
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

[GREG]: Thank you. Welcome to the sixth meeting of the jurisdiction subgroup for October 5th. Please mute your phones if you're not speaking [Inaudible] I think it's much better.

First, I'd like to ask for anybody who's only on audio to identify themselves for the roll call. [Inaudible] I will assume that we are all identified in the Adobe Connect.

Second call for any updates to Statements of Interest. I'm hearing no updates. We have satisfied that formality as well, and I'll get to the second item on our agenda.

I think it's important for us to go back and discuss the scope of the work of this group because I don't think that we have really settled the scope of the work yet. And there are, based on the e-mail traffic, there are still some fairly broad variations in how we believe this work should be approached or really more what the extent of this group's focus should be. In particular, I'm looking at two or three items, some of which are expressed here as #3 and #4 in the agenda. One that is unexpressed, but really kind of falls to some extent under #4, is one that has been brought up in particular by [Inaudible] and by others and I think it's an important point which is our foundational document, if you can call it that, Annex 12 refers to the settlement of dispute resolution twice as being the focus of this group's work.

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

I see [inaudible] asked is there a new proposal on the scope of our work. We still have Annex 12.

Yes. We do have our Annex 12, and the more one reads Annex 12, the more one sees the limits to its clarity. And I think what we need to know is clarified what the Annex 12 contemplated, and try to settle that.

So I think the first question, really, or big question that we have [inaudible] back and forth on quite a bit is focus on the place of incorporation or headquarters, or location of ICANN.

We have successfully managed to establish that this topic is not off limits in its entirety, that we can look at the effect of that place of incorporation and headquarters location. And I use the word effect on purpose because it's a neutral word to include both positive and negative effects.

Beyond that, I think we still have some disagreement, or at least a lack of consensus. Though I think we're moving towards a consensus, but in particular as to whether this group can consider as the recommendation at the end of this work Recommending that ICANN move its headquarters or [inaudible] its incorporation Out of California or outside the United States.

So I might open the board to some discussion on this particular point, and I see a queue building. Jean-Jacques, go ahead.

I'm not hearing Jean-Jacques, at least on the phone. I am still not hearing him. Okay. I think we might be having some sort of audio problem with Jean-Jacques. Although I see is his microphone to be

opened, [inaudible] speakers [inaudible] hopefully we can solve that problem.

I'll move on to [David McAuley].

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you [Greg]. David McAuley here, for the transcript. I hope you can hear me.

In any event, since you mentioned that I had made a statement on that, I will simply mention that about a week or two ago, I did put an e-mail out there to state a position on this.

I agree with the comment that the paragraphs in Annex 12 may not be a Model of clarity, but when it gets to our focus, I think paragraph 30 in our annex 12 is very clear, and I will just read one sentence.

It says—this is the first bullet in paragraph 30—it says, “Consideration of jurisdiction in work stream two will focus on the settlement of disputes and jurisdiction issues, and includes,” and then it has to be sub-bullets. One of them is “find potential alternatives.” I believe that the alternatives in that respect are to be considered with respect to their impact on dispute resolution mechanisms.

California law is sort of in the background as you say for the mechanisms that we've done, but with respect to dispute resolution, ICANN, I believe, is subject to of jurisdiction in California, Singapore, Turkey, Paraguay, Belgium, wherever else they have a presence. I know they're establishing an office, I think, in Kenya. Arguably, they are subject to jurisdiction in other countries because the concepts of the

jurisdiction, I believe, are changing in the digital age as targeted digital impacts might be felt. But that is a matter for and expertise that I don't have, I'm just saying it may be the case.

In any event, I think our job is to look at alternatives with respect to dispute resolution mechanisms. In the world of contracts, the parties will negotiate, ICANN and the people they have contracts with, will negotiate the governing law to a contract. I think paragraph 30 is clear, and I think we should limit our scope to what's laid out in paragraph 30 and discuss alternatives in that frame. Thanks very much.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, David. I will see if we have solved the Adobe Connect [inaudible] audio issues. And if he can now be heard, let's give it another try, Jean-Jacques, please.

