RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay, here is the draft agenda. So I'd like to first welcome you all for the third meeting of the SSR2 Review Team. I think we're starting to make some progress. At least we have number three to start. We will take a roll call from those that are listed as participants [inaudible], and those who have indicated that they are participating via phone that may not show up in the participant box.

Now, I do need to ask if there's any updated statements of interest from any of the review team members. Okay, hearing none, we can move on to the draft agenda. I leave it open for discussion as to how you would want to reorganize this, finalize it, and proceed with the meeting today. Any comments?

Alright, hearing none, we will proceed and note that it's open for discussion throughout the session as to how you would want to approach any of the topics. So the first topic on the list is to finalize the leadership selection. Now, I have noted the four review team members who expressed their interest at the March 15th Plenary session in Copenhagen. I don't know if there's any more from the floor? Yes.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Karen, it's Don. I'm going to have to step back from volunteering.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay.

DON BLUMENTHAL: I'm not sure I can handle it.

KAREN MULBERRY: Alright, thank you, Don. So we'll remove your name from the list. So we have three candidates that have expressed interest. We wanted to make sure, to confirm your agreement that you're looking at a co-chair structure for the review team. And then the next step is to proceed with how do you want to about choosing the leadership. And if you notice up in the far corner of the Adobe room, we did put together a poll, assuming that you might want to use that option. To select your leadership you can do it by whatever mechanism you feel is the most appropriate for the review team.   So, any discussion, suggestions, thoughts?

DENISE MICHEL: Hi, this is Denise, there seems to be a big echo online.

KAREN MULBERRY: No, you're not alone.

DENISE MICHEL: James Gannon had a good suggestion as far as I'm concerned, since we've got three volunteers and we have co-chairs, and I would posit that I and Emily and Eric can coordinate and work out a sharing of duties

among us, and come back to the team with a proposal of how to best operate. If the other team members are comfortable with that, and of course, Emily and Eric are comfortable with that, as well?

KAREN MULBERRY: Denise, this is Karen, I couldn't hear you clearly. I don't know if you could repeat what you are suggesting?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure, can you hear me now?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, much better.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, great, sorry I brought a cold with me back from Copenhagen. I was agreeing with James Gannon, if you can read the text in the window, and his suggestion for those who aren't on line, was that since we now have just three volunteers for leadership position, that we dispense with voting and have three co-chairs. I was further suggesting that Emily, Eric and I coordinate, come up with a sharing of duties the way that we feel would be best to operate, and come back to the team with our proposal about how we would organize our duties and function. So that was my suggestion, if it's acceptable to others, and especially to Emily and Eric.

KAREN MULBERRY: Any comments or discussion from the review team members? I did see one hand up, but it has disappeared, so I'm not sure if anyone else has any comments on the proposal that Denise has?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: This is Kerry, my apologies I'm in by phone, so I'm unable to raise my hand. I have no objection to Denise's proposal once Emily and Eric are fine with that arrangement. I think it's probably important hearing from them being the other two volunteers, to see if they're okay with it.

KAREN MULBERRY: Emily, please proceed.

EMILY: Hi, it's Emily here. I had my hand raised. Just to confirm, I'm very happy with what Denise has proposed. I would be really delighted to work with Denise and Eric. I think that the level of work required from volunteers is intense, particularly the burden of chairing, so I think that having three people who can share that load together and work corporately together would be a really good solution.

KAREN MULBERRY: Eric, you have you hand up?

ERIC OSTERWELL: Yeah, I think it sounds like a really good option, so it definitely works for me.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay, it looks like you have agreed by acclamation to have three co-chairs.

UNIDENTIFIED: I second that.

KAREN MULBERRY: I don't think we operate by Robert's Rules of Order here. But I wanted to give you all the last minute, and confirmation, it appears everyone is supportive of that. Denise, you have your hand raised?

DENISE MICHEL: Just the first coordination effort among the leadership team is then driving the slides. Emily, Eric, do you have a preference? I have a bad cold, and will be happy to have one of you take this call, if you could.

KAREN MULBERRY: Emily, you have your hand raised?

EMILY: Hi, just to say, sorry to hear about your cold. I'm very happy to run through the slides. Eric, if you want to do it or to share it, I'm very happy as well, I don't want to push myself forward.

