

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
July 3, 2015  
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recording has started. You may now begin.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you. So this call is a synchronization call between independent council and co-chairs of the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability in order to ensure we are clear about the next steps after the discussions that took place in Buenos Aires and on the way to the (Aires) face-to-face meeting.

So I think the first point would be whether Holly or Rosemary you have any update or need for clarification about progress since Buenos Aires and the requests that were made to investigate in more detail the (unintelligible) models. And actually Holly's hand is up, so Holly?

Holly Gregory: Well hello everybody. So we've been making great progress. In fact, I got up early this morning and I've been putting the finishing touches taking comments from Rosemary and her team and some of the internal folks at Sidley on what is a PowerPoint presentation that looks at the two models that were proposed in Buenos Aires and that we were asked to look into in more detail.

So what we've done is we've looked in more detail. The PowerPoint describes the two models to the best of our ability based on what we heard, although they hadn't really been fleshed out in any detail in the meeting.

We then talk about some of the legal issues that they raised and then we go on to talk about what's similar about the models, what's different about the models. And finally Rosemary has put together a great set of slides on how one might implement the two models, meaning we've had to take them and adjust them a bit to address some of the issues that really lays them out with much more flesh on the bone.

One of the thoughts that we have is about next steps. We think this is probably ready, where we could have a presentation to the CCWG by phone next week if you wanted to do it pre-Paris to get people thinking about these issues.

We are a little hesitant to simply send the slides out without, you know, in advance of a presentation because they're really designed to have someone walk through them and explain them. So we wanted to raise that with you today.

The only other - there were two other things that I'd like to discuss at some point today, so I'll put them on the table now and you can decide where you want to put them on the agenda.

One has to do with a third model that's been in the back of our heads as lawyers. And as we heard about the concerns in Buenos Aires, we think it may solve some of the concerns that were expressed and are simpler than the models that have been put on the table.

That being said, we understand as lawyers that you haven't asked us to come forward with models. But we also think that we need to let you know that there is another way to go that could address a lot of the concerns that have been raised. So we would like you to give us direction about what you would like us to do with that and how we should advise you.

And finally one of my colleagues, Ed McNicholas, who's been working on the binding IRP, binding arbitration kinds of issues, will be in Paris for other purposes at the time of our meeting and has volunteered to attend if that would make sense for you all.

So you would have no cost of any kind of travel or hotel or any of that - as our, you know, Sidley second. So those are the things I wanted to talk about. I figured I'd put them all out at once. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Holly.

Rosemary Fei: I...

Mathieu Weill: I think you will - (Rosemary)?

Rosemary Fei: Sorry about that. Didn't mean to breach protocol by talking without raising my hand. I actually have a question about one of the fundamental - or two of the powers, one being the fundamental bylaws versus the standard bylaws, because I had understood it prior to Buenos Aires as being the difference was really about the threshold.

But in Buenos Aires - and that's based on reading the proposal of the reference model. But in Buenos Aires it seemed to me that there was also a distinction being drawn about what the board's role would be versus the

community's role. So it wouldn't just be that there's a higher threshold to change fundamental bylaw, it was also that it would be done by the community and not by the board.

And I just wanted to find out what is the community's desire when it describes the fundamental bylaws? What's the difference between fundamental and how they're changed versus standard and how those are changed?

Mathieu Weill: Holly you will (unintelligible)?

Holly Gregory: Because I wanted to give you some context so that you'd understand why this question now arises. We noted in the reference model that the way in which the community powers around the standard bylaw is described from a verb standpoint says the ability to cause reconsideration or to reject the standard bylaws.

With fundamental bylaws, it says the right to approve fundamental bylaws. And this issue becomes important because under California law, third parties can be given the right to veto bylaws but not initiate and approve bylaws. So that's I believe the reason why this issue is coming up is we're trying to think about what powers can we really give to the community in a designator model.

You know, is the community looking for a veto right? Would that be sufficient? And then a provision that it was a higher vote threshold for that veto or higher threshold for the board to initiate? Or is the community looking for initiation and approval rights?

The reference model described - and I read it again this morning - in the initial draft, it seems, does not speak of the community initiating but wanted to make sure we understood the point.