Are we still getting nothing on the audio bridge? I hear now that it might turn on Adobe connect volume, I can hear Jean-Jacques. [Inaudible] I would love to give Jean-Jacques an opportunity to speak, but not everyone can hear him. That's not going to help. Let's see if we can solve that. Apologies to all, especially Jean-Jacques. I'll turn to [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, Greg. For the record, you know [inaudible], I'm generally in agreement with what David said and posted, but rather than debating whether or not it's in scope, I'd rather discuss whether it makes any sense to go down this rabbit hole.

We've just been an extremely long time developing a designated model, and creating new bylaws which are all keyed to California law. I don't believe we'll find any significant gaps between what is required and the ability to undertake the accountability under California law, because we spent a great deal of money and a great deal of time sorting out extra counseling, creating that. There's plenty of work to be done on jurisdiction on the issues relating to all of ICANN separate offices around the world, as well as choice of law for agreements, for contracted parties and others. If we are going to open this Pandora's Box, looking to change the place of incorporation, when we've got new bylaws which just set the two entities, the PTI and the empowered community as California nonprofit corporations, protected by fundamental bylaws, we would have to spend an enormous amount of time and frankly money, and consulting with counsel, to look at multiple alternate jurisdictions to see parts of their laws would or wouldn't fit with the accountability model we've created. We'd have to choose one, after that one process, there are clearly many possibilities. We'd have to revise bylaws. We'd have to create a new article of incorporation.

How much time and how much money would be involved with that? And what is the point? So long as ICANN's going to be a nonprofit private sector entity, and not a U.N. Agency, it's going to be subject to some nation's laws. We have created an accountability process keyed to California laws, where ICANN has always been located. And I would argue strongly that regardless of whether or not it's in scope, it makes no sense to go down that path.

And in fact, going down that path is assured to be quite evasive, quite expensive, and prevent us from getting close to resolving the other issues that we should be looking at in work stream two.

Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, [Phil]. I think that's actually a very helpful point, not just on substance, but on approach.

I think that by framing it in terms of scope, that traps us into looking backward at annex 12, and arguing about what it meant. Arguing is maybe too strong a word, but spending time trying to unpack the text, without really actually paying any attention to the substance of the issue.

And I think that your framing of this topic, actually, takes us directly to the substance, you know. Whether or not it was intended to be part of the scope of our work to consider the issue may be lost in the mix of time. But the question of whether it is something that makes sense for us to consider, whether it is something that we can contemplate, and how we should decide, how we should look at that issue, it's a different question.

So I think that that is the better framing of this question, and we should discuss the substance of this point. So I've heard thoughts on the matter. We've all heard them in the call, that it would not make sense to consider recommendations that involve moving ICANN physically, and it's worth noting that the GNSO council in its most recent meeting

passed a resolution of which the direct topic was the legal budget, or the [extra] budget for work stream two. It specifically indicated that the GNSO council, which really represents all of the stakeholders of the GNSO, indicated that it did not think that any approach that recommended moving ICANN would be acceptable at this time out of this work from the GNSO [inaudible] only one chartering organization, but I think it's well worth noting, and of course, noting also that ICANN's headquarters location, [inaudible] of incorporation is in the articles of incorporation, which are treated the same as the fundamental bylaws. So those are some of the points kind of on that side of the ledger.

I see a hand from [inaudible].

[JORGE]: Hello. Do you hear me? Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

[JORGE]: Hello. Good afternoon for those who are [inaudible].

I want to reiterate something I said in chat. A bit forward from the beginning, when we started to talk about the scope and related matters, as the one in the agenda item #3. And that we have a scope that was difficult to agree, as everything in Marrakesh, which came out of a package that was agreed by the community At-Large. [Inaudible] that was in the wording of Annex 12 and of many other aspects out of

Marrakesh agreement. So perhaps we may share a similar intuition, or preliminary ideas on what the scope of our work is, or how we should construe the wording of Annex 12, but it's like a discussion going in circles. And we are in October, and I think we started in August, and we still haven't made a lot of progress on this.

So I'm of the opinion that it would be more efficient if we would go into the specific issues, the specific topics, and along the discussion, and according to how the debate progresses, we will see whether there are issues, whether there are problems, whether there are solutions, that may be out of scope.

But to make this general scope discussion beforehand, seems to me to be putting the cart before the horse, so they say. So I would really urge that we go into specific issues of related to jurisdiction where we can improve the present framework to make the legal system and the different accountability instruments more accountable to the global ICANN community, and leave the question of scope and related matters for a later moment, as they arise during the discussions. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, Jorge.

