
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Hello? Well, we are starting the call. I am not sure if you and I can speak, I heard her, but. So thanks everyone for joining today conf call. As you can see in the Adobe Connect we have the agenda still basically working in this twelve [inaudible] document. The first item, just maybe give us some introduction. Now we are I think on the third or fourth call, and now we still have [inaudible] the first stage [inaudible] using [inaudible], we still need your input and comments to move forward. For the previous action items from the last meeting, is it possible to see them? I cannot see them.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi Raf, this is Yvette again. I did go through the notes, the action items to the last meetings were actually kind of done verbally, so maybe Fiona may want to facilitate that for this part. I can go ahead and look through— I did not actually find any action items that I could find in written form to place up there, but I can certainly go ahead and see if I can find those and put those in the chat for you ASAP. In the meantime, if you just either would like to do them verbally, or if you wanted to move on to the Strawman [ph] document, it's entirely up to you and Fiona.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks Yvette, I'm not sure— Yes, Fiona, go ahead.

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.

FIONA ASONGA: I think in summary the action items from the last meeting was for everybody to the Strawman document that we put on Google. And to either commence or share their feedback. But we will now discuss it in more detail during this meeting. And during this meeting [inaudible] will be agreeing on [inaudible] reading of the information [inaudible] that we'd like to use for the purposes of the work we want to do in the subgroup. And I think those two are the main action items from last week's meeting.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Fiona. And I think they're already done, the Google doc, we'll share it already, and open it for comment. Okay, that's done. I guess we can move to more substantive parts of the call, which is about the Strawman document discussion. Basically talk about two items here. First, we'd like to hear from Mathieu how they did for the [inaudible] study, in particular the collection of data sets. Since we [inaudible], we may need to collect data within ICANN and then we will try to go through the comments [inaudible], and try to respond to them, or to solve them.

Mathieu, can you hear us?

MATHIEU WEILL: Hi, yes can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, but it would better if you can speak up more louder please.

MATHIEU WEILL: Hey, is that better now?

RAFIK DAMMAK: A little bit. Yeah, I think it's ok. Thanks Mathieu for joining today's call, and being keen to share the experience. So, please go ahead.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you Rafik and Fiona for inviting me to this call. I'm obviously here only in my member capacity, and certainly not with any of the hat. So in the document that's being— the Strawman— that the group has been providing, is a number of items that we had been discussing when we provided a snapshot of what we mentioned as ICANN's diversity, with many short calls, obviously, just before Helsinki.

But I told them it would be valuable to share the number of questions we had, which are certainly questions for this group to consider, and a number of the difficulties we've been facing. I pasted in the chat the link to the PDF of the whole study, but I think the most valuable thing we can do, if you're okay with that Rafik and Fiona, is probably that I share the comments that I provided in the Google doc, and that highlight the kind of issues we've been facing. So, unless you interrupt, I'll go on with this approach.

You rightly highlighted a number of elements of diversity. And clearly it can be difficult. It is always relevant to [inaudible] different dimensions,

but some dimensions are more difficult to collect, and actually ensure that data is reliable than others. So for instance, the regional criteria is pretty simple in theory. But we need to decide whether we want to have it based on the country of birth, the country of residence, the citizenship. And there's a lot within ICANN that is based on this, but I'm not 100% sure of whether there is a consistent application of a consistent criteria on this approach.

One that is also quite difficult is the language because some people have several languages. There's meeting language, and it's not always easy to access. And maybe it could be also interesting to see the language, sometimes you're fluent in a language because you have a native language, but you live in a country that has several official languages, and obviously you'd be learning this language from childhood. So that's quite a difficult one, and something where defining the type of information you want is absolutely critical.

And obviously even the stakeholder group type of dimension is difficult, because many individuals may have several roles, and so you need to define whether you have a sort of a preferred stakeholder group type of criteria or whether you have all the stakeholder groups as specific individual is related to. So that's the kind of discussion which I think needs to be had. Bearing in mind that the simpler you start, the faster you get to something that actually helps marking diversity, but sometimes with a price, in terms of reliability of data.

