

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
June 16, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Yes, sir, the recordings have been started.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much and welcome to this cross community working group (unintelligible) ICANN accountability call number 37 on June the 16th of 2015 and I remind you to keep your lines muted if you're not speaking.

And we'll do the roll call is usual with those present on the Adobe Connect group. And I would also like to ask if there is anyone on the phone bridge that is not in the Adobe Connect group so that we can add their name to our call. So at this point, can anyone that's only on the phone bridge, and is not in the Adobe Connect group, could you please state your names?

Thomas Rickert: Hi, Leon. This is Thomas Rickert speaking. I'm just on the audio bridge and not in the Adobe Connect.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Thomas. Anyone else?

Greg Shatan: And Greg Shatan.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Greg. Do anyone else besides Thomas and Greg? Okay, so another reminder, for everyone that has not yet filed their statement of interest, there have been repeated reminders to - asking if you can file your statement of interest.

If you haven't done so, please do it. It's urgent that we have your statement of interest if you are to continue to be members or participants of the group. Of course, our charter requires that we have statements of interest filed so please, if you haven't done so, contact (the staff) at your earliest convenience so they can help you with that issue.

And with no further delay, I would like to and the call to my co-chair, Mathieu Weill, for item number two – Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much, Leon. Hello everyone. This call is designed to be a shorter call. I think we have a lot of focus right now in preparing for the face-to-face taking place on Friday in Buenos Aires.

We're all impatient to be there. And the number one item on this call is to share with you aware seeing this meeting take place, the (tentative) agenda, and collect your feedback on this.

The - so the goals we're setting for this meeting are in line with what we've discussed already. So number one is agreeing on the assessment of the public comments, so reading those comments and drafting our responses are going to be at the core of the meeting.

We also will need to use this face-to-face time to define the key messages for the community engagements that will take place during the following week. And, of course, refine our working message, preparing for public comment

number two which takes place in July, so very quickly after the Buenos Aires meeting.

So you see on the screen what the draft agenda, including (reading) list, will be substantial and made essentially with the contributions from the work parties of assessing the public comment document.

In the freeze deadline is today at 23:59 UTC, so that's - I know there's a lot of work in work party one and work party two and working both at individual analysis of comments but also at summarizing the various comments on each question.

And that is going to be the key substance for our meeting on Friday and everyone is encouraged to use their travel - or any other time, obviously, to read this before the meeting so we are efficient.

In terms of agenda, we are starting at 8:00, local time, and a significant portion of the agenda will be devoted to the drafting of the responses to the public comment we've received so that at the end of the day, we have an overall view of where we stand.

Our goal also be to identify which items will need further discussion from our group in which items obviously are, I'd say, almost ready for finalization and will be ready for further consensus goals as discussed in, I think, the last couple of calls.

As soon as we're ready on a topic, we would aim for going for a consensus goal so that we get closer on some items they are ready as soon as possible. And, yes, Sabine, this is (night 8-8), I would say (8:00 am) sharp so that we get enough time to review our comments that we received.

The one thing we would like to do before lunch, and that's in order to change a little bit from a rigorous analysis of comments that will be doing, it would like to try a debate on - around the topic of, call it, enforceability or (cooperative) model versus membership model.

And we would like to call for a couple of volunteers in an exercise we would name the - turning the table around. So we would like to have the supporter - some form of supporter in a cooperative model to take the stand with the group and promote the cooperative approach, so, the internal bylaw approach and vice versa so that we get further into the understanding of each other's perspective.

And obviously try and use this debate to better understand all the perspectives that are obviously making this topic one of the key discussion points in the - in our work.

So we're going to be calling for volunteers for that exercise, and unless we have volunteers, we would appoint them on the spot, so I would certainly encourage people who have thought about this to volunteer for the exercise which would probably help us take a step back and a broader view on this topic.

In terms of agenda, in the afternoon, we also have to start considering the NTIA letter which was requesting us to provide clarity on the timeline shortly after Buenos Aires.

So it's time that we start considering what kind of response we might do to this letter from Larry Strickland, in this meeting would be a good place to start this reflection.

