EN

CCWG-DIVERSITY SUBGROUP MEETING
Thursday, January 25, 2018 – 13:00-14:00

>> FIONA ASONGA: Today's agenda, is displayed. Thank you everybody for joining us. For today's call which is the [indiscernible]

2018. Starting UTC. We will start with the roll call.

And anyone who has dialed in and has not given their name, kindly do on so.

Staff kindly confirm when you have completed the roll call.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think we are good to go.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you Bernard. We can proceed.

>> SEBASTIEN: This is Sebastien, I'm by telephone.

This is Sebastien I'm using my phone today.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much, Sebastien.

Anyone else on the call who has not yet identified themselves?

Okay, now we move on. Bernard, kindly put up the revised staff summary document. The document you have documented.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: There's some minor modification to the document I circulated. I have now included row numbers. Under the second column. So you will notice that we have 101, 102, 103. Just to make it easier for everyone to follow. This seems to work well in all of the other groups. Because depending on format you use, page numbers can change. This way we have unique row numbers. Thank you, back to you.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much Bernard for clarifying that.

And I hope that we have all had an opportunity to go through the rive recommendations. I agree during our last call we agreed to set up this meeting with a review of the comments on the recommendations first.

EN

Then proceed to all the other issues that have been raised.

Bernard, your hand is up.

Thank you.

So then we can proceed.

With comments regarding recommendations and defining the 7 key elements of diversity.

And the first comment is from the GNSO-IPC.

The IPC notes it's support for recommendation 1 enhancing diversity through each of the 7 key elements discussed in the draft is essential to the success of ICANN.

They are in support of the 7 key elements.

Comment 2, still on the same. From the N -- the GNSO, NCSG. And their comment is that the NCSG affirms the 7 key elements of diversity. As identified by the subgroup, agency being the best line for all of the diversity considerations within ICANN. However, we would like to be clear this is the baseline and not the exhaustive list. And with the passage of time, there should be a clear mechanism in place to extend, modify and update this set of criteria.

Indeed it is far from apparent that this list is even adequate today, with obvious elements of diversity absent. For instance sexual orientation or ideology or religion.

To update the criteria the self identification of communities could be contemplates plated, self identification allows one to identify the need to different the community based on an element not listed in the baseline, and such aspects that could be temporary or strategic for instance refugees, indigenous people among others.

Further discussion is required on how to weaken sure that the common framework is diversity is one that which remains fit for push purpose.

In order to ensure the contribute of the language, identified by the subgroup as a key element of diversity, is represented in ICANN we encourage the use of translation and interpretation into the UN language as much as possible. At present, this happens consistently for the GAC and ALAC meetings. The public forum and some board meetings, however there's a need for translation interpretation in

EN

other meetings as well. And that there is not currently a perceived need for these services is not a reflection on the lack of diversity a sign there is no need at all for language assistance.

Any comments on that? Comments? Any views on that?

The position presented by the GNSO -- NCSG.

Sebastien I would like to take the floor, Sebastien would like to speak.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Please proceed Sebastien.

>> SEBASTIEN: Yes, thank you very much   Sebastien speaking. I think it's a very important element in this comment from the GNSO. But, this is contradicting the last proposition made by the staff. So we have to see, in the CCWG framework, we can take that into account.

Thank you.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much Sebastien. Any other comments?

I think on the whole we had quite an extensive discussion on the language. And the issues of translation interpretation and we are encouraging ICANN to accommodate them as much as possible. And I sort of feel that we have not -- the fact that the different ACs and SOs in some cases have not asked for the translation doesn't necessarily mean they don't need, or there is passive, a lack of need for the translation. So I sort of personally think that it's important for it to be really clarified. Whether there has been groups that asked for the translation and been told no, it's not needed. Or from staff, what has been maybe if staff could check and just advise on this. This comments, what happens in our group, a group that has not normally had translation, asked for translation? How fast can that be addressed? Because I think since the advent of the discussion in the diversity, I have been trying to make a lot of adjustments as we have been moving along to accommodate especially in issues of language diversity and the request for that. Has that changed significantly Bernard?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: [indiscernible] I don't know if it's changed significantly, I think it's probably the language services is equipped to provide a variety of services quite quickly. I think one of the key questions unfortunately remains a budget thing. So if within a budget, an SO or AC tried or requests translation and uses it's funding to do that, then it can be provided quite easily.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Okay thank you very much for that clarification.