And the second I mention, which is really, truly important because it shapes the analysis that comes later, these are categories you define within the different types of dimensions. If you only look at age, at over

25 or below 25, obviously you have less information in the end in your statistical analysis than if you go below 25, between 25 and 35, between 35 and 45, and so on, and so forth. And it can be quite challenging in some instances to define those categories. So I think because we have a subgroup here that's extremely important to take into account, and probably make suggestions, and think about why you're making these suggestions.

Third area is that scope is obviously extremely [inaudible]. Scope is different, you can have a diversity analysis of only the board members. It's easy to do, it can be quick, it can be easily maintained, but it's probably a little short to characterize the overall ICANN diversity. On the other hand, you can have, if you look at everyone that participates in meetings, plus the working groups, plus the observers, you have such a wide database that you may lose some of the bias which is typical in diversity analysis, where you look at the base population and then you compare to the different layers of influence within the organization.

So, it's important to address the question of scope. The APNIC study focused on, approximately, I think it was 150 individuals who were all elected or appointed one way or another to a mandate within ICANN. We thought that was useful because it helped not who was having influence, but that's only one view. So to me, it was mentioned on the [inaudible], you're looking at PDP [inaudible], rapporteurs, even CCWG rapporteurs and chairs... It's quite useful, because that's how policy or big decisions are made within ICANN, so that's an aspect of influence. But it can also be compared with all meeting participants, ICANN staff, and actually [inaudible], I found some interesting statistics from ICANN HR on diversity within the ICANN staff, and from the ICANN meetings

team on diversity of policy foreign participants. I see that the— probably I should take the question now, and finish with the remaining items later, if you're okay Fiona and Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mathieu, for this. It's quite interesting, and yes I've seen Lousewies raising her hand, so, Lousewies, yes please go ahead.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Yes, thank you very much, can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Ok, good. Hi everyone. I wanted to come in on this point because I think it's extremely important, which is the summary which is in italics. Diversity within ICANN refers to the ability of ICANN to facilitate variations in different aspects of stakeholders' representation at various levels within the organization. And there was a comment there about what we actually mean. And Mathieu was referencing this as well, we have been, especially it's been [Joran's] effort to try to make a distinction between ICANN the community, ICANN the organization, which means the staff, and ICANN the board. And so I'm wondering if it

would be helpful with the questions that were raised, if we actually just make that explicit?

So actually mentioning all three aspects. Because it was my feeling, from the way I interpret the bylaws, is that we would like the diversity to be as broad as possible. So I just wanted to, I was wondering if that would be helpful? If we could basically have it read, the end would read, at various levels within the ICANN organization, community, and board. So that we make it clear that we cover everything. It's a question I wanted to put in at this point.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes. Thanks Lousewies. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. I just wanted to pick up on this, Lousewies. I would like, I think it's very important, and I am struggling since years, and even the four years I was in the board, to say there is... when we use ICANN we do not know what we are talking about. From my point of view, when we are using ICANN, the ICANN word is for everything. The board, the staff, the community. And then if we want to be more precise, the ICANN board, the ICANN staff, and ICANN participants, or SO/AC. It's very important that we all together are ICANN. What I call *the* organization, the none-for-profit US based organization, and then the three components. And, yes, it's part of the difficulty when we just have one word for three subitems. And finally we get the [inaudible] you understand that, and either to force the board to accept also that, because it was not the case few years ago. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Ok, thanks Sebastien... I do think that there is this kind of distinction in the documents, maybe not enough clear and highlighted. And that's why I guess there is maybe some confusion. We can follow that approach to think about diversity, like that, but ICANN as the community, which means through its SO/ACs and also how the different teams, working groups and so on, are set. And then the staff, and then the board.

So, I guess we can follow that. So back maybe to the presentation made by Mathieu. Mathieu I can understand the focus, the study was mostly about leadership roles? And, I guess some of the, let's say, dimension of diversity, I mean how one person can have many of, in speaking a different language, and maybe having several citizenships and so on. But also, I guess, about data collection. Many of this information are kind of self-declared. And I think one of the... not controversial, but it's interesting, it's not necessarily clear in the definition, I think it's about citizenship and the country. And I think people can be quite flexible in how they interpret that one. So what do you think? How do you try to handle that part?