If I could ask a follow-up question, I think that Phil [Corwin]'s remarks have moved us past the issues of scope and interpretation of Annex 12 to the substantive question of whether it makes sense for this group to contemplate recommendations that would move of ICANN out of California physically. So it would be helpful to have your thoughts on the substantive questions, rather than the timing.

[JORGE]: Is this a direct question, directed to me?

UNKNOWN SEAKER: Yes, it is. Does it make sense for this group to consider recommendations that would move ICANN out of California?

[JORGE]: Yeah. I think this question is related to this scope question. It's possibly our intuitions are similar in that we just bought a new car, which was very expensive, and this car is built according to Californian standards, and now we have to see, in words, how we feel with it, whether we're happy, and this will take time. But I think that deciding on this question now is a bit weird, because we haven't gotten into the specifics so far and of all the different layers of jurisdiction. And maybe we may find issues. Maybe we don't find any issues. Perhaps we find issues, and we may agree at some point in time, 'okay, being in California has some shortcomings,' but that is the consequence of arriving at such a conclusion. If we were to arrive at such a conclusion that we have to take the whole of ICANN out of California and move it elsewhere. It's like very wide-stretched.

So although I guess at this moment in time we may share the intuitions, I am not sure of what is the value of taking a decision on something we haven't studied really. I hope this helps.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you [Jorge]. I think that's helpful, and the analogy is useful. [inaudible] taken this car and built it to California specifications, that this group, which is [inaudible] only about nine months, it would be rather unusual at least to contemplate ripping out the engine and replacing it with Diesel, bridging the wheel on the other side, and perhaps turning it into a van. It seems a bit outside of what could accomplish. I think that there's also the issue of consequences.

One comment, and then I will get to Pedro, but first let me read what Jean-Jacques typed into the chat.

One common comment is that he thinks we need to, and we should think about this as we go through our work, we need to separate the issue of [inaudible] from recommendations. What I mean by that is that we may find shortcomings, or challenges, or tradeoffs that come from any of ICANN's jurisdiction limitations, whether it's based on the place of incorporation or based on choice of law or other things. The question then is, what are the recommendations that can be considered and should be considered to resolve those issues.

Taking off my [inaudible] hat for a second and thinking more generally, I think we are going back to [inaudible]. I'm trying to find the simplest solution that does the [inaudible] the least—

[THE HOST HAS LEFT THE MEETING TO SPEAK WITH MEETING SUPPORT AND WE'LL REJOIN SOON]

-Number of consequences and unintended effects. Probably to make sense in this particular instance, I think that would mean looking at

recommendations to resolve shortcomings that involve something less drastic and physical than a physical relocation.

So I think that we do need [inaudible] to identify first issues and then to identify recommended resolutions of those issues.

And now, with apologies to both Jean-Jacques and anybody who doesn't have access to the chat, Jean-Jacque's comment in the chat.

First, "in improving institutional confidence 2008–2009, I, as one of the co-authors, have proposed the notion of additional jurisdiction rather than alternative jurisdiction. This was important. ICANN's headquarters would not change, but jurisdiction could be added for non-contract aspects too. I agree with one of the previous speakers, David, but we could agree to distinguish between things: contract-related items, U.S./California jurisdiction, and other items [inaudible]-

[THE HOST HAS LEFT THE MEETING TO SPEAK WITH MEETING SUPPORT AND WE'LL REJOIN SOON]

-conflict resolution, etc."

Those are shown Jean-Jacque's comments [inaudible]. And now I will turn to Pedro. Thank you.

[PEDRO]:

Yes. Can you hear me? Okay. Thank you, Greg. Thank you also other colleagues who have spoken before me. Yeah, I just wanted to repeat what I have probably saying the past two or three meetings, and I believe it's in line with what Jorge said.

I think this question about moving or not moving ICANN's place of incorporation, I think it's let's say a question that is related to recommendations, and not really about the initial stage of our work. So I think it's like Jorge said, I think at this point of time it definitely doesn't make sense. We have a reasonable amount of argument in favor of, let's say, maintaining ICANN's place of incorporation. And it is maybe probable that once we are done with our exercise of analyzing issues related to jurisdiction, we may stay at the same conclusion.