ERIC OSTERWELL: I'm happy to let you go with it this time, Emily, yes. Definitely no problems, definitely better than striping back and forth.

EMILY: Okay, fine. So, congratulations to the team, we've made one of our first decisions, and I really hope, I'm very pleased to be working with all of you, and Denise and Eric in particular, and I hope that we can earn your trust and look forward to coming months together. So, this is the draft agenda.

As you can see, we spent some time I think looking at future team meetings and we asked staff to review the different time zones that we are in, and I think, if I can just go to this slide here, I think that this is the time zones, so we're all over the place, basically. But it seems, if I understand correctly, that was have three slots, one is at 5:00 am UTC, one is at 13:00 UTC, and one is at 19:00 UTC. Is that correct? Perhaps someone on staff who actually created this map? Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes ma'am. That is correct. Those three slots are blocked off from top to bottom as you can see on the screen.

EMILY: So I think that the discussion that he had, if I can just repeat, the idea is that there is not going to be one comfortable slot for all of us, and so this is an attempt to share the pain, to distribute it evenly, so for each individual there's going to be one horrible time, one okay time, and one sort of okay time. We're current meeting on Wednesdays, aren't we?

First of all, can I ask whether anybody's got any comments that they want to make on these proposed time slots?

KAREN MULBERRY: Emily, this is Karen. The time slots that are in red are actually ones that are in conflict, where staff support is unavailable. Those times were focusing on other things that we support. So those are the times that are locked, because we can't be there. And they're provided for your information, the 0500, 1300, and 1900 times are actually when workstream Q accountability work has blocked for their sessions and CCT review team meets at 1500 on Tuesday or Wednesday.

So they supplied some guidance for you in terms of times that we are not available versus time where you might want to schedule the SSR2 calls. Now it appears in looking at everything, that 1400 UTC looks like it might be the best for everybody, but that's for you all to discuss and decide.

EMILY: Okay, does anybody have any objections, I can see some chat. We are being asked, please ignore everything I've just said, and listen to Karen on this. What is being proposed is that we meet at 1400 UTC on Tuesdays.   Does anybody have problems with that, or anticipate problems?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: This is Kerry, I have no objection.

KAREN MULBERRY: And there are two hands up. Denise and Eric both have their hands up. Denise people go ahead and then Eric.

DENISE MICHEL: Eric you can go first, I'm trying to pull up a better version of the timetable.

ERIC OSTERWELL: Okay, I was just going to, just looking at the chart, it looked to me like if we just added one to the hour, we get kind of some of the lesser evils, so at 0600 hours, 1400 hours, and 2000 hours, so I don't know if that gives a lot of consternation, but for me, it's doable if we do it on Mondays or Tuesdays, and I see the recommendation on the slide for Tuesdays, so a straw man that I might suggest is what if we had one to where our current reserved hour, and pick a day, Tuesday, just as a straw man starting point?

EMILY: Thank you, Eric. So the straw man is that we go to 1500 on Tuesday. I see from the chat room, Matogoro is saying that is 1900 for him, and not okay, that is the 2:00 p.m., the 1400 slot. Geoff, do you want to go ahead, you had your hand raised?

GEOFF: Yes I do, thank you. Look, at 1500 I'm just not going to make it at all, at 1400 my appearance will be variable but low. If you don't choose to rotate the calls, then basically you're hitting a window where I just can't make. Now, I don't mind, it's fine by me, I'm simply saying I can't do those times consistently, that's the middle of the night and I am normally asleep. Thanks.

EMILY: Thank you very much.

KAREN MULBERRY: Denise has her hand up.

EMILY: Yes, thank you, Denise please go ahead and.

DENISE MICHEL: I was asked about whether it's an obscene hour for some people, and the team, I think Geoff just answered that. I would suggest that we try and rotate each week to different time slots. I also wanted to ask, although I understand that there are days and times that are not good for the staff, is there on the red column, is there one staff person available for that time? I'd like to explore whether we could go forward with a call with just one staff person and then the chairs potentially could coordinate with other staff, as needed. So I guess that's an opinion and also a question.

EMILY: Thank you, Noorul and Margie in the queue.