MATHIEU WEILL:

That's right, you're right in your assessment Rafik. There's some form of margin of member for declaring that you belong to one region or another on aspects of ICANN. For instance, if you take the ccNSO, Chris Disspain, his nationality is British, but he was working for the dot EU ccTLD in Australia, so he was part of the AP region representatives—

until recently. When we did our research, in some cases it felt like, we tried to focus when [inaudible] went low, on citizenship rather than self-declared. So that is a choice, and I don't know whether it's a good choice or not. Honestly, it's something to decide upon.

But that's also raising a question about how are all this data either collected or researched, or both. And I think that scenario where this group will have to come up with recommendations, if you ask me, about how this should take place so that it's consistent across the whole scope, and made on a regular basis. It's a cost. It's a lot of time. It can be instigated through the various systems that exist through ICANN to collect information about participants to working groups, participants to the different organizations, participants to meetings. But right now, and that's just my impression, the systems that collect this information and store it are very, very distributed. Not necessarily checked for reliability, where there would be a significant investment to make before, enabling ICANN to produce reliable, consistent set of data around this criteria. Apart from the fact that you would also need to explain what you're looking for in terms of data. Does that answer your question Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Mathieu. I think the issue of standardization, and how the information or data is distributed, I think it was [inaudible] in some review, like the latest GNSO review. So we have for example the statement of interest when people join working groups. But also, depending within GNSO, like Constituency Stakeholder Group, how they collect data about their members, and so it's kind of at many places. There is some kind of inconstancy sometimes, so, this is maybe kind of

something we can look at later on when we [inaudible], and how it's important to start first by standardizing information and what we are trying to have. Probably maybe try other issues regarding the data, we can check later. So I'm seeing, instead of a growing discussion in the Adobe Connect chat, people want to try the question, or ask Mathieu here?

Okay, I guess there was more, kind of, confusion or question about this kind of new treaty within ICANN? Between [inaudible] and community. I'm not sure who is the holy father here [laughs].

Okay, so thanks Mathieu again for this presentation. I mean, maybe before, if there is no question, before moving to, trying to go through the document, do you have any other suggestions or recommendations on how, as a subgroup we [inaudible] on data collection, or what you think we should also explore that maybe the study [inaudible]? I understand that you focus on leadership, but how you think that can be expanded to other areas or aspects?

MATHIEU WEILL:

I think it's, once you've decided on what you're looking for, in terms of information, and who you're going to type it into categories, then it can easily be expanded. Especially if you rely upon the existing registration systems for participants and members of the various communities that exist. It's not trivial, it requires a significant effort from ICANN as a whole, but it's possible, and it can be useful.

Then the next thing that the group should also consider in the spirit of transparency and how this whole data set can be shared and made

transparent, so that it's not only a database buried into an information system [inaudible] ICANN, but also something that used as a tool for greater transparency, and demonstrating the improvement that ICANN is making in terms of diversity. So that's where our personal view that trying to make this open data is the way forward, that is also something that I think the group should consider at some point, [inaudible] whether that's appropriate.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Mathieu. I think it's a valid point here. I mean it's all about collecting the data and having them accessible, standardizing them and I think this is something we will have to look at later on, because it also can be the basis for any indicator we may think about.

Okay, to not talk more, we'll move here to Sebastien, he was raising his hand here for a while. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you very much. Yes, three things. The first one is about going on the discussion about what is ICANN, and I really think it's important to consider that when we are talking about ICANN the [inaudible], it can be the staff. And I just want to raise that if someone within this organization wants to change something, the wording, the appellation, the way we talk about something, it can't be a unilateral decision of either the CEO or the board. It needs to be a discussion. Why would we change the name of things if we don't have the discussion with the people who are affected? It's important the discussion we're having in the chat about not calling the staff the organization, because at the end

if it's the way we are talking about everybody we consider that the staff is the ICANN organization, and then nobody else is part of that. And it would be worse, the remedy will be worse than [inaudible].