And then (unintelligible) and then obviously we'll finalize this letter after BA. And the other item - there's a numbering issue in the agenda on your screen but it's, of course, preparing the various meetings we'll have during the week, including the board meeting, the meetings with many constituencies, (and so) and ACs and, of course, the engagement sessions, so ensuring we have clarity about the messages that we are able to carry to the community around the week based on the (commentary) responses that we received.

And that is, so far, the agenda, we're seeing. So I would now call for any comments on this agenda which is obviously tentative so far, so that we can finalize it before everyone starts traveling. And, Jordan, yes we'll try to have downloaded document available. And I see Sebastien's and is up, so please, Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, thank you very much. Thank you for the presentation of the agenda for the meeting at the end of the week. Yes, you asked for (unintelligible) (on debate possibility). Before you asked this question, I wanted to first - maybe to ask you to change the layout of the debate.

I am not sure that we want to debate where we will have black and white against each other but what we will need to try to find if available, or as much as possible, a compromise on agreement or a consensus on this issue.

It's not too much about a possibility. I would say it's about the power we want the community (to gain). And then which power we want to gain, what is the community, and after, what (is the) tool we need to use?

And there's a question here - it's on (a possibility) - it's one tool, one possible tool. I hope in my comments -- sorry to have been late, that (reason in) French

I had to try to explain other possibilities, what I guess you call now incorporating a model.

Then I would like very much if you would change the title and you asked for volunteers, I am ready to help on that issue to participate more deeply. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Sebastien. We indeed need to have a title that is as clear and broadest possible. The idea of this particular part of the agenda, we - I'm not setting any expectation that we find a compromise but only that we try and understand the various perspectives better, which is, I guess, the first step to finding something that has agreement from a broader base of (colleagues). So happy to adjust (the title) on this. Jordan?

Jordan Carter: Thanks, Mathieu. Can you hear me?

Mathieu Weill: Perfectly.

Jordan Carter: Great, thanks. Jordan Carter here for the record. I just think with the debate, we need to make sure and kind of agree, that the (unintelligible) if we do it right. If we do it wrong, it's a good way to polarize things and reduce the (possibility of a census).

So I'm assuming the proposal is (tended) to be a bit gentle, maybe a bit of humor, but also to try and tease out the arguments. And if we all take it in that spirit, you will be quite helpful and (I certainly) will take it away.

Mathieu Weill: Thanks, Jordan. You're right. It will not formally be a debate but a (successive) presentation of perspectives so that we fully understand them and appreciate

them. I agree with you - we need not polarize the debate. And the other comments on the agenda? No?

So as I said earlier, the intention is to have a rather short call, so not doing any further, I would just like to confirm that we'll finalize the agenda. So that's one action item for (unintelligible) and the co-chairs and taking into account the previous action item.

And we're confirming the deadline for the documents by 23:59 UTC today, so that we can share a package of documents, easily downloadable for the whole group to take on travels or please consult before the meeting. And so with that, I will turn to Leon for the next item on the agenda - Leon.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Mathieu. And while we received couple of the (memos) from the (lay) advisors regards to the many questions that have been raised, mainly with regards to governments and how the different membership model for the voluntary model can affect governments in their future performance within ICANN.

And we will be displaying lists - a summary - an executive summary that Mathieu speculated earlier today and that was sent by (Emily Chen) to the legal (unintelligible) list.

And this, of course, creates new questions, I believe, by (Malcolm Holly) that came in, like, one hour or an hour and a half before our call. So I haven't really had time to read them in detail, but I think that the main questions that were raised, along the many calls that we have, have been, of course, from many governments but I quite remember those raised by (Caboose) which I believe is not on the call but which has received answers in many emails and in many ways to these questions.

I also remember questions from (Jose Cancio) and (Valdes Calindo), and I believe that those questions have already been addressed in replied to properly with each of the memorandums that have arrived from our legal team.

And I don't see either Rafael or Jorge on the call. And it was they would be here. So - okay, well, I think the bottom line here is that we have a chart that was sent by council in which they compared different powers for the members on each model, the volunteer model, the designator model and the member organized ICANN.

And with this chart, council provided us with some guidance as to where these powers would be more or less viable or even not viable at all with regards to each model.