MARGIE: Yeah, it's such that it's more about the secretariat support, plus staff to be able to keep track of action items and note items, and those times reflected in the red relate to times where the secretariat staff is already occupied. So, like, setting up the call, the call logistics, it's not feasible for us to do it on those dates.

NOORUL: I couldn't attend the Copenhagen meeting because of the official procedures and all things, so I request the team to proceed with 19:00 GMT, that is fine for me.

EMILY: Okay, thank you. So I think that what I'm hearing is that the suggestion is 14:00 UTC. Eric has proposed 15:00. Several people both in the chat and speakers have said we should try to find at least one other time slot and rotate for the benefit of those that will be disadvantaged by this timing. In order to also move on to the other agenda items, I propose that we look for a morning slot as the alternative, when I say a morning slot, an early UTC slot, as an alternative. Eric, yes.

ERIC OSTERWELL: Sorry, I wasn't clear before. I guess I misremembered. I thought we previously had thought about rotating call times, and yeah, I didn't mean to express a preference for 15:00 so much as I just looked at all the slots on the slide that are reserved, currently it's 05:00, 13:00, and 19:00, and it looked to me like adjacent to those times was a lot of availability from the ICANN staff, but it sounds like we're coming to parity elsewhere. So I just wanted to clarify, I wasn't trying to put a flag in the ground for 15:00 hours. That's all.

EMILY: Can I ask a question for those who are in the UTC plus zone, how would 7:00 UTC be, or would that be horrible for people in different time zones?

KAREN MULBERRY: Emily, while you're waiting for a response on that, I believe Bernie has his hand up.

EMILY: Please go ahead and Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Emily. Just to be clear, I think to review Eric's proposal, which I thought was interesting for a rotation point of view, and just to be clear, 05:00, 13:00, and 19:00 are marked as reserved not for this group, because we cannot use them, that's why they're in red. All the

stuff that's in red cannot be used. Eric's proposal, as far as I understand it, for rotation schedule, is 06:00, 14:00, and 20:00.

Now, this does provide a rotation of slots, and does take off, if you look at the bottom under the colored lines, there is a percentage conflict there. So obviously 06:00, 14:00, and 20:00, you've got staff available, that's not an issue, and we could rotate between those options should you be interested to do that. Just trying to make sure the option is very clear for everyone. Thank you.

EMILY: Thank you very much, Bernie. Can I just check that everyone is looking at the same slide? I think Matogoro was saying please make the slide match the correct slide. I think we're all on slide 4. I would just like to try to find without all us individually talking about each time – James, please come in, go ahead and.

JAMES GANNON: Sorry, two computers, wrong mic muted. You've asked, can we please control of the slides to Emily so that we can be coordinated on the slides. We don't want everybody with scrolling rights, let's give them to Emily so everybody can be looking at the same thing. I'm good with 1400, for the record.

EMILY: Thank you James. We seem to have some consensus on 1400, that's great. I think we need to ask staff to find a reasonable other time that works particularly for Geoff in Australia and for those who are

disadvantaged by 1400, rather than us all discuss this now, can we review that on the list? What I propose is that we particularly at the beginning of our work, we meet by phone once a week at 1400 to start with, and find a rotating time. [AUDIO BREAK] ... I'm sorry, Matogoro, we missed the contents of your ... [AUDIO INTERRUPTION]... I think we've lost Matogoro temporarily. Can I make the proposal again that we meet weekly at 14:00 UTC and that [inaudible].

Okay, Don did you want to make a comment?

DON BLUMENTHAL: Yeah, Emily, it's not on the substance. I just want to suggest that Mr. Matogoro can tape what he wants to say and to say and to chat. I'm not getting anything when he's speaking.

EMILY: Matogoro, it's very difficult to hear you on the line, there's a lot of back noise, so it would be great if you could kindly mute and type in chat. Okay, I don't hear any objection to the proposal, so we will agree that our next meeting will be next Tuesday at 14:00 UTC. And then find a suitable rotation time, but Tuesday is going to be our day. Right, can I move on to the next slide, yes I can, because I'm running it. So the draft action items we had were to circulate the slide deck after the SSR meeting. Cathy, do you want to please come in?

CATHY HANDLEY: Yes, Emily, before you leave that slide, I could have missed it. Are we going to do these every week or every other week?