Second point is about the discussion you were having with Mathieu, a very important one. The suggestion of Mathieu to have the way to gather information, I would like to suggest two ways of doing it. I hope quite easily is when you are starting to participate through any working group, you have to fulfill a statement of interest. And within the statement of interest, I think we need to add all the information we want to collect about diversity, and like that we will have this information.

The other way is that within the current icann.org website, once again, .org the organization, full, not just the staff, the icann.org you have the possibility to register your profile. It could be one way also, in that it could be open for more than just the participants of the working groups. That's two ways, now we have to see which one we can collect easiest the information, and transform them into data useable and we can throw a tendency design [inaudible] and so on and so forth. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sebastien. I understand there is a kind of, I don't know what to call this, a disagreement about separating ICANN between organization, board, and community. So just to confirm, I mean, we should not use this in our document, or? How do you, I mean, what can be done here exactly, when we are talking about the diversity? I mean, not, about this whole new [inaudible] in ICANN.

Yes, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's not a question of [inaudible], it was a discussion about board and the CEO wanted to start to have different wording, and that's a good idea, between the communities, the board. And we are talking or I am talking about staff, and it seems that [Joran] [inaudible] wanted to talk about the organization. And my feeling is that the organization, I write it: the organization it's all, and within the organization you have staff, including the CEO, you have board, including the CEO, and you have the community, and we can have more detail, we can be more granular. But the question was what does ICANN organization mean. That's it, the rest are all that can be used in the document, I don't see any problem, just that we need to be agree of which will mean what. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks for the clarification, Sebastien. We can use this, kind of, [inaudible], and even, like, maybe [inaudible] highlighting there is also some overlap too. Between, like, the board and the community, yes?

Yes, Lousewies.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you. I think Sebastien makes a really good point because it's important for everyone to know what we mean by organization. And, just to make it very clear, I think now that you're under the board, nor anyone is trying to unilaterally redefine anything. It's just that we have seen, even in our own documents, that words are used almost

interchangeably, and that doesn't make it clear what we are talking about. And I think clarity is very important also for accountability and for transparency.

So I think it would be good to have that discussion. I don't know if this is the right place. But as long as we all know what we mean, and that's why I think it's good when, if for the time being, we write organization, and by that we mean all three items, that, the board, and the community, then at least it's clear in this document what is meant. But I think it's out of the remit of anyone to say "Oh we should now all redefine it", for everyone else. As long as we are clear what we mean by it in this working group, I think the proposals which are being given right now are, are definitely an improvement over not defining what we mean by organization. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you Lousewies. If I may say I think we all are ICANN at the end. Seeing the meetings, the Adobe connection, also maybe talk about the statement of interest, and so on. I think even if it's a little bit early, maybe, to go into details about that part, at least the initial assessment is that we do some collection. I think that for the statements of interest, or when, maybe people join SO/ACs and they become members so there is some collection of data. Or now, like, when they renewed the ICANN website, you can create a profile and so on. The thing is, all this kind of information or data sources are not integrated and they are not standardized here, for this data, so there may be overlap and inconsistency and so on. So, when they work on that data in terms of

how we can recommend. And also to see if there was some proposal than before.

Okay, Lousewies, is this an old or new hand?

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Sorry, it was an old hand. I just lowered it. Apologies.

RAFIK DAMMAK: No problem. I guess maybe we can move to the next part of this item. And thanks again to Mathieu for this presentation, it was really good insight to know the study, and how we can follow this approach and expand it. Thanks again Mathieu.

So regarding the Strawman document, as you can see on the screen, there are several comments. Maybe we can go through them one by one and try to, we cannot think resolving, but maybe just to... if those who made the comment are here if they can, they want to extend, or to explain. So, I'm not sure, but I see the first comment. I'm not sure, it's in the document itself, and it's a little bit hard to read it.

So, the first comment is about to include the preliminary [inaudible] diversity [inaudible] that reports directly to the ICANN [inaudible]. I think this comment was made by Dalila? I think maybe she wants to expand here?

DALILA RAHMOUNI: Hello Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Dalila.

DALILA RAHMOUNI: Can you hear me? Yes.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you.