EN

So, I think Julie Hammer I can see your hand up.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Yes. Yes, I just wanted to make a general remark on issues such as language that have been mentioned by a couple of different groups. It's a particular element of diversity that we had identified, but all of our recommendations are all general recommendations about the whole fit of diversity elements. And now we have made comments about supporting you know greater support for language and translation services. With as best I can is able within -- ICANN is able within its budget.

My comment is that is the appropriate way to express our views on that. That is the comment within our text, which we have done, but we -- I don't want we should start singling out particular elements of die e diversity for individual recommendations. I think the way we have framed our recommendations all about   being the fit and we have said that it's not an exhaustive set, so we have covered some of those comments.

I think we should stick to that. While we might note and not necessarily disagree with what has been said, I'm not sure what we need to in this particular instance or any other similar instances alter our report and introduce new specific recommendations.

Thank you Fiona.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much Julie. I see Cheryl agrees with you. Rafik?

>> RAFIK: Okay, thanks, maybe being familiar with this comment, maybe I can add more or elaborate. I guess the focus not yet about the language in itself. But here's it's emphasizing that maybe it needs more support in terms of translation and interpretation. That's existing. But I guess it's to explain it to all SOs and ACs.

I think we emphasize maybe we can add more to that. And regarding providing the resources to support that. But I think the main may be elements in this comment is about the self identification. I think some express concern that even we try to do our best to this seven key elements of diversity. It's possible that it's not exhaustive and maybe to provide a mechanism that we can add more in the future to that kind of -- I'm not going to appear to be more granular but in the way that people can still identify other aspects they see is important. So I'm not sure how we can handle that. Our recommendation may be something that translation to be add in a way to show that diversity is diverse. That the elements of diversity is diverse. So I think that's important to justify that.

EN

>> FIONA ASONGA: Okay. Thank you very much for that. I believe that one of other recommendations is to allow groups to identify of diversity. That very important to them. And so, within that I think we do capture their ability to accommodate other elements of diversity that you may not have factored in. And the issue of self identification then becomes a question of when and where that is required within the ICANN processes.

So, then it's something to note. So that as different documents are proved they are just a room for self identification. Because our recommendation too, does allow for diversity elements from the SO and ACs to [indiscernible] eventually [indiscernible] group on diversity and the results.

Are [indiscernible] identified by the [indiscernible] SOs and ACs.

We move on to the next.

Next is GNSO, talk about the language within recommendation No. 1 seems to apply to points of formal acceptance of the key elements of diversity by the different SO/AC/Groups. The RySG suggests amending the language in line with the other recommendations to the SO/AC groups should great. That's not so clear. Is there something missing.

Rafik your hand is still up?

Julie?

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Fiona. What I think we have missing here is the word should. All of the other recommendations we say each SO I see groups should identify, should under take, should use within recommendation 1 we said SO/AC agree that the 7 key elements. So we are suggesting we should put in the word "should" and I think that's a good suggestion and we should do that.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Okay. Thanks I actually had that has been [indiscernible] now that you explained it, it's very clear. Thank you.

>> JULIE HAMMER: No problem.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Okay. The next comment.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, I propose that the group except that and we make that change to our report Fiona.

EN

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you. Anyone opposed to as making that adjustment?

I see there's that agree. So we will accommodate.

Say adjustment proposed by the register stakeholders group.

The next comment is a comment and argument from the government of France yes.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: For the transcript it makes it a lot easier for tracking things if you read the rule number before starting the comment please.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Sorry?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Could you please the read the rule number before starting to comment? 1.03, 1.04, etc. It makes it a lot easier for tracking in the transcript.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Okay. Because I'm actually reading it from the beginning. And starting with the group that has provided the comment, then the row number.

 Okay.

I seem to have control of the document in Adobe. Yeah.

So the next meant and from the government of France. 1.04 recommendation. On defining the 7 key elements. Of diversity.