EMILY: Thank you for raising that, Cathy. I was proposing that initially we meet weekly. If we're getting way ahead of ourselves on our work program, then we can review the frequency, that would be my proposal. Okay, just looking at the draft action items from last Thursday, or the 15th of March, I don't want to work through each and every one of these, does anybody want to make any comment on the draft action items or anything that they feel has been missed?

Okay, I'm not hearing or seeing anything. Some suggestions appeared on the chat, that we cancel the call if you don't have an agenda 24 hours in advance, and I think that is a very sound suggestion, it was something that we discussed at our meeting, and particularly for those people who are going to be getting up very early or staying up very late, and that seems to have a high level of support in the chat room.

Thank you staff for actioning the item with the draft action items that were asked for. These are mainly informational, circulating slide deck, adding material to the Wiki, for those who haven't familiarized themselves with the Wiki, that is a great source, and one that we will be working through a lot during the coming months. You will remember that we had some discussion over definitions, this is going to be very relevant to our work, defining our work program, so thank you for doing that. Circulating names, contact information to vendors that we heard from. That was done. And also the CDR study report which we heard

about in very short form at our face to face meeting. We have the fact sheet sample and schedule. The time zone mapping we've been looking at to our heart's content.

And then there is the summary of types of requests for assistance that receive in community. I noticed that there is a TBD on that. Would anybody from staff like to speak to that point? Okay, if I don't see anything, can I just propose that we thank staff for actioning those and that we look forward to an update. Steve, you wanted to comment on that point?

STEVE CONTE: Yes, we were looking at the items and I then the commissioned John Crane. My understanding is that he will be compiling, we didn't have a report written already for this, so he is compiling a list of the various requests that have come in, and will be submitting that within a reasonable amount of time.

EMILY: Thank you, understood. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Could you please add to the list the outstanding items from SSR1 review team implementation list? One of our core mandates, the implementation of the SSR1 review, and to make sure that we keep an eye on completion of the outstanding items.

EMILY: Thank you, I think that was quite hard to hear what you just said, but you were asking for the SSR1 action items to be added, and also I think we have asked for some sort of interaction with the SSR1 team members. I recall that from the meeting that we had. Could I ask for that to be added as well?

KAREN MULBERRY: This is Karen, can I clarify? You would like us to arrange a meeting with the staff and the SSR1 team members that supported that effort?

EMILY: It was to – to clarify my request – I think that we wanted to meet with either a call or in person with anyone who is still around from the SSR1, to get some sort of feedback from them about how they feel implementation has gone.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you. We can reach out to them and maybe coordinate with the leadership team on a call that they could be invited to?

EMILY: That was be fantastic, exactly, yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise, I'm wondering if we could just hold off on staff action on SSR1. I think there are a few items if you scroll for the co-chairs to discuss and also to come back to the team on, in terms of how we're

sequencing these events. I think depending on when we can get the items in SSR1, implementation has not been completed, how quickly those can be completed, so we have a full and comprehensive implementation report to review, and then discuss with the SSR1. I think that probably would be ideal. So, if I may suggest, I think it would be good to discuss this off line a little bit further before we take action on SSR1 contacts.

EMILY: That sounds very reasonable, I'm very happy to do that. I just wanted to note it at this stage, it doesn't have to be done immediately. In the interest of time, I would like to just move onto the next slide. The scope of work and work plan. We do need to prepare a response to the Board regarding the due date. You will recall that the Board has asked us to provide them with a work plan by the 30th of this month. Unless some miracle happens, we're going to get to that deadline. So we are asked in this slide to just discuss the ways of working in terms of preparing or terms of reference, work plan, and the scope.

And for those of you who can't see the slide, the alternatives for each of these is either to have a specific call where we try to get to the answer together, that's number one. Number two would be a small group of volunteers on the brainstorming output. Then the third option would be to start to prepare a straw man.   Matogoro you have your hand raised, is that just a remnant from earlier?   [AUDIO BREAK] I'm not hearing anything. James, please go ahead.