DALILA RAHMOUNI: Okay, the first comment, yes, I suggest to include a first paragraph or a preliminary title to make the link between the diversity and ICANN legitimacy. This is a form of rationale to underline why diversity is important, and why diversity implies to strengthen the effectiveness of the action of the ICANN. And this point was in the AFNIC today. As written in this survey, we can read that the structures that have made strong diversity have... this structure, this institution, have developed more [inaudible] discussion and debate, more effectiveness. So I think it will be a good thing to make this thing with the legitimacy of ICANN and the diversity.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks Dalila. We assume maybe hearing, not sure, so just maybe asking if people are happy with this suggestion. I'm not seeing your reaction, so... Maybe in the Adobe Connect? Maybe there is some support for this?

And I see that [Rachel] suggested some wording here. We can use that...

Yes Fiona, Go ahead.

FIONA ASONGA:

I think what's going through my head, we wanted to read up on strengthening ICANN legitimacy through diversity, because I'm thinking of... [inaudible] to strengthen ICANN's legitimacy? I don't know, I'm not so sure... I am okay with the content being proposed, I am just not so sure about using the planned legitimacy that we are... that is the goal, I think? I don't think it is suiting politically [laughs]. I would want to choose a different [inaudible]... I'm not quite [inaudible] what. But the content that has been explained [inaudible], I think is very important to include. [inaudible] Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Fiona. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Rafik. Our group is targeted to talk about ICANN accountability, and I think we need to stick with that for the moment. If we [inaudible] we will try [inaudible] ICANN legitimacy. But here what we are talking, it's a more diverse ICANN, who will ask ICANN to be accountable. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sebastien. Lousewies?

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: All right. I think Sebastien said it very well. This is all part of the accountability. And, Fiona's point I also agree with. What I like about the list that comes from the AFNIC document is that it explains the many, many benefits of diversity, that legitimacy, vitality, democracy, involvement, inclusion, a higher quality of the debate and the discussion. So I think it would be valuable to mention all of these. Simply because I think that even though there is consensus on the need for diversity, it can never do harm to explain the many benefits of diversity. Because there will always be people who still question that, especially when we get into the details. So, for the title we could simply say either, strengthening ICANN accountability, since this is all part of the accountability through diversity, or, simply saying, strengthening ICANN through diversity. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay? We word this title, and I guess we can add the paragraphs about the benefits of diversity, to maybe explain why we are trying to work on that. I see that, now that you're mentioning the advisors here. Maybe a little bit off topic here, but is it possible to get them back about this discussion? My understanding is that was [inaudible] who was active, maybe in the talking. Is it possible, Mathieu, to get their input here or some advices here in this topic? Yes, Mathieu.

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes, thanks, Rafik. So when I said the advisors here, it was a group of individuals that actually helped AFNIC get this document together, in

terms of methodology as well as advice. They mention in our acknowledgement section, so someone named Sebastien Bachollet, Olga Cavalli, Avri Doria, [Asha] and [Tijani], from the ICANN board and [inaudible]. And they were really great to stress, and I think that's extremely important with the point that Lousewies raised, which is you should never underestimate the need to explain why diversity matters. Because it is not as accepted globally and logical as one may think. So, I think it's not about asking for extra input there. Certainly, if you want to reach out to [inaudible] I'm sure he will be delighted to provide even more contributions. He was sending me a number of references about where that's explained in official documents, what the benefits of diversity are. But I think it's [inaudible] it's not a big addition. And he will be available I'm sure.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Mathieu, for the clarification. Because this maybe [inaudible] to see advisors. So, yes, thanks for the clarification.

I think the idea is to explain the why and the what. But diversity, and then, later on you can see the how that we are working about the proposal.

I thought that Rachel was raising her hand before, but she already—
Rachel, do you still want to speak, or...?

Okay, I see that there is still some discussion about the title. And so, kind of maybe hear some more... maybe [inaudible] clarify this last one: enhancing diversity to strengthen ICANN accountably. So if there is any consensus around here, if you agree, so if there is agreement that we

can just change it, replace it in the document, and maybe move to the next comment.

Yes, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah, I think that's a good way forward. It's Cheryl, for the record.