But I think this conclusion will be, let's say, stronger, will be more legitimate, once we have done our work of analyzing all these different issues and topics related to the subject. So in time. I think we shouldn't be, let's say, dealing with this discussion at this moment.

Maybe I can understand but maybe some of our colleagues here want to engage or start with this exercise with the comfort that we won't, at the end, reach that conclusion of moving ICANN out, but I don't think this is really, let's say, a conclusion that we should reach up front just in order to comfort, let's say, some people that, let's say, have this kind of fear. So we have to have a very open and honest debate and examination of all those different aspects, and for that I think we should perhaps start our work with actually #5 of your suggested agenda, Greg, which is examining all these multiple layers of jurisdiction, which is actually, I think, you have done a good work in bringing up this topic and actually proposing some layers for us to discuss.

Actually, I think we should start from there, identify all those, let's say, try to have a broad few of all, let's say, global issues that we may deal

with, and then start, let's say, selecting which should be our priorities here. Thank you.

[GREG]: Thank you, Pedro.

[DAVID MCAULEY]: Greg, thank you. It's David McAuley again for the transcript, and my comment is in the nature of a side comment.

Obviously, I stated my position on the scope, but I wanted to make a side comment in light of what Jorge said, and looking at Jorge's mail this morning that had a number of points, especially points #1 and #3, dealing with the new alternative dispute mechanisms.

I just wanted to sort of make an advertisement as a member of the IRP Implementation Oversight Team, members, people that are interested in these issues may want to look at joining us in the IRP Implementation Team. It's been effectively led by Becky Birch. She'll be stepping down from that role when she steps up to the Board, but we have pretty much completed our work, or almost completed on the supplemental rules of procedure.

But there are other things about the IRP that are going to come up that affect the new provider or things of that nature, and so I'm just saying everybody would be welcome to come and join us as we pick those up. Thank you.

[GREG]:

Thank you, David.

What I'd like to do is kind of bring this topic temporarily to a close and get a sense of the room as a preliminary recommendation. And I think it's fair to say—or preliminary position. And I think it's safe to say that we'll go back and review all of our conclusions before sending them up to the plenary.

So what I'd like to do is to ask by green ticks who would [inaudible] the view that at this time we should take the possibility of moving ICANN out of California off the table, but revisit it later on in our work if we find a problem that relates to that location and can't find any solution less drastic to that than that solution. So I'd like to see by a show of green ticks who would agree with that, and who would-

You put a red X if you believe that this is something we should be contemplating actively as a potential result of our discussions under any circumstances.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

[Inaudible].

[GREG]:

Yes, Tijani. I hear you. I am just giving people a little chance to register green ticks or red Xs.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

It is about this [inaudible] that you are trying to do. I am really uncomfortable, because we don't need it, in my point of view. We can go ahead and we will see, when we discuss the issue, we will decide not to move ICANN from California. It is obvious. Why you want to make this process? We spent two calls about this, and [inaudible] is almost finished and we are still discussing if we have to remove it from the table or not. I am really uncomfortable with that. Thank you.

[GREG]:

Thank you, Tijani. The reason I brought it up is that a number of participants in the group have brought it up. And I think it's important to hear that out. If you're uncomfortable, if you think we should be openly considering moving ICANN out of California a fair position, and if you want to register that position, or if I mischaracterized your position, please let me know. But I am not making this choice out of any personal focus, but rather that it has been a focus of this group and of others looking at the work of this group.

In any event, I see a number of—I see one, two, three, four, five green ticks. I see no red Xs and what I would call a number of abstentions.

I also see Jean-Jacques in the chat saying, "I agree that moving the headquarters of California is not an urgent matter. We should examine what additional 'underlined' jurisdictions could achieve for specific purposes."

I think that's a fair [inaudible] to the next point. Right. If you could take down your checks, your [inaudible] or whatever they are, of checks and crosses, we can move on.

I think, actually, the suggestion is to pass #4 for the moment, that we could cover #2 and #3, the multiple layers of jurisdiction slide.

So if I could ask staff to put up the slide that was [inaudible] in the e-mail earlier. I think this would be helpful.