And they also answered a couple of questions with regards to whether it was mandatory to file the statement with the State Departments for forming the (unincorporated) association. The answer to that is no, although council (scores) recommend that for evidence of warming the (unincorporated) association.

We do file that statement with the State Department, although it's not mandatory, as I said. The filing fee - I believe it's \$25. And there were also some questions raised with regards to the applications that an unincorporated association with have, as for example, periodic reports or assemblies or administrative issues like any corporate structure needs to fulfill.

And the answer from council was that the unincorporated associations have no obligation of informing anyone about their activities unless they, of course, are active. And there was also another question with regards to taxation and

other duties that may be required by law to be fulfilled by any unincorporated association.

And the answer by council was that there was no obligation to file any tax declaration for anything like that unless, of course, the unincorporated association had any income or any economical activity, in which case, it would, of course, be subject to filing the tax declarations as needed.

And I would like to, of course, have our legal counsel to jump in if they feel that they need any clarification on the different issues or the different questions that have so far been raised by - with regards to governmental advisory committee and the possible structures that we could adopt in the future. So I'd like to ask either Holly or Rosemary if you need any kind of clarification from our side, so we could, of course, provided at this point.

Holly Gregory: Hi, Leon. This is Holly. I think it's pretty clear. I don't need any clarification at this point but I defer to Rosemary.

Rosemary Fei: Oh, no, I think we're fine.

Leon Sanchez: Okay, so, so far we don't need to (raise) any clarification. Mathieu?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, I think there were some very useful clarifications on the mailing list on the question side and I know Jorge apologize for this meeting and that he was excused.

My only concern would be that some of the questions tended to sort of hope for a legislation by legislation review of constraints and local (laws) for governments to join a California association.

And I'm hopeful or not getting into too wide a study on this, I mean, just for the benefit of not expanding costs too much. So I would like to just check that we - this is not the exercise you're getting into which would be obviously very complex and costly.

Holly Gregory: This is Holly. We agree with that. We have no intention of looking into multiple jurisdictions to determine whether differently situated ACs or SOs would have different types of problems or, you know, state (actors) have different types of problems under different jurisdictions.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Holly. Thank you very much, Mathieu. There are some questions that, as I said, have been raised by Malcolm Hutty and maybe we can forward them to Holly and Rosemary to have, of course, the corresponding reply.

And I don't know if anyone else has any other questions or concerns with regards to the different models that we have been discussing. I don't know if it's clear.

I remember seeing a discussion in the mailing list in which Jordan addressed pretty well, from my point of view, the fact that the any unincorporated (decision) that would, of course, be needed regardless of the membership or designated model, it would only be like an (envelope) that would carry the message to the rights or exercise the powers by the community.

So I don't know if this message is clear for everyone in the group, that the legal person would only be the vehicle, if needed, to exercise the powers and, of course, and forced the rights that we're trying to provide immunity with. I see Tijani's hand is up - Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jamaa: Yes, thank you, Leon. Tijani speaking. You see only - only. I'm not sure if it is only that (unintelligible) and you have obligations, so when we arrive the point that you have a legal presence in the California jurisdiction, there are a lot of consequences that we have to consider.

Yes, perhaps with a practical - or for the day-to-day running our work, it is almost that you said but there are other consequences that we cannot hide are we cannot consider when we are (treating) these questions. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Think you very much, Tijani. And I think some of the - of these consequences are, of course, there and some of them are unforeseeable at the moment. But I mean, for me it's pretty clear that the legal person would only be a vehicle that would be triggered if needed and not, of course, on a regular basis. Next in the queue, I have Roelof. Roelof, can you please (unintelligible).

Roelof Meijer: Yes, thank you, Leon. It (unintelligible) but I'm unclear on this, so maybe we can have some clarity on that. I think it was Avri who, some time back, wrote in an email about the unincorporated (designations).

As I understand it, they're only power is that they have a standing to sue ICANN for failing to comply with its own bylaws. And when I'm still struggling with is the answer to the question, is that the only reason why we would need the unincorporated associations. So can we have a membership organization where the SOs and the ACs are indicated to be members in the bylaws without them being legal entities?

And that this would only give us the problem -- and I know that many of us consider that a useful one but this would only give us the problem that we have no legal enforceability or would there be an illegal construct? So would somebody prevent us from doing that? I don't think I make my question clear.