With the global changes that we're making, I think we can probably accept a number of them, based on this call. So I'm happy just to go through, quite briefly, and just go, yes, yes, yes, yes, and yes. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Cheryl. Okay, so let's go with the last suggestion and move on to the next comments. We still have less than ten minutes in the call. So hopefully we can try, at least, to discuss the next comment, and then also just maybe having to agree on the action items for the next call.

Okay, the second comment, I think this one is from Carolina, and it's maybe, regarding the summary we put about the [inaudible] of diversity, is just diversity [inaudible] ICANN [inaudible]... ICANN, and she's raising here that [inaudible] and confusing, so... I guess this also is linked to what we were discussing before regarding ICANN as staff, board and community.

Carolina? Yes. That's indecisive. So, I guess we addressed this before and we can move to the next comment.

I'm not sure who made this comment, and if he or she is in the call. This is [inaudible] it's not liability itself.

Okay, this is made by [inaudible]. I am not sure if he is in the call. He is not here. So, I think it's still about maybe to be sure that we have the same understanding when we talk about diversity, and, maybe, to agree on the definition here.

Again, also, on the comment that representation is not enough, engagement is, at least, equally important.

Yes, Lousewies.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Sorry, I had to use my—

RAFIK DAMMAK: Lousewies?

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Yes, sorry, my phone was on mute. I think this is a really important comment. And I think just having someone there so that we can tick a box is not going to make a difference. And I'm wondering if also there is room somewhere in the document for the word "[inclusion]?" Because just having representatives of groups that make something look diverse, but then if people are not speaking up, having their voice heard, don't feel that their opinion is valued, etc. Then you can have, almost, a fake diversity. So I think this is a really key comment, and I am wondering if—

it's hard to measure, and I know it's more complicated to do, but I just wanted to say that we should make sure this is never just a box ticking exercise.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Lousewies, I think, it's kind, of the presentation is necessary but not sufficient. I agree we can include "inclusion" and engagement part, maybe trying to elaborate more what we mean by that, because at the end, what [inaudible] later on, we have to think how we can access the evaluated in the most objective manner, as much as possible.

Yes, Fiona?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hi Rafik, I'm sorry to interrupt, this is Yvette. Fiona has just let me know privately in the chat that her call had dropped, and I am work on getting her back on right now, so as soon as she is back on, we'll make you aware and she can make her comment. My apologies for the audio inconvenience.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks. Okay, so let's put that part about the inclusion, and work on it to elaborate more. And thanks everyone for the comments in the chat. It's really useful.

Okay, I guess the next comment is just, kind of, maybe [inaudible] the other one. It's saying about [inaudible] elements of diversity, possibly the title, section one-four. Set out normative expectation, so it's actually

[inaudible] normative section that includes section break after this [inaudible]. I'm not sure who made this comment... This was made by Malcolm. He is not here, so I'm not sure how to understand what is suggested here, but we can ask him later.

And, yes, so I'm reminded that we have less than five minutes left in the call, and it's better to, kind of, maybe wrap up here.

So, I think what we should do... We have started now with more discussion about the document, we will continue to work on it, and please try to put your comments and suggestions. We had also some suggestions in the chat. We will try to reflect that in the document, so I'm looking for all the notes and the recordings here.

So I really encourage you guys to put your comments and suggestions— and in particular to propose wording. That will be really helpful for us. And [inaudible] also we can change the layout and structure of the document. Strawman is just [inaudible] to, kind of, kick off the discussion and facilitate some feedback.

Okay, so, what's left in the agenda. So for the Hyderabad plan, we are requested to provide the status report. I think the deadline is today, so we have to work on that. So if you have, probably we need to share with you the report.

And for any other business, do you want to add any comments?

Thanks [inaudible], that's how we can spend the weekend, sure, working on the status report [laughs].

So, any other business? Any comments or questions or suggestions?

Okay. [inaudible] I guess we can adjourn the call for today. Thanks everyone again for attending and participating in the discussion. Please let's continue the discussion in the document, and also the mailing list, so if you have any suggestions like other examples, please share them. And, okay, I think that's it. Thank you and see you soon.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]