JAMES GANNON:	Thanks Emily, so obviously these are items that I think the co-chairs will end up discussing as well, but my two cents on this is for the terms of reference, I think having staff prepare a straw man and bring it back to us, and for us to then tweak and flesh out to what we need is probably a good option, and the work plan, and I think before we define the work plan, we need to still define our scope of work. So I think that may be something that may need to come after our scoping, or maybe in conjunction with and in parallel with it, but I think that is problem something that we can look at probably pushing out with a small group of volunteers leading it and then bringing it back to the plenary as well.
	Also, I think on these two items, because they are related to the board resolution, I think maybe we should say to Kaveh as our board liaison, we will probably not meet the 30th on that and for him to transmit back to the board that we are currently working on it, we are actually doing the work, but we will probably not meet the 30th deadline.
EMILY:	Thank you for that. I'm just seeing on the that, people are liking your suggestion about asking staff to draft terms of reference. There is one comment that scope should probably come first. Kaveh, did you have your hand raised?
KAVEH RANJBAR:	Yes, I was typing that sure, I can do that. I can bring that message back to the board.

EMILY: Much appreciated. May I suggest, I think we still have one call before the end of this month, and it might be ideal if at that stage we felt that we could offer another deadline that we think we can meet for the draft, if we could be agreeable to that, rather than just saying we're working on it, we aren't going to make the deadline, which you definitely do need to do, but to have some positive commitment about when we think we will do it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Emily, this is Kerry-Ann. I agree with your last suggestion, I also agree with James' suggestion. I think given that there has been a lot of dialogue about the email chats concerning what our scope should be, a small group of volunteers looking at all the information that staff has provided and the various exchanges we've had, and actually doing an analysis and propose a true way forward in terms of scope, taking into account other views we've heard expressed at the face to face and on the emails, and keeping in mind that we are doing an interpretation exercised based on the recent transition process. So I think it would be useful to approach it that way.

EMILY: Thank you very much, I appreciate that. Geoff, you wanted to make a comment, please go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes, I do, three comments. One, firstly, externally imposed deadlines are sort internally imposed or self imposed deadlines seem somewhat

pointless. I would hesitate to say any more to the board other than haven't got a particular terms of reference or work plan at the time, we are working on it, and don't say more than you have to say.

In terms of the approach, I still think James kind of hit the nail on the head in terms of getting staff to do the terms of reference first, and then reviewing it. I appreciate that in my role here, I am a rank amateur. I don't live the life that staff live in terms of topic space, and I would be keen to understand their insights, because this is their job, in terms of what they see and how they interpret this, and then basically push this back to the team saying, well, how do we define that particular proposal in terms of terms of reference.

Otherwise, I think if we sort of leave it to us, the boil the ocean component will quickly dominate and you will find the terms of reference which is unworkable. At that point I think we'll all give up and go home. So I strongly prefer to have some focus at the outset to make sure we don't go wandering off into the weeds. Thanks.

EMILY: Thank you for that Geoff. Does anybody else want to comment? Thanks for the time check. We have 13 minutes left on the call. So we're hearing that we'd like to see a straw man prepared from staff. Is that both for the terms reference and for the work plan? I think those will get us started. It's easier to react to something than it is to create it out of thin air.

I don't see any objections to that, but I also note in the chat room that several people are mentioning that the scope and Kerry-Ann also

mentioned this, is something that we'll probably need a group of people to really hammer it out. It's going to be quite difficult for us.

I take your point Geoff, about boiling the ocean, having something not discussion and agreed with the team as a whole, is going to likely prove problematic later down the line. So I think, can we ask staff to prepare a straw man for the next meeting on both of those? Unless I've got the wrong end of the stick, or if I misunderstood. Geoff, did you have your hand raised again?

GEOFF HUSTON: Sorry, no.

EMILY: Okay, Denise saying agree to have staff straw man, but want to reinforce the importance of team members using email and conference calls to flesh out and finalize.   Noted, well noted. Okay. I'm going to move on in the interest of time, if I may.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Emily this is Bernie. Sorry, just trying to capture the action items properly. I have staff contribute a straw man for terms of reference. I just want to make sure the second part I'm still a little fuzzy on. So if you could clarify that for me, that would be greatly appreciated.