Rosemary Fei: And also to clarify just a bit further, it doesn't mean if you tell us what we wanted was the community to initiate, I don't think it means that we can't give you, the community the power directly, in other words, the power to force the board on threat of recall to do it. It just means what we can do isn't quite the designators vote and pass a bylaw amendment.

Mathieu Weill: (Unintelligible)

Rosemary Fei: So we just want to put this in the right category.

Holly Gregory: I mean the answer may be that this is not the call to answer that question and that we simply need to raise this as an issue for clarification with the CCWG. And (unintelligible).

Mathieu Weill: I suspect that that's going to be sort of - my answer to this last question about fundamental and standard bylaws - obviously so far we've always conceived the difference as standard bylaw powers being veto rights in certain thresholds and fundamental bylaws being an approval right with a certain threshold.

Holly Gregory: But what we don't understand is the difference between how you see the power to veto and the power to approve because they're really just the flip side of the same decision. So...

Mathieu Weill: No it is not because this veto would be triggered by a petition which is not the case for the fundamental bylaws.

Holly Gregory: That helps. That helps.

Mathieu Weill: So on the veto rights, the process was in the model we've been describing in the initial proposal, was that to get to the point where the community votes, you need I think it was one SO or AC to launch a petition and say we think the community needs to vote on this one with a veto right of it, which is not the case for the fundamental bylaw where there is no petition.

And if it's a change of the fundamental bylaw then we go straight to the community body and get a vote.

Holly Gregory: Can I ask for clarification? That really helped. So aside from the petition, if what you were seeking was that certainly on the standard by-laws you're saying look, if the community has a concern, it will raise it in their - they have to petition and say they want to have a reconsideration veto.

In the fundamental bylaws, the fundamental bylaw cannot become effective until the community has had an opportunity to vote. That vote opportunity, if that vote opportunity was a simple veto, it may be a way to bridge the two concerns we have which is every fundamental bylaw must go to the community for an opportunity for this veto.

And maybe that's what you're calling approval because it cannot be implemented until the community has had an opportunity to weigh in. Am I getting it right?

Mathieu Weill: That would need to be checked with the group. But that sounds reasonable to me.

Rosemary Fei: The issue it raises is that the vote to veto by the community would have to be the flip of the vote to approve. So...

Holly Gregory: Right, it would be a veto vote.

Rosemary Fei: If it plans to have a 90% approval vote, you would have a 10% veto vote.

Mathieu Weill: Yes. (Unintelligible)

Rosemary Fei: Ten percent of the community wanted to veto it, that would be it.

Holly Gregory: Right, of course.

Mathieu Weill: So just to...

Holly Gregory: If 90% voted to veto, it would still veto.

Rosemary Fei: No. You would have 10% to vote to veto it, and it would be a veto.

Holly Gregory: Oh, you're right.

Rosemary Fei: That's what I'm saying.

Holly Gregory: You're absolutely right, okay. You're right.

Rosemary Fei: It's totally flipped. And so it looks quite different. I mean I think - from what I understood, even though I hadn't understood that until Buenos Aires I have to say. I hadn't understood it reading the reference models.

Holly Gregory: So, but it's more - I'm just trying to get to the point of it's workable. You know...

Rosemary Fei: Either way. But we put in a different place. It's not a direct right. It's an indirect right.

Holly Gregory: Okay. So we'll raise that in our - place it in our - it's raised in the PowerPoint of the issue. Rosemary addressed it a little bit this morning and I just circulated a new draft to you. So...

Rosemary Fei: I'm sorry for getting you guys involved in (this), but this is exactly the kind of thing we've been going through for the last three days.

Mathieu Weill: Yes. And I think what is our expectation from this exercise and the request we're having is that under the various headlines of the models, you suggest what is number one legally correct, and number two as close as possible to our requirements.

Holly Gregory: Yes we said that.

Mathieu Weill: You say - in the designator models, the closest we can do to the fundamental bylaw approval is the veto right that has to be 10% and so on and so forth, then I think that's already extremely useful.

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Fei: We're interpreting our - sorry - we're interpreting our remix here to take each of the models as described by the community and reflect back to you the best we can do toward what you wanted that model to do. And in some cases we're

adjusting structures, and in some cases we're having to give rights indirectly because we can't give them directly.