Leon Sanchez: If I understand you well Roelof the question is whether we could have the membership model like structure without having the unincorporated association or other kind of legal person could in the real world is that right?

Roelof Meijer: Yes that's it. And the additional question then is would that mean that we only have the problem that we don't have legal enforceability so that the legal entities are only necessary to make sure that we get legal enforceability?

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Roelof. If I understand and I think that I recall reading a memo by counsel answering these exact questions.

And they told us that it wasn't possible to have a membership model without having the legal personhood for the members of course.

If we went through that task then of course the different drives that we would like to provide the community with would be enforceable.

And well that's the short answer is no, it is not possible. And I see that Holly is raising her hand. And maybe Holly would you like to jump in and provide an answer to Roelof?

Holly Gregory: Well Leon you just provided a very good answer. There are a couple of issues here.

As a threshold matter members simply must be legal persons either human beings or legally recognized entities such as an unincorporated association.

The issues of standing and enforceability are in addition to that requirement. Their related to it and some ways but we start with the fundamental prospect

that you cannot have a membership in a - you cannot as a non-legal entity be a member of ICANN.

Leon Sanchez: Thank very much.

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Maybe that's the sound of the community (incentralizing) itself.

I think that the member of model and the point of legal persons is not to give everyone the power to run off the court all the time.

And I think we're kind of attempting to prejudice ourselves against any model that involves legal persons with considering that to be the end result of such a model.

The point of the member model is to fundamentally change the balance of power in a corporate because members sit atop a nonprofit corporation. that's what we get out of that.

We get a board actually owes the fiduciary duty to the members as well as to the corporation. And we get a set of tools which if they were fully used would put ultimate results in going to court.

But the idea is to not do that because the balance of power has changed and with the community wielding more power the board and management will feel more constrained.

The idea that the current system kind of ends up in public shame and ridicule I think and therefore the board is constrained by that I think paints too simplistic a picture of what happens under the current balance of power.

Now I suppose if we're all generally happy with the amount of accountability that we have been able to wield as a community then, you know, that's great.

Just I'm not entirely sure that what we will be able to accomplish or without members and without formal designators will ultimately take us far enough in the right direction but considering this to be an exercise in trying to go to court I think massively, you know, misstates what enforceability means and how it would actually be used in practice. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much for that Greg. Next on the queue I have Jordan Carter. Jordan could you please?

Jordan Carter: It's Jordan here. Is my audio working? I just had to...

Leon Sanchez: It is. It is working.

Jordan Carter: Great. Thank you. But it almost feels like we're in a circular debate. The things - I think the things that we agree on are quite a lot more fundamental than the things we don't agree on.

We all want ICANN to keep working as a multi-stakeholder - well I think we all want ICANN to keep working as a multi-stakeholder organization.

I think we want to minimize the disruption to ICANN's way of working in that way. I think we all want to have a system where the accountability powers that we're proposing that it's got very, very strong community support

at least through measured by the public comments that we've got. People want the powers that are involved.

And what I fail to get my head around still in the discussion and I don't obviously the way were discussing it or the way I am talking about it doesn't make sense to people or it's just a (unintelligible) experience is that the membership model is the one that says the community organized as members has in the end got the final say over ICANN's future. So it has the power to set out to shape its future.

And we know that you can have members without legal persons being involved. And so we've got some models about how we might do that.

We might make individuals summative by an SO or AC member and accord them those powers. We might have unincorporated associations which provide a kind of legal envelope or blanket on the SOs and ACs.

But they don't change with the SOs and ACs do. They don't change their nature. They don't require people to join them.

And they do have in (statute 10) in reality are kind concerning and shaping effect on what the board can do and they give these powers.

And to me that's the most important thing. To me one of the questions we have to answer is in the globally multi-stakeholder community organized through ICANN to coordinate naming policy and identify who's in charge?

You know, and maybe I'm sloganeering. But to me there's fundamental binary here. It is either that the board of directors of the nonprofit corporation with no members isn't in charge or a set of different actions are in charge.

And to me the idea of distributing power away from that single point if you like that, a single group of people into a more distributed negotiated diverse stakeholder base power matrix is fundamental to making the corporation more accountable.