Let me briefly introduce this. I've tried to take what was listed in Annex 12 and sort of boil it down to layers, along with the little bit of other comments that have been made, and tried to suggest alternate terms, at least for some of these, so we are not always using the term jurisdiction to mean so many different things.

So, in a sense, we start with what may be the most fundamental or at least with one aspect, which is the jurisdiction incorporation, and then the jurisdiction headquarters location, the physical location, it's entirely possible at least in the U.S. to be incorporated in one state and physically have your headquarters in another state. Here, of course, California covers both. And then, there's the jurisdiction for other places of physical presence, and that goes to the issue that David mentioned, that ICANN is physically located in various types of offices and engagement centers, and other things with a permanent location, in several other countries than the United States. Then there is the jurisdiction for interpretation of contract, which is the choice of law, which law governs a particular contract, like [inaudible] had this one interpreted, and when one is engaging in a dispute over that contract, what law does one look to. Next the jurisdiction for litigated dispute, and that [inaudible] to physical and jurisdiction, which is the venue. In what court, in what country's court, or what state court could one physically sue ICANN, or ICANN could ICANN [inaudible] sue someone

else? So that is a question. A separate question. And next, almost last, and this was taken so much directly from Annex 12, [inaudible] relationship with the national jurisdictions for particular domestic issues, I think that goes to issues of friction between ICANN, between what we're looking at, and then I think we need to get another scope discussion regarding how many different things we can look at. And then, lastly, meeting the NTIA requirements which is necessary clearly, and to some extent may be considered a moot point, but clearly, doing something that would violate the NTIA requirements so quickly after having met them as a condition of the transition would be awkward, to say the least.

I see Jean-Jacques's hand is up. Let's just quickly focus on the 4th and 5th layers if you will, from the top. I think these are the two that go to the issue of what's been called settlement of dispute resolution. Which is a terrible phrase, but I take that as meaning both the physical jurisdiction in which a dispute can be initiated and resolved, and also the law that one looks to in determining all that matters relating to that dispute. And I think that these layers are clearly intended to be the focus of our work based on what is stated in Annex 12.

So I will now turn to Jean-Jacques who, I think, has switched devices and should be audible. So, Jean-Jacques.

Regrettably, I am still not getting any audio from Jean-Jacques. I see his microphone [inaudible] on mute, and now it's off mute. Can you, Jean-Jacques, please try again?

[CHERYL]: Greg, Cheryl here. We can hear him through Adobe Connect only, so let's all just turn up our volumes, and hopefully someone can capture in chat whatever he is saying [inaudible].

[GREG]: Okay. Let's just give that a shot, and let Jean-Jacques speak through Adobe Connect.

[INAUDIBLE]

[JEAN-JACQUES]: All right. Good.

[GREG]: -Describing the core of your comment in the chat, so everyone who can't hear you will see them.

[JEAN-JACQUES]: [INAUDIBLE] I think it's a novel approach [inaudible] of having several additional jurisdictions [inaudible] California. [Inaudible] additional rather than alternative [inaudible] ICANN in California [inaudible] another country [inaudible] institutional confidence [inaudible] of jurisdiction [inaudible]-

[GREG]:

Somehow I think we just lost Jean-Jacques. If there is anything that proves we don't control the Internet, maybe this is it.

In any event, hopefully we'll solve various this thing with multiple layers of audio problems for Jean-Jacques. I'd like to see if there is- just answer from Jean-Jacques, why is not a majority of users using Adobe, I think most if not all of us are using Adobe for the visual portion of that meeting, but many, if not all, many clearly not all use the phone for the audio because the audio on Adobe Connect is both receptive and expressive, it leaves a lot to be desired. So the phone, 19th-century technology though it might be, still seems to be better during [inaudible]], while the Adobe Connect provides all of the other multiple layers of communication.

So what's supposed to happen is that there is some sort of matrix of communication technology that [inaudible] the Adobe audio and the audio bridge into a seamless conversation, but probably, there are issues with the matrix at the moment.

In any event, rather than spend the last few minutes talking about the wonders of Adobe connect audio, I would like to see if there are others who would like to comment in any fashion on the multiple layers of jurisdiction that we see in front of us.

Pedro.

[PEDRO]:

Yes, Greg. Thank you very much. Thank you for putting up this slide.