Holly Gregory: So what we're doing is we're explaining - we're taking the model and then we're doing the best we can at saying what we think is possible. Now what is possible and whether it's acceptable to the community will be two different issues.

And so one of the things that we also do in this presentation is start by saying these issues fall on sort of a continuum between trust and enforceability. And while the reference model is a clean model from an enforceability standpoint, we heard the concerns in Buenos Aires.

We heard the comments and we understand that that may not be where CCWG and the ICANN community want to be on this continuum as they think about the mechanisms that they're putting in place.

And so we sort of put on this continuum where the different models fit in terms of - on that sort of voluntary compliance to enforcement. And we're looking right now at models that fall somewhere in between. And so what we have to do as lawyers is make sure you understand the risk.

What you have to do as clients is tell us how much risk you're willing to accept. That's your - you know, so I want to have a little discussion, put that out at the outset.

I am concerned that people think that because the lawyers talk about enforceability that we think that that's the right answer. And it's not for us to come to the right answer. It's for us to understand your goals and help support them and at the same time make sure that you're fully aware of the risks.

Mathieu Weill: So regarding this there was -- in the graphics that were laid out at the meeting in Buenos Aires -- were a number of issues. I think we labeled them problems or whatever.

And that's really reflecting some of the requirements of basically (unintelligible) of changes that are - how much change that's going to imply for the organization, how much it relies on potentially the court is something that we've heard. Those are the kinds of risks that need to be surfaced as well as importantly (unintelligible).

Holly Gregory: And we do, absolutely. And one of the things that we need to go back to - I think Rosemary this is the thing that remains to be done, and maybe Ingrid could take care of it today - is to look at the Friday, that Friday chart that was from our Friday working session and make sure that our chart at the back covers all of those issues.

Mathieu Weill: Absolutely, excellent. So you were also saying that the risk we were running in the process (unintelligible) is that your presentations might be perceived by some as trying to influence in a way or another. And that's what we need to be extremely careful about...

Holly Gregory: I agree.

Mathieu Weill: ...because that's not your point. That's not my point. And we're trying to get as much information available to the group for the group itself to make an informed decision. But we have a little bit of extra effect to make which demonstrates that we are actually neutral about the options, but once you underline the consequences.

So my suggestion, I turn to (Liam) to see whether he thinks it's appropriate to have this on the meeting on Tuesday. I'm rather inclined to take a bit of time on this. However, my suggestion would be that we - maybe (Liam) and I - I don't think Thomas will be back by then - sort of review the document but only on the basis of whether we spot anything that might give the impression that you're pushing for something or another.

Holly Gregory: So and also - I mean we'll say at the outset, again what I want, and I think that we do need to state this to the group, that our goal as your lawyers is to understand your goals and help you think about how to best implement them, making sure that you're aware of the risks so that you're making an informed decision about the risks.

We do not have a view about how much risk you should or should not take on. That's what you have to decide. And so our whole goal is to make sure that you're informed. And sometimes the questions that we raise you might assume that there's a viewpoint about what's a better path behind them. But usually those questions are just simply questions. So I mean when...

Mathieu Weill: That's why I think what we can do is sort of an outside reader, providing you with feedback whether unintentionally, some of the wording might provide a wrong impression or something like that.

Holly Gregory: Right. Now with that being said...

Mathieu Weill: I know it's very difficult.

Holly Gregory: With that being said I do have to say that some of the presentations in Buenos Aires of the model seemed to us very much designed to be advocacy rather than information. And so we're trying to make it more information and you

know for each model we've put up sort of, you know, here's what we think it is. Here's what we think some of the concerns might be that we need to be addressed. Here's a way to implement it that would - to the extent we can figure out/address the concerns that we've raised.

And that way you now have the model to look at and think about whether or not they - you know, whether or not they make sense. So with that being said, I know Ingrid - I don't know if Ingrid has the time to look at this today.

Ingrid Mittermaier: I'm sorry. I do have time. I just need a little more clarification what I should be looking at.

Holly Gregory: On the Friday work day, which was the first sort of day in Istanbul with the CCWG, when they did the discussions around all the various proposals that have been out there, there was up on the screen - and I haven't been able to find it - there was sort of a chart, a very nice chart that was put together of some of the concerns and considerations.