And personally I would support that whether or not we were in a situation of having the entire contract (where) I believe because it's the way it should be.

You know, the Internet should be run and controlled and owned by the global community. It shouldn't be just by a set of actors who are appointed by a board, by an (unintelligible) violations. It should be broader than that.

So, you know, there's a clear kind of trajectory and direction there. And what I hope we can get out of be it it's a kind of assessment of where that public comment is and where we go from it, yes?

And so anyway I'm talking too much. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jordan. Next on the queue I have Sebastien. Sebastien could you please take the floor?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes thank you Leon. I will start with the point about the what we are doing here? It's one of the topics you are asking for volunteers to help to set up the scene during the BA meeting.

If we want to do that now by phone and the same people putting the same arguments again and again on the same thing and we don't try to find to use the inputs of each and every one to try to find to go in the direction of the consensus we can do that.

We can spend hours and I can be in contradiction with what Jordan just said and disagreeing with that.

And but what is the goal? Where are we going? I suggest that we stop the discussion now we go to BA. We have time to discuss and to put to the table the three different option, may be more. And then we will be able to have the full picture.

If we say I don't see how we can find a solution if it's not my solution yes, that's a way to discuss and debate but that's not the way where we will be able to find any compromise.

And I really can do the same that others here but I will stop here. Thank you very much.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Sebastien. And I agree with you. We could continue to discuss this for hours and maybe could not reach an agreement or consensus.

So if there are not any other questions for the lawyer at this point we should move to the next point in the agenda.

I remind you that we expect that everyone comes to Buenos Aires with the legal background of course to be would to contribute to different discussions.

And going through the different memoranda that legal counsel has kindly provided would be a suggestion. And we do encourage you to go through the different legal memos.

I believe that there is already a repository of all these memos in the wiki page. We will check that with staff of course. And we would definitely encourage you to go through these legal memos.

I don't know if any of my coaches would like to add anything to the discussion. Maybe Mathieu or Thomas would you like to add anything?

Mathieu Weill: This is Mathieu speaking. I think there was an important comment. I don't know maybe it was Becky on the chat.

What we need around the various models each of them getting some traction is that we look very deeply at what requirements or how they are different in terms of requirements and base our discussions about the requirements we put in priority is privatization involved so really encouraging everyone to think deeply about the underlying requirements and their positions. And that's going to be the key part of the discussion.

In this debate we were talking about for the face to face in Buenos Aires because my feeling is that we're talking about each other right now.

And that's what we - the first step for us is to ensure we understand the other perspectives and that perspectives expressed within this group are always founded.

And if we - if you're not seeing the foundation of a perspective then we need to look for this foundation into the requirement.

And I mean trying to convince each other is obviously not going to be the way forward.

So we'll have to try several things for that but I'm confident that working together in good faith is going to move us further.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Mathieu. I see Alan's hand is up. Alan could you please take the floor?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Yes thank you very much. One other thought. As we have these debates and we been having them for a long time both verbally and on the last there seems to be on both peoples on all sides of presumption that if we pick the solution I like everyone will act in good faith and will worry about the possible threats and it will work.

And if we pick the solution that I don't like that everyone will, you know, take the worst possible path forward and we will be in a mess.

And we really have to get past that part. We really have to start using the same assumptions in analyzing any given scenario.

I can go into more detail and I will on Friday if necessary but I really think it's important that we not presume that everyone's going to do things properly if we pick my solution and they'll do the worst case scenario if we pick the other. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. Jonathan?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes thank you. Jonathan Zuck, for the record. I guess Alan I found that point to be rhetorically eloquent but factually misleading.

I think this entire exercise has been about assuming that everyone will act at their worst in all scenarios. And that that was the exercise behind the stress test is that everyone does a poor job.

I don't think anyone on either side is necessarily making the assumption that people are going to behave well, et cetera, because as we're trying to solidify an organization we can't really afford that assumption.

So I mean I think the assumption, you know, in all of these has got to be very people are not going to behave well. And so those that are proponents of empowering the community are looking hard at how to, you know, Becky looked hard at how to constrain the community if the GNSO decided to get together.