And it is in support of what you had provided unless someone has a -- something to add? Or is opposed or any comments, then I suggest we move on. I'd like to pay more attention to comments that do not fully support or are in disagreement. That fully supports our position. So I'd like to move on.

Comment 1.05. Defining the 7 key elements from the government of India.

And it reads, recommendation No. 1 and 2 although it has stated that SO/AC/Groups agree with the 7 elements of diversity can be used for the common starting points for all diversity considerations within ICANN the following aspects also additionally be taken into account.

Race, ethnicity.

EN

It's imperative to ebb sure diversity in SO/AC/Groups. While speaking in diversity the importance of geographic diversity cannot be over stated much therefore it's strongly recommended that geographies, crows, where the largest number of I went net users come from should be provided with voting rights and membership proportionate to the legions of Internet users they seek to represent. Furthermore, each SO/AC must ensure equitable representation from each geography in pro position to the number of Internet users that they represent. [Long response please, see document for complete text] that is a comment from staff that we put in brackets. But the summary of the long comments is what has been presented. In the spreadsheet.

Cheryl, I can see your hand is up, please share your views.

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: The thank you, for Fiona. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. This aspect that the government of India has brought up in terms of desirability for some form of proportionality is in my view force with danger, very difficult if not near impossible to successfully implement. It's in fact an ideal method if one wish to try to implement. And I greater agree it not be attempted especially in a model, a multi-stakeholder model of ICANN. That would be the antithesis of the benefits of diversity for any form of minority and minority representation. And in my view would be, should we see any reason to go with what I think is a fantastical folly, would be a great way of insuring that the complexity of the thing is so much administratively laden and subject to debate and discussion, that they would be no opportunity to any of the other key elements beyond the geography, rate and ethnicity to be dealt with. I think we note this courteously and we ignore it. It's inappropriate to try to a put proportionality into a multi-stakeholder model that seeks to allow a greater ability for minority is and emerging voice to be fairly represented.

Thank you.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much Cheryl. I couldn't have put that any better. I will ask Rafik to take the floor.

>> RAFIK: So thank you. Yes. Yes sorry. So thanks Fiona and for the comments. But I do support that.

So the concern here is that it's a problem of service. I mean if we give like, we start thinking that some groups are more important than others, just by matter of number, it's not fair anymore and we kind of creatinine balance in the multi-stakeholder model that we are trying to define here. I may be biased because I'm coming from kind of a small country in terms of population. We are just 12 million. In terms of users. It means we can is not be represented.

EN

And as Cheryl was saying, it's kind of what will be denial for minority to be represented. So would kind of be a dictatorship of majority if you have great numbers you should be able to for that reason only.

So, I think we cannot have this because it's the emphasis of the diversity in fact. We are trying by the different elements to ensure that we have different groups represented and to bring with that the, I cannot find other feeling for diversity but to bring different point of view or interests and so on. And that if we go to give more weight to just number, that will decrease any element of disaster we trying to define here.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you Rafik for that. And Renata.

>> RENATA AQINO RIBEIRO: I agree Cheryl and Rafik, about region and representation. I think it's not the proportionality aspect of it. It's not about, for example, Beijing or China, one of the large effort populated countries in Asia doesn't mean that for example countries, smaller countries in Asia shouldn't be represented. But, I also see another side to this. Which is the importance of stating under represented regions and the rural areas. So I think it's solution to this is selecting cities, information. So if you see the representation in Brazil has on international organizations. If you find out that from where the people come from, you will find out that most of the people come from region that is empowered by the largest city. So the great effort majority is not represented.

So there are some situations where you want to know where is -- where are these representatives from. And who are they for? But, I would come back to the point of levels of identification for different purposes. So this is the strategic purposes -- purpose. When you want to find out the whole country representative. For example, discussing rural regions then you can collect that.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much for that. Bringing an interesting as expect. Sebastien?

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you very much. Sebastien on the -- take the floor. I was very interested in what I heard earlier. And I want to make sure that we understand what is under the comment of the government of India. Maybe they could not anticipate the governor of India to our next phone conference and we know more about their comment. I think that the issue of diversity, if we want to be fully diverse all the nations of the world should participate. It's just not possible.