Then we had a discussion where we actually populated that chart based on the discussion in the room to try to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the various proposals.

I think Mathieu that's what you are talking about us being able to do with this. And so because we've already come up with sort of the categories it would be great just to grab that chart and then look at our two models now against it.

Rosemary Fei: But I don't know that we've ever been able to - I don't think that's been shared. I'm not sure if it's something that the people developed right on the spot. They must be shared somewhere we just haven't been able to find it.

Holly Gregory: Yes we haven't been able to find it. It was I mean it was up on the screen and the staff was checking it off but I haven't been able to find it. So maybe if, you know, (Alice) or someone from ICANN could help us find that it would be really terrific.

And it won't take long once we have it, I mean I think it's, you know, just an hour or so walking through it. We have used other...

Mathieu Weill: Was that the (line mapping)?

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Fei: It was the one that had the model and then people went through in the room and described how each model stood up against this criteria.

Holly Gregory: This was that first (sale) on working session where people were debating but we weren't calling it a debate.

Mathieu Weill: So (Alice) that's the spreadsheet from (Thomas) from the Friday...

Holly Gregory: Yes.

Mathieu Weill: So action item is to send it back and share with (unintelligible).

Rosemary Fei: And obviously it's not the (unintelligible) across the top we care about it's the criteria and requirements that we did on the side.

Mathieu Weill: Right. Yes. So Leon what do you think about a presentation on the next CCWG call to get people through the current thinking on the two models?

Leon Sanchez: I think it would be a good idea maybe to keep it short and not have it being the center of...

Holly Gregory: No we can't - Leon that's the problem we can't keep it short. For us to go through this it's 20 slides, it's going to take some time and focus and attention.

Now if we can't do - we're going to have to do it at some point and so the question is do it pre-Paris so people can sort of get a head start and think about it or wait until Paris where I think you need to give Rosemary and me a good 40 minutes to present, maybe an hour.

And that's if I take 40 minutes that's 40 minutes without being interrupted.

((Crosstalk))

Holly Gregory: A real presentation and then you're going to need another 40 minutes of Q&A I'm sure.

Leon Sanchez: Yes we would be lucky if we had 40 minutes of questions.

Mathieu Weill: Sure, I think we need to ensure we don't have any other urgent topics on the agenda (unintelligible) before that. But I'm trying to think that this could be possible this week but not next week.

And from what I see on the potential agenda for Tuesday that might be suitable to dedicate an hour, maybe an hour and 15 minutes with that because the rest of the work is basically preparing stuff in the work parties and we will have to approve or not the final drafting on the AOC or something like this.

So I guess that could be feasible but we will need to check with the other officers whether they do need time to move some items forward.

Holly Gregory: We are happy to wait until Paris if that makes more sense from a focus and timing perspective. I do think the community is eager to see what the lawyers have to say about the model and I'm very hesitant for this slide presentation to be sent out without the opportunity to at the same time present it.

Mathieu Weill: So the other item which sort of pushes me towards the idea of presenting is what you said about a new model. Let me explain why. I don't think you should come up with a new model like this...

Holly Gregory: I agree.

Mathieu Weill: ...and especially not (unintelligible) Paris.

Holly Gregory: I agree we have no intentions. We have no intentions bringing forward a new model but at some point...

Mathieu Weill: I know.

Holly Gregory: ...I mean I think I feel like we're not doing our jobs if we see a way that could - I'm not saying that it would, you know, people may have concerns about it but it's cleaner and crisper and addresses a lot of the concerns.

And so one thing to think about is there somebody who would want to propose it.

Mathieu Weill: So let me just finish what I think is valuable is if you can go through the presentation of the two models on Tuesday, have some question and answers

but also if we can - if you can explain why you think a new model might be worthwhile exploring that might enable us to have, to actually certify the request in making it a new model on Tuesday.

So that in Paris...

Leon Sanchez: Good idea.

Mathieu Weill: ...we get potentially to three models. None of these models just came up a couple of days earlier. They were all properly certified and we can put you in front of the room for one hour or even a two hour question and answer session, grilling session about the model and see if everyone has exhorted in every question on it.

And so that's why I'm tempted to push some things out of the agenda on Tuesday so that we can have this update.