I think this is a very good start. I mean, although I know this kind of reflects what is in our report, I think it's a bit better structured. And I think this is precisely—it says at least the way I saw we should start to work. I mean I think we should have a view of all these different aspects of jurisdiction.

Maybe I would kindly suggest that you could allow us maybe a week, maybe, to comment on that, and perhaps coming up with more other probable layers that at least should be considered as a [inaudible] for initial analysis for us.

I know that Jorge sent an e-mail. Maybe some of the things he mentioned could fit into one of those layers or he eventually mentioned other layers as well, or maybe we could have a week to comment on that. And then, probably, as a second step, I think then we should consider, actually, what are the implications of those different jurisdictions on layers to the work of ICANN. Maybe not—we should then perhaps indicate to what extent these jurisdictions actually affect the work of ICANN. Some, I think, should have a greater influence. Others, lesser ones. But I think going down to dig deeply may give us a list of all different aspects or issues that we could potentially deal with.

And then, as a subsequent step, then actually, coming to selecting actually which are the topics we want to really address in this exercise here.

So I just wanted to, let's say, say that this is, I think, a good start. Maybe we should allow us then some days or a week to come up perhaps other

issues and suggestions, then do our work starting from this list. Thank you.

[GREG]: Thank you, Pedro. I'll move to Phil [Corwen] then.

[PHIL]: Thanks Greg. Phil for the record.

I just want to observe in regard to the two boxes, jurisdiction for interpretation of contract, and jurisdiction for litigating.

In most contracts, it's usually the same. You specify that any dispute would be litigated in the court of X jurisdiction, and interpreted under the laws of the same jurisdiction. But I think there is a division to be made in terms of the type of contracts. There are the contracts with contacted parties, with registries and registrars where ICANN would, I would say, want to designate the same jurisdiction for every contacted party, for both uniformity of interpretation and judgments and other factors.

And then, of course, there will be contracts entered into, starting with leasing a real estate where all the different offices are located, and other contracts related to those non-U.S. locations where it's quite likely that each of them is going to be subject to the laws and interpretation of the jurisdiction in which the physical presence is.

That's just the point I wanted to make, that you have to—we should be thinking about contracts with contacted parties vs. contracts with other parties, and particularly related to non-U.S. hubs and offices. Thank you.

[GREG]:

Thank you, Phil. I would add a third type of jurisdictional question regarding disputes. And mindful of the fact that we are doing it as a continuation of the accountability work, which is the choice of law and potential venues for enforcing the accountability mechanisms and actions of the empowered community.

So I really think that there are three, at least, for the choice of law and venue, three major fears in which these need to be considered. And probably this fear of this every day contracting, employment contracts, contracts with services, real estate and the like, probably not controversial, not even doing more than acknowledging in this group. But I think the first that I called and the third are the ones we should focus on, specifically, not giving [inaudible] that is enforceability of the empowered community's actions. Which we spent many months dealing with and was [inaudible] with the basis of choosing a lot of what we chose.

We don't have much time, so I won't read [Jorge]'s e-mail into the list, or into—but I want you all to go back and look at the comment which, in my view at least, goes primarily to #4 and #5, choice of law and venue.

And the last comment I'll make [inaudible] perhaps to look at this or are familiar with is, please speak up.

I believe that the current contracts with contracted parties are silent, either on choice of law or on venue.

Out of the top of my head, I apologize for not remembering which one it is, but I think there is a certain delicacy or a certain desire to avoid being absolutely concrete on either choice of law or venue. So we can look at that.

So we are down to the top of the hour. So I think that what we should do is spend more time as Pedro urged us, to look at the multiple layers of jurisdiction and comment on this slide.

What I will do is put a text version of this into Google docs, so people can comment on. It won't be quite as pretty, if you call this pretty, because it's designed as a slide, obviously, that way we can collect further comments.

Our next meeting is at 19:00 on Monday, so we have somewhat of a short week, as it were. So thank you all for this discussion and I look forward to working on the chat in the Google docs and to our call on Monday.

Finally, I am sure I said this at the beginning, I convey regrets from my collaborator [inaudible] who is in mid-flight at this time, and thus unable to participate.

So thank you all and we may adjourn this meeting and stop the recording. Thank you and goodbye.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Greg. [Inaudible]. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]