We need representation of people and that is why it is so important to implement what working group is proposing as elements of diversity. This is the end of the process? No. We are not finished. That is why certain members of the group are not in agreement. Maybe observatory of diversity is needed in

EN

the future. Let's put that aside and said that it's very important to understand that what we do now is just one step, a couple of step, this the not the end of the process. Thank you.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you Sebastien. Cheryl your hand is up.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Fiona. Cheryl for the record. Yes it is up again. I put up a red X while Sebastien was proposing looking at this particular comment from the Indian government in excruciating and gory detail with them as a focal point in a future meeting. Because we just don't have the time for this. And to do that. And it would also not be a way of treating any of -- of all of the comments equitably. One dissenting voice, even if it does come from the government of India suggesting we make a radical change to some of our recommendations. I don't think, even if we thought it desirable, I don't believe it is actually desirable from an equity point of view. But we simply wouldn't be able to make our he had lines, it's not possible.

As it is, I currently fear for the progress we are making in the way we are working through this. That we will make any deadlines anyway. And of course, what happens if we don't make our deadlines in terms of having any changes of recommendations fully discussed consensus about that made and final text ready to go in the file report? None of our recommendations would be making it into our final report. And I think that would be a very sad and disappointing thing. So I'm keen to recognize when there's yellow and red. And see whether or not we survive brief discussion many we need to make any changes in our consensus future. Any of our recommendations when there is yellow and red. But I think we need to pick up the pace and we certainly don't have the time or the luxury of kowtowing to any of the commenters. From wherever they come. So, even if desirable to do it, we certainly couldn't do it. But we do need the pick up the pace as well, thank you.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much Cheryl for putting that out there very clearly. And initially my idea was to pick the red and yellow. In reality some of the green, the light green comes with some issues that may not be quite agreeable. And if it would help but certainly everyone has read through the comments so come with the comments then I don't need to read through it again it would help. We just get into a discussion and raise hands up if anyone has an issue with a comment. That can help us move. But at the end of every equation on issue recommendation, I wanted us to agree on whether we are changing that recommendation or not. Then we first deal with that. And then once we are done with which recommendation we change, which ones do not change, we will revisit the issue of responsive to all the comments later so that then we will be dealing with all of the comments at the same time -- in the same manner and equally for all of the participants will have responded.

EN

Is there anyone opposed to that approach?

Can that be -- I'd love to continue but my Adobe will not show me the comments anymore.

And the document I have doesn't have the number. So you will bear with me.

Still on the issue of the recommendation 1 defining the 7 key elements of the diversity.

It's global organizations are document I have is not numbered Bernard so bear with me.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's from ICANN it's number 106.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you. So, 1.06.

The ICANN board sets that the global organization diversity is important to the ICANN board and ICANN organization and as such we support these recommendations as written. However, with regard to these recommendations, it is important to note the following elements specific to the board and ICANN organization.

Why is this light green?

Because I think it's in support?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: I believe we had this one green because of the however.

>> FIONA ASOGNA: Okay thank you but I think it's in support. Because they are just trying to emphasize. This is to emphasize the importance of the elements you have listed to the board and ICANN.

They acknowledge that they are important. So I don't think that meant that there's a disagreement. So I'll move on.

Unless there's a comment on that? Okay. So I move on to the next comment.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: 7 thank you.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Yes? 1.07 yes.

EN

>> FIONA ASONGA: This is from the Work Stream 2 recommendation but the diversity should be defined using employed as a common starting point for all different e diversity considerations within irk can.

And currently the 7 elements as identified in the draft report as geographical region representation language, gender, age, physical ability and diverse skills in groups and across -- INT supports the concepts of identifying key elements the elements themselves are include such factors that should be considered. Specifically, INTA not the execution of ethnicity, race/national origin, minorities [as applied to a particular geographic representation and groups. For example, there may be certain people in a country for example New Zealand who are considered under represented in that country based on their race or ethnicity. However, the under the factors as set forth in the draft diversity report such person would not be considered as diverse and under the definition of diversity as they would not fit within the 7en you'll rated categories. Any comment on that? Yes, Julie?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: [indiscernible]

>> FIONA ASONGA: Hello Julie? We can't hear you.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Fiona. I think this is another example of where we have [indiscernible]

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Can you hear me.

