but for now you're okay with that.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay thanks. So now Avri suggested that maybe they request it of the ICANN board. They could also request it that the - if the CSC has the ability

to escalate it to the - an IFR - or an SIFR they could also then request it of the CSC.

I don't know that I lean one way or the other or maybe it's both but what are your thoughts on that, anyone? Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: This is - yeah. I would be against that. First of all the CSC...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...could already do it so if - I would be against having them request it of the CSC.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, thank you.

Avri Doria: Partially because what might be the problem is an impossible CSC that the CSC could be operating in such a way that it is made their functioning impossible and they need something fixed. They're not, you know, this is not a separation review yet, this is just an IFR that basically from their perspective things are working out badly.

Now the CSC could have already sent it on its own. The CSC could certainly come to an agreement with them to send it up through the SOs. But the IFR, I mean, the PTI - the IFO - could find itself in just an untenable situation that did not work and want to request that.

So now I agree that they shouldn't be able to just initiate it, they need to be able to make their case to someone. But the CSC is their most immediate contact. It's the one that they're constantly dealing with so I wouldn't make them dependent on that for its ability to go up the chain.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri, good points. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. The question I had, and I also put it in the chat, presumably this conversation in relation to the PTI board being able to request an SIFR should be covered in that section and not in the escalation mechanisms. Do I have that right? I'm just trying to already see where we need to start making changes and how it should get covered.

But is that a correct assumption that that should be updated and presumably through conversations that Avri may have as well with the DTN-SRX I think it is and the design team to see if they're also comfortable with that?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Avri. I think - the way I would see this happening is that if DTM decides that this is something that you'd want to see happen that it go to the CWG meeting because it is a big new thing, response to comment. And it's trivial then for us - (unintelligible) that meeting with adding an extra bullet that in addition to the combined vote of the GNSO and ccNSO being able to request a board initiate that the PTI board could initiate a request the board initiate.

So that would just be adding one bullet, that's not at all difficult for the DTN-SR to do. But the CWG would have to be the one that said, yeah, that's the kind of thing we want to do.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. And we could - certainly in our response to the comment we can indicate that this would be covered in the IFR document so that would be doable. Staffan, are you okay with what we're talking about here?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, I think so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I understand the think so. But for now...

Staffan Jonson: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...we can comment further when it gets to the full CWG or even on list before then and deal with that. But that's - I at least want to know that we're generally in agreement so that we know what to put forward.

So I think then that we've covered the comments of AFRALO which I think were maybe the most difficult - well, not necessarily because we need to do with the change to the Registry Stakeholder Group issue as well. But I think we're done with that.

Marika, are you clear on where we're at so you can write this up?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, I think I've taken notes on the right hand side, those not, you know, directly written as a response to the comment. I don't think that should be too difficult to do.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay, yeah, I was pretty sure you were but I thought I'd ask anyway. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: I have a question. Yeah, I have a question on something that Marika said and put in the chat, presumably, you know, about it presumably being covered as part of the IFR. And of course I've agreed to that. But I think it may also need to be mentioned here in that it is part of - an escalation procedure in a sense.

It's from the other side of the view but it's admitting that there is a way for the other party in the CSC PTI relationship to escalate an issue. And so I think it would be worthwhile having it described as a thing here that is effectuated by a change in the IFFR - no, whatever - the SIFR initiation process.

Chuck Gomes: Imagine what those who are not involved in this like us how they must struggle with all of these acronyms and names and everything else. Anyway, that's a side point. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And the way I think that can be easily done is indeed as it's written now this additional step of the PTI board I guess we could just include a footnote saying note that the PTI board is also enabled to request an SIFR per, you know, the recommendations in Annex - I think it's - I don't even know which annex it is - but making the reference in that sense so I think that serves a purpose that Avri was outlining if I'm correct.

Chuck Gomes: And even that footnote could mention the whatever annex it is. So okay, any objections to that? Thanks, Avri, for that additional suggestion. Okay, so now let's talk about - let's see I'm jumping ahead and looking here. It was an ALAC comment, it's not one of the ones we're responding to here that I think - oh here we go. It was the comments by CDT - the Center for Democracy and Technology - I think that is where the issue of the changing GNSO to Registry Stakeholder Group.

And, Avri, I don't think you agreed with that. Do you want to comment first on that?

Staffan Jonson: Sorry, what number is it?

Chuck Gomes: Let's see. That - hold on, good question. Let me get that in - that's 255 I think. Did they say that in 255? I'm looking, okay. Maybe it's not what they said. No, that's not the right one. Oh it's 256, it's the NCSG comment I think unless I'm misreading it. So sorry I'm reading.