I mean this is the part that feels difficult for me to get my mind around. But if the GNSO all got together and agreed to mount a frivolous lawsuit against ICANN rather than go through the embedded channels what are the means that could be used to prevent that?

So all around there's this idea of trying to build something that can handle people's worst behavior and I so I don't think that the people are making favorable assumptions to their side I think that - and we can't afford to.

I think we need to assume for the purposes of building a strong accountability framework people are not doing what they are meant to do. Because if everybody does as they're meant to do we don't even need an accountability framework.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jonathan. And I wouldn't want to jump again into the pit of endless discussion but I see Alan hand is up again.

And Alan if you want to react to that please do take the floor and let's close the discussion with that. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I too hope this would not be a debate on an opinion I gave but apparently it is.

Chris Desspain has repeated - and others have repeatedly asked the question how do we make sure that the people that we appoint to be our representatives on the UA actually follow the instructions of the AC or the SO since the AC and SO is not a legal person and therefore cannot enforce, cannot take action against that person if that person chooses to act with malice and not follow the instructions.

And there is never an answer to that. The answer is they won't if they're under the control but we don't know what the mechanism is for that control. That's the kind of example I was talking about. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. So I would like to close the discussion on this issue at this point. And that there will - there's some homework we have to do before Buenos Aires as I said going through the legal memos and what Mathieu commented.

But I think it's really important. We should definitely take thought on the requirements that this group has stated as essential for accountability weight them, see the pros and cons with regards to each model that is being discussed and then we can of course provide our arguments on different - the different options we have on the table.

So are there any other questions related to legal advice or the fact that there are some implications for government and the different memos that we have shown here?

I see some GAC members here present. Does anyone else want to raise any other questions at this point?

Okay seeing no other questions I would like to turn back to Mathieu for agenda Item Number 4.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Leon. And it's very open agenda item. It's for any other business. So if anyone has any other business to share I see Sebastien. Please Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes thank you Mathieu. Just a question and I may have raised that an item before but how's the group of that CCWG accountability will measure in the Buenos Aires will pick up why we are meeting all the different SOs, ACs constituency that way need to meet to be sure that everybody gets the same level of information that we have exchanged with them. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Sebastien. So we've reached out to all the SO ACs in responding to several - responded also to several other requests.

We have not turned down any request. I don't know if we have contacts with all the SO ACs but it's possible to accommodate some requests.

Obviously they number of meetings is already quite high and becoming challenging to find slots. But we've reached out. We're open so any other requests can still be accommodated. Roelof you're next.

Roelof Meijer: Okay thank you Mathieu. This is Roelof Meijer for the record. Let me start with the disclaimer.

This is not an attack on any person or any company or maybe I should summarize that as any legal entity.

Quite a few do know that I've been a chair of the ccNSO that has been scrutinizing ICANN's budgets and expenses for quite a few years.

And from that perspective I have a worry. And the worry is and the number of lawyers from the two firms that we have participating in our calls.

We've had two calls for Working Party 1 last week and I think we had respectively four or five people from Sidley Adler on the phone.

And I think now we have something like five people from Sidley and I don't know how many from Adler.

I'm a bit worried about the enormous amount of money we're spending on legal advice. And there may be a very good reason but I don't understand why we need so many people participating in the call. I think they're all very good experts and I suggest we could do with two, one from each firm.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Roelof. I think it is the concern is well heard. I would suggest that we have an action item as cochairs to sit down with the firms while we're in Buenos Aires and clarify expectations and processes for that going further in the interest of the quality of interaction we have with the firms as well obviously as managing costs. So I think we need to take that action. But thanks for pointing it out.

Any other business?

Okay so with that I wish you all safe travels. I'm looking forward to seeing you in person in Buenos Aires for a very, very busy week.

Do take some time to read the documents that are being prepared right now by the working parties. This is provide - going to be very very helpful in the discussions on Friday.

And please also come with an open mind in terms of understanding each other's perspective it's going to be a key success factors for our meetings in Buenos Aires. And I know we are all very, very keen on getting - moving this further while we are there in Argentina.

So thank you all for your participation. We've managed to keep this call very short and that is helpful to get us ready for our travels. Thank you all. Bye.

Man: Thanks everyone and safe travels.

Man: Bye...

END