Leon Sanchez: I would agree with that view Mathieu and I also agree that the group is (unintelligible) to have an explanation on a different model. And I suggest that I would make is that on any slides that are presented each model is labeled for its name because I mean so far we've been very clear or the lawyers have been very clear on the names of the models.

Whether they are membership models, designator models but then we came with the (unintelligible) model level and that has caused a little bit of confusion I think.

So maybe a good way to go would be to just call the things by their name and be very clear about what we're talking about.

Holly Gregory: So I think that's good feedback and it is obviously something that we've had to struggle with in order to put the slides together. Mathieu we had told you that we would give you something toward the end of this week which would be today.

And this slide deck that we've been talking about is exactly I think what has come out of our agreement to get you a description of the model driven as far as we can from within the legal framework.

And so I want if we're going to present on Tuesday was there a thought that we could have shared the slide earlier with the co-chairs just to make sure we haven't misunderstood something or put something, you know, that there's an error in the way that we've understood what you want?

Mathieu Weill: I think it would be a good idea (unintelligible). And of course we will make any comments or suggestions if we see something that is not - or that could cut confusion.

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Fei: I'd like to do that so is that okay with you?

Holly Gregory: Of course, of course. I agree if the co-chairs would like to see it that is fine with us. Absolutely I think getting your feedback would be good. Another question I had was whether it makes sense to share some or all of it with the two proponents of the two models.

So that they have an opportunity to let us know if we did not fully capture what their idea was. So John...

((Crosstalk))

Holly Gregory: ...are the proponents of the two models and I wonder if it would be helpful. I wouldn't send them the full thing but rather the description of their models. So that we can know if we can get it right because I would hate to...

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: So that would be Becky Burr and...

Holly Gregory: John Curran and I guess we would just give one to each. We would send Becky the one she proposed and the John the one he proposed.

Rosemary Fei: It would really only be two slides just to (unintelligible). So maybe we'll do (unintelligible).

Mathieu Weill: Okay so I think that's good practice if I understand correctly what you are describing. I'm not sure it's John Curran who forwarded the message...

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: ...he sent an email.

Holly Gregory: It was a proposal from John Curran saying please consider this.

Leon Sanchez: Yes I remember that it was (Becky's) model and then John Curran made some additions to it and his slides were (unintelligible).

Rosemary Fei: In a way Mathieu I can reassure you the word hybrid does not appear in these 20 slides.

Mathieu Weill: That would be helpful I mean it's just the kind of word that at some point just gets...

Rosemary Fei: I don't even know what that would be a hybrid between, you know. What does (Alice) mean by Jordan Carter?

Holly Gregory: I think she was asking if maybe he was a proponent of the other model but it was John Curran.

Rosemary Fei: I thought it was John Curran.

Holly Gregory: It's definitely John Curran I have the email that he sent where he proposed it.

Mathieu Weill: So it's John Curran and then in the room it was echoed by some I think it was (Fiona Funar).

((Crosstalk))

Holly Gregory: It was echoed by a number of people but I think we have to go to the person who put it to paper and just make sure that they agree, you know, we'll give them an opportunity to tell us if they agree or don't agree.

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: Yes but the issue we are having is that John is not a member or participant of the group. So if he is contacted and not others that might lead to some issues. So my suggestion would be to go to (Fiona Funar) or (Athena) because I know they work together and they are from the same community as John so that's going to be all right.

Holly Gregory: Well actually if I could make a suggestion. The designator, empowered designator model I don't know that we have a lot of questions about it but it's really pretty straight forward.

So maybe it's just enough to go to Becky and make sure we got her model correct.

Mathieu Weill: Yes that's safer, that's the safer road.

Rosemary Fei: Okay I agree.

Holly Gregory: So let's do that then.

Rosemary Fei: So we will - Ingrid is going to take a last pass at the slides is that the idea (Holly)? I know you just made some edits this morning?

Holly Gregory: I would like to see what Ingrid does with that last chart.

Rosemary Fei: Right.

Holly Gregory: If she could put it in and then send...

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Fei: We'll try and make final edits today at the point and then share it with the chairs only today and...

((Crosstalk))

Holly Gregory: I'm hoping that there are not a lot of other edits on the slides at this point. I am, I have to turn to a lot of other things.