It doesn't necessarily...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I thought the 256 from NCSG was more about general inconsistencies and details not about anything specific.

Chuck Gomes: It is, you're right. So I'm at a loss - I don't have right in front of me where that came from. I know I picked it up somewhere. And believe it or not even though I'm from the Registry Stakeholder Group it didn't come from me.

Staffan Jonson: I've read that too today so I know it is here somewhere, we'll just find it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. So regardless let's - because we're running out of time, I think some of the other issues are a little bit quicker. But the - what about this instead of - now the GNSO process obviously to get - for the GNSO to deal with it is a little more complicated than the Registry Stakeholder Group deal with it but maybe that's not sufficient from a multi-stakeholder point of view and I get that.

But let's think about complexity and so forth but let's hear everybody out on this and come up with hopefully a recommendation that the four of us can support for the CWG to consider. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay yeah. Thank you. I'm fairly convinced of the parity between the two SOs in terms of the inclusion of stakeholders. It's just done differently. Now I understand that the ccNSO doesn't include all the ccTLDs and I think we're going to find eventually that the GNSO doesn't either but that's beside the point.

In the GNSO we deal with the separate stakeholder groups at a global level and deal with the civil society and the other users and what (unintelligible) the registrars, etcetera at a global level covering all gTLDs.

Whereas if you look at the, you know, the RFC - I forget Number 15, 29, whatever the holy number is, and I'm not good at remembering, you know, numbers like that, but as that RFC defines it each of those ccTLDs includes that on a local basis or on a national basis it's civil society, it's registrar mechanisms if it's using registrar mechanisms, it's businesses, it's government. So that's all itself contained within each of the ccTLDs. So one does it horizontally, one does it vertically.

But in essence each of the SOs comes to the table with a multi-stakeholder approach. To say that we're going to take just the Registries and equate them to the ccNSO because in some sense at a surface level they look just like Registries is sort of, to my mind, a false equivalent because we're not looking at what it means to be - and yes not all ccTLDs follow it to the full extent - but what it means to be a ccTLD as defined in 1591, is that the number? But anyway you guys know what I mean.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Avri Doria: I think.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. I don't have any argument with that myself. Staffan, or Marika, any thoughts on that?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, it's 1591. I'm quite sure about that. So, yes, yeah, let me come back to it, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay all right that's fine. Marika, any thoughts on that?

Marika Konings: Nope.

Chuck Gomes: So, I mean, I don't have any good argument against that, Avri, myself. And if Staffan is in agreement then we would reverse the change - the edit that was made the change it to Registry Stakeholder Group and leave it as GNSO and then the reason for that as some form of what Avri just said. So I - she said it quite well.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: In other words somebody like Marika will take my - somebody like Marika will take my circular reasoning and make it straight?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Avri, I was just actually just going to ask you to put a few lines in the chat to help me out.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay certainly, I'll try. Having said it all I can write it easier so it'll show up in a bit.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it was well said but I'm sure you can say it a little more briefly so that we can respond why we didn't make that change so that will be good. Staffan, you said you wanted to come back...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I know how confusion my locutions can be.

Chuck Gomes: It wasn't confusing to me but I just am saying that probably your good points can be made more briefly, that's all. I know when I'm talking I usually use more words than when I put it in writing so - so anyway. Staffan, do you have any more thoughts on this?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, well, Avri, yes I agree on all you said but I'm not sure I follow the punch line, so to say, because yeah, to me this is not a big thing but I know this, it is a big thing for others. So just to be practical here if we propose a change here what will happen in the other end? Will we have a long discussion turning - just to make this a smooth process because I have no issues with what you said but I didn't hear the other side of it so to say.

So what are the arguments against you, if I'll put it that way instead so - because if we - if we propose something we need to hear your opponent as well. So can it be changed the other way around your argument?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And I can maybe try because I think one of the main proponents of this change was with ALAC and Alan in the conversations on Thursday and Friday.

And if I understand it correctly I think his main argument was that, you know, this escalation would just be referring it to the next body which would be multi-stakeholder and as such involving the GNSO as a whole may actually bring in more complexities than are necessary instead of just having the registries as direct customers making an assessment on whether or not it needs to be escalated with the assumption being here that then in that next step once GNSO and ccNSO agree to go to the next level that that is where the multi-stakeholder component comes in.