EMILY: Thank you very much and apologies for not being clearer. Yes, please, I think we are asking staff to prepare a straw man for both, in terms of reference and work plan. There is a plea from Denise on the list for all team members to really engage with this and to turn their minds particularly to the substantive issue the scope. This is a draft outline in terms of reference. I'm not going to dwell on that unless anybody has comments.

Okay, moving on to the next slide 7. We had some discussion on the role of observers at the face to face meeting, and I think, for those who are not looking at the Adobe, we have the ability to have observers, staff has already invited those who applied to the team but weren't selected to be an observer. There is a separate email list. We have been asked for our views on the role of observers and how we get their feedback and input.

There are three options here. Should they be given a time on the RT agenda to speak? How would be like to think of their input, and should be sections which are closed to observers? Matagoro, I'm assuming that your hand is just raised as a sort of remnant, so I'm going to go to Denise, and then James, please.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you Emily. In my view, I think that whenever we're seeking key input or posting things for public comment, I think it would be important, in addition, email the observer list, to call their attention to that, and invite their comments, and starting out , and also like the

observers to use the SSR team email address to provide any ongoing input that they may have, and of course follow our work on the Wiki.

Then separate from that, I would recommend not inviting additional people to speak on our conference calls. I think it's going to be challenging to get our work done and stay on task just with the team members speaking. But again, if we provide ample opportunity to provide input online and of course at our public meetings, that would be sufficient for the observers, and in terms of review of team sessions closed to observers, I would recommend that our default conference call and meeting protocols are that we have open meetings, and then if the review team finds itself at a point where we need to review confidential information and we feel the need to close a meeting, then we can take that decision at that time. Thank you.

EMILY: Thank you very much Denise. James, you had something?

JAMES GANNON: Thanks Emily, yes, I'm broadly in agreement with Denise. One potential thing that we spoke about in Copenhagen as well was potentially some of the subteams may want to reach out when we have our subteam, may want to reach out to some of the specific experts that are looked up and have signed up as observers. Potentially, if it wasn't too much work for staff, a quick whole of the experience of the observer what areas that they have specific expertise in might be useful for us when we move into the more detailed and narrower work.

Then we might be able to write to the observer specifically asking them for potential input. I'm thinking we have some people here on the observer list that I know, I'd certainly like to have the option of being to engage formerly in writing, as some of this will prove work. So if that was an option, that would be good.

EMILY: Thank you very much, both of you. Does anybody else have any strong feelings about this? Alright, I'm not seeing any other hands raised on this so can we initially go with the proposal I'm hearing, which, to summarize, would be that we reach to observers at every point where we are asking for community input, that the observers be given an opportunity obviously to attend, but also to speak at face to face meetings at particular slots. The position would be that our sessions are open but we have the option in exceptional circumstances to have closed sessions, too.

Lastly, to say that the subgroups may well want to engage with observers and James' request that staff provide summary of the expertise available within the observers. Okay, I hope I've captured that correctly. Just in the last three minutes, additional information, that is the board resolution, asking for the work plan in terms of reference by the 30th. So unless there is any other business, does anybody else want to make any observations or comment on anything that we have discussed or not discussed?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, Emily, if I can, this is Karen.

EMILY: Please.

KAREN MULBERRY: I just wanted to let you know that straw man from staff probably will not be available by your call next Tuesday.

EMILY: Thank you for that.

KAREN MULBERRY: We will let you know as soon as we get ourselves together and figure out how we want to approach this, when we can have it in your hands, but just wanted an expectation that it will not be next Tuesday, it will probably be your following call, whenever you determine that you're going to schedule that.

EMILY: Many thanks. Can I just say that I think the comment that Eric and Denise made at the beginning of the call, that the three of us would like to have a call just in order to sort of orientate and perhaps to try to get some shape and planning started. So that was another thing to note. Okay, with that, is there anything else from anyone, either staff or members? In that case I will close this call. Thank you to all of you for attending. Denise, please go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: I was just going to note, Eric, for my co-chairs, I'll follow up with a couple of suggested times and a bridge for our call.

ERIC OSTERWELL: Sounds great, thank you.

EMILY: Thank you. And Boban, just a final thing to say, yes, good suggestion. One of the agenda items should be to discuss face to face meetings. We will be forwarding an agenda in advance. Thank you very much. Good evening to you, good morning, good afternoon, and look forward to our next call. Thanks everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]