Rosemary Fei: That would be good.

Holly Gregory: So really next, you know, I think it pretty much hangs together. Take a look at what I did on this last draft.

Rosemary Fei: Understood but I'm trying to get it where we're going to end up in terms of the timeline of events.

Holly Gregory: We're going to send it to the chairs either later today or tomorrow and...

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Fei: And will we send it to Becky or will the chairs send it to Becky the one page?

Holly Gregory: I think I should send - I think we should send it to Becky and again that's just going to be a slide or two.

Rosemary Fei: Okay, all right that's just all I was trying to get at who is doing what when. So then the chairs will be able to give us any feedback that might require further adjustment to the slide prior to the Tuesday morning California time anyway, presentation of the slides to the larger group on the (7th).

Mathieu Weill: Right, yes. Okay well I think that's the main topics here. I noted there was the question about the colleague who is the IRP specialist.

Holly Gregory: Well he's an arbitration guy yes and he'll be, so that will be up to you whether you'd like to have me include him in Paris or not.

Mathieu Weill: That could be very interesting however I would suggest can you maybe reach out to Becky and copying us (unintelligible) to suggest that so we can discuss this with her as she is in charge of the part of the report that address the IRP.

There might be I mean it would be more valuable if they could sort of interact before so that...

Holly Gregory: Well they have I mean they, (Ed) and Becky have interacted. He commented on her slides, you know, he's been part of the team and he's had direct contact with her when we were giving her feedback on the slides that she was presenting but I can certainly, I'll certainly do that.

Mathieu Weill: Yes I think that that would be good so that we can have the discussion with Becky as well about how she is planning to do the discussions on the IRP particularly.

Holly Gregory: Yes okay.

Mathieu Weill: And if this extra lawyer comes in and joins the meeting we will probably disclose that this was an opportunity and it's not adding any extra cost to the group so that there is no ambiguity about the fact that we are still within the framework about the number of lawyers at the meeting we said we would have.

Holly Gregory: Mathieu I'm going to tell you that frankly I have some mixed feelings about it because I don't want it to over emphasize the IRP aspects of this and take us down discussion paths that we don't need to emphasize.

This would simply, you know meet with somebody in town and if it was no big deal we would instead of me having my plus one on the phone the plus one would be in the room.

Part of my difficulty is he won't always be the right plus one. So I've got, you know, my own issues that I have to try to manage.

Mathieu Weill: So think about it and then we'll keep in touch with Becky okay?

Holly Gregory: Okay, okay sounds good.

Mathieu Weill: Is there anything else?

Holly Gregory: I don't have anything else I did note that (Robin) sent a message to the full group asking how the lawyers were being managed and by whom.

Mathieu Weill: Yes I think I would. So I noticed (unintelligible) email what we are going to - I've already asked (Alice) to recap the notes from the meetings when we discussed this request and when we discussed the fact that CCWG co-chairs were managing the relationship with the lawyers and so on.

(Unintelligible) want to remind everyone of the process and we will also report back to the group about the fact that we've had this call, that it's being transcribed and will be available.

And that basically that with (unintelligible) to check that their presentation as early as Tuesday and through (unintelligible). And then the paranoia will step into that (unintelligible).

Holly Gregory: Right.

Mathieu Weill: So that's...

((Crosstalk))

Holly Gregory: It's already in so...

Mathieu Weill: ...really I didn't notice.

Holly Gregory: ...yes a couple of emails...

Rosemary Fei: Just one point of clarification. We're going to send the slides to you today hopefully for you to look at. I think we'll wait for your comment before I reach out and send the slide or two to Becky. Does that make sense?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, yes that makes sense.

Rosemary Fei: Okay.

Mathieu Weill: Okay, so I think we've been good and efficient and thank you for your very prompt work on this and I think it was useful to synchronize and understand exactly how we're going to proceed.

So I'm very much looking forward to seeing the slides and we'll try to get back to you quickly with anything that would raise suspicion or actually (conserve) and so that we can be in time for Tuesday.

Holly Gregory: Terrific.

Mathieu Weill: Thanks a lot.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks everyone.

Rosemary Fei: Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Bye.

Rosemary Fei: Bye-bye.

END