And I think that was Alan's argument for suggesting that it should be just Registry Stakeholder Group. But, again, I didn't really get a sense either whether this was really, you know, one of their key points that they would like to see there or it was just a suggestion to consider to make things easier but not one of those to, you know, die in a ditch for to keep it. But that may be something again to bring up maybe on the call later today to see if that is a major point or whether based on the conversations or recommendation of DTM whether people don't feel any major issues with changing that back.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. That's helpful in bringing us back to where all this came from. And I think you're right in terms of that Alan said. And I guess that's part of what I was saying is - and I don't feel super strongly about this but the - it does make it more complex at this step to involve the full GNSO. But if that's the right thing to do we do it.

Now is it sufficient to use what we think Alan's reasoning was is that the multi-stakeholder process is going to come in at the IFR level, is that sufficient? And do we want to just allow the Registry Stakeholder Group to be able to push it up a level to that multi-stakeholder process? Avri, I'd like you respond please.

Avri Doria: I was rereading what I had just written and didn't hear a word you said, apologies.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and did you hear what Marika said was Alan's reasoning?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: Right. And I think that the issue about where the multi-stakeholder lies is what's critical. And I think you're going to have a - the multi-stakeholder model doesn't exist just at one layer. So we have multi-stakeholder at the board level, but we also have a next layer down multi-stakeholder model in each of the name supporting organizations.

And so I think that, you know, subjecting it to the multi-stakeholder community at one layer and then going further, having a community review, and having the board make a decision you basically have made sure that all the stakeholders have indeed been included. So - and I just don't see removing the second layer multi-stakeholder structure because there's another one later on that should catch any issues.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you.

Avri Doria: Does that answer it?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it does. That's good, very helpful. And so my inclination, and Staffan, I'm going to put you on the spot and see if you're okay with this so as I'm talking you can think about that. Does - my inclination is to not make the change from GNSO to RySG, to leave it as GNSO and of course then putting

the rationale that Avri is writing for us and maybe citing that we did consider the thoughts that were shared in the CWG call on - what's today - yeah, I guess it was Thursday's meeting with regard to the possible change to the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note that it actually would be changing it back again and...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...my fault, you know, we did go ahead and knowing that things were still in flux we did already make the change that went on the mailing list. So I think it is worth calling that out probably on the call later today...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marika Konings: ...and just blame staff for it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and that's - I agree, that's correct. Staffan, now I'm putting you on the spot.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, if I can - it is. I don't have a strong view on this...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: ...step back here and please - and please go ahead and do...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Very good. All right let's see, where are we at? The - I think we may have already dealt with the Center for Democracy and Technology comment. That's Number 255. And in terms of the CSC being able to initiate an SIFR, so do we need to do anything further on that?

Staffan Jonson: No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, everybody's okay - and, Staffan, you were okay with that. Avri, are you okay with that? Okay, not hearing any objections. The NCSG have some concerns about inconsistencies between the CSC and its responsibilities and the IFR. I think that those are going to be removed by some of the added detail, am I correct on that, that's being done not only by - I think our flow chart and the flow chart - keep in mind the flow chart was not in the original document for public comment.

Is - and the propose CWG response is, "The CSC charter was largely done prior to discussions of PTI board," and so forth. Do we need to - does anyone think we need to do more to remove any inconsistencies like the NCSG suggested? And I think it's not only what we've done but what Avri's team is leading on DTN and SR and so forth. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri. I think we're cleaning it up. You know, it's really going to take reading the two of them together to make sure that we haven't left any. We've certainly been working our way through all of the inconsistencies and such.

And one of the inconsistencies we had is that the DTN SR stuff was describing the CSC interface whereas it's really below where the SIFR - the SIFR - is initiated. So I think we've gotten it straight, but again, I'll have to read it just - when we're - and I know we're in the next to last version now and we're already changing the next to last version of probably both of them.

But it's going to take reading them through to make sure that we've caught it all. I think we have.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. No, I think so too. But we'll have some more opportunities to adjust it. So I think we're okay on that. The last item I think was, let's see, oh from - this was from the ALAC - oh the ALAC's concern was that the ccNSO and GNSO are policy development bodies and therefore they shouldn't be used for this purpose of an escalation step.

And, Staffan, you commented on this. Let me let you just kind of talk about your comments and then we'll go to Avri.

Staffan Jonson: Yes, I don't find my comments right now written but I'll take it from my memory instead. So, yes, it is true that they have double roles. But - and I think I didn't put it very good in writing. But my point at least was trying to mention that there is a huge diversity within CC community as well. And since - or as I understand there will be a trust within the CC community saying that ccNSO was also include other actors, other CCs in the - that are also - that are not members but still there is a way of doing it.

So my very short answer is, yes, it's not really 100% consistent but it's a practical thing of handling it, it's avoiding, creating a new institution. And I think that's a good thing. So I believe there is enough trust in community to

actually let it happen anyway. But I think that's my main meaning at least.

Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Staffan. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I guess I have two reasons for not accepting the argument that they have no role in this. First of all in terms of name - naming policy and such what we've already looked at within the GNSO is the whole relationship between those who make policy and those who raise alarms about the implementation not being kosher.

And so for the GNSO and ccNSO by equivalent to basically have a role in saying things don't look right. We think we need a further review. We see problems, we see inconsistencies, we see that the implementation is not working correctly, to raise the alarms, they're not going to change anything about it, they're not going to be in a position of creating new policy that directs the (IFO) to behave differently, they're just going to say we think there's something wrong here, it needs to be looked at. So that's one aspect.

The other aspect is the GNSO, you know, and this one and I may find myself ruing the day that I said what I'm about to say but the GNSO has been discussed frequently as there's a difference between the concerns of the entire GNSO, it gets into budget, it gets into, you know, long term strategies for the organization.

And as has been so often pointed out to us, the policy functions are the policy management functions of the Council. And we don't want to limit the GNSO to a policy Council set of responsibilities.

We're talking about, yes, the Council always represents the interests of the GNSO and that's how they're brought forward but we don't want to make that mistake of saying the GNSO only concerns itself with gTLD policy because it's not true. We concern ourselves with a lot that has to do with the running of ICANN, etcetera. We don't make consensus, you know, super majority decisions necessarily on those things but we do. So given those two points, I don't see the argument. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri. So I'm in agreement with both of you. I think Staffan's point that we understand the concern but we think that in this case practical considerations in terms of using existing structures have enough advantages that we support going this direction.

And then adding to that the things that Avri just said, the two points she made, I think are valid as well. I don't think that it's perfect but I think it's probably all things considered, the best way to go. So now this I think is going to be even more challenging for Marika in terms of putting it to words. So - but hopefully you're up to the challenge, Marika.

So any questions or comments on that? So our...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...here is would be to leave it as is. Respectfully accept the comments from ALAC and realize the perception there. But at the same time cite the reasons that we - that Avri and Staffan have communicated for doing this. Are you okay on that, Marika?

Staffan Jonson: Marika is mute. Her phone has frozen she says.

Chuck Gomes: Oh.

Staffan Jonson: In the chat she says it so.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I see it. Yes, thanks.

Marika Konings: Hi, I'm back again. Kind of restarted itself and now I can do things again so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Staffan Jonson: Welcome back.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Are you okay with our responses on this last one, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, I think so. I think I was still writing it and I think I see Avri's also noting her points so I'll get those as well.

Chuck Gomes: Excellent. Okay now we're just about out of time. And the next question I wanted to ask is should we try and get something out to the CWG list before the CWG call which is just a little over a half hour away? Or should we not even try that and just get it in after the CWG call? And I guess a lot of that is on you, Marika. So what are you - what's your preference? Let me just ask you your preference.

Marika Konings: I have to make dinner for my kids in the half hour I have so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we'll put...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I gave you the preference and I'm going to respect your response so we'll put it after the CWG.

Avri Doria: Important priorities.

Chuck Gomes: I think the kids should be a priority. I'm a grandfather so I like kids so. All right so let's not even try to get it in before the CWG. I can let them know on the call that we've finished our deliberation but we weren't - and we will be - should I say by the end of the day today or should I say by early tomorrow?

Staffan Jonson: Early tomorrow please.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...your call.

Marika Konings: Yeah, I think I'll get it to the DTM list later today and that then gives everyone a chance to look at it and then we can send it to the group tomorrow morning if there's no further comments.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that sounds good to me. So we've got that covered. You know, I think we accomplished what we needed to. Did anybody have anything else in the sections in the final proposal relating to DTM that we need to talk about? Okay then I think we've covered our agenda.

Hey, it's been a great meeting. Thanks for the good sharing because I believe that we're putting forth recommendations with regard to the public comment

action items that are reasonable and defensible and thanks to each of you for making it happen.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you very much.

Marika Konings: Thanks, guys.

Avri Doria: And to Marika. Have fun with dinner.

Staffan Jonson: Yes, thank you, Marika for...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Always to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you all. Bye.

Chuck Gomes: So, all right so we'll be talking again in a little over half hour in a bigger meeting. Thanks a lot.

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: Okay thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: The recording can stop.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

END