>> FIONA ASONGA: I heard you.

For those [indiscernible] this is another example of a comment with examples that are covered. So, there is no issue. That we need to address.

So then we move on. I will skip 1.08.

Sorry, we -- that's 1.08 is a different set of recommendation. So we look at those comments that have come through on recommendation 1. Of our reports are recommendation 1 we have agreed that to have an adjustment of is if should. So reading it, we will now read recommendation 1, SO and ACs and groups should read that the element of divert that the comments in point for all of the support in ICANN we have listed geographic representation, language, gender, age, physical disability, diverse skills they call that group of constituency. And we are in agreement that we will proceed with those. We do recognize the input of, from the comments of elements that have been left out. In our previous call we

EN

did have a conversation on the elements we discussed some of them that have been mentioned like sexual orientation, such as ethnicity. Minority groups, we did look into all that. And we figured, we did figure out that these 7 would be the -- our best starting point on the elements of diversity.

If anyone strongly feels that we need to accommodate other elements, of diversity, I will be -- I would like to give you a opportunity to share your views. If we are in agreement, that the 7 are a good starting point, and therefore the recommendation can says is we are going to have may be another two readings and discussions on this. But this is going to be our first opportunity to say for now, that recommendation is okay.

If anyone is a you posed to us reading the recommendation as it is, let us know.

Anyone opposed to changing the recommendation? I mean to us leaving the recommendation as is?

That means we are not going the change it. We are leaving it as is. Anyone opposed to that?

The only thing we are going to add in is the "should" yes that's why I read it should agree. I read it adding in the should agree.

I think for now, this recommendation passes. It remains as is.

We have got about 12 minutes. So the end of our call, let's look at the next set of comments.

Recommendation 2.

Focusing mainly on the comments in the contentious issues in the light agreement that are not in agreement and then the red and   the yellow.

So that puts us to 1.09.

Because 1.08 is in agreement.

So, 1.09.

From the GNSO and SC identification of elements of diversity. Where they say a closer community every SO and SA should be committed to upholding ICANN diversity and that the policies and practices. Accordingly it is our strongly held view that all SO and ACs must address all if identified key elements of diversity. There's no justifiable reason for a chapter to consider some criteria but not others.

EN

What did our recommendation to agree which SO and AC groups to diversity is monitored in the chapters or ICANN bylaws is and any or elements that are relevant and applicable to each of the levels including leadership, and [indiscernible] publish the results of the exercise on the initial website.

So while NCSG agrees that the groups must consider elements of diversity, they insist that these should be the elements of diversity that we operate as key elements. So those must be considered. And others can be added.

Or is my English interpretation wrong?

Bernard there is nothing on the screen, the comments.

And so, if then -- Julie I see your hand is up. And Cheryl's hand is up. Julie.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Fiona. While I'll agree that each SO and AC should address all of the identified elements of diversity and may indeed address additional ones. That doesn't necessarily mean that they agreed them all to be relevant to their group. We have that knowledge, we have very different groups all across ICANN. We need to recognize the diversity of the constituency and the groups that exist and accommodate that. So if this is saying that every -- that's what I think they are trying to say. That every element of diversity is relevant to every SO and AC, grow agree with that. And I think the way we have framed it is the correct way to deal with it. So I would recommend no change to what we have.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much Julie. Cheryl.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Fiona. I agree absolutely with Julie here. I think we again need to the [indiscernible] input we thank them for the thoughtful concern and consideration on this. And note that we however are not changing our [indiscernible] designed recommendation on our aspects of diversity for consideration by -- as desirable by all of the SOs and ACs.

Because what is being suggested here in this comment is in fact some form of ability to compel. And if we go do you that pathway, it's going to have all sorts of consequences. And effect wide objections of things that are highly desirable. And that some part of ICANN will be better equipped to follow than others. So I see yeah, thanks for your comments, but we looked at this and we are not changing our recommendation. Thanks.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much Cheryl.

EN

Any other comments on that? There being none we would like to quickly move to the next recommendation. And if staff and everyone can allow us another 10 minutes and look at a next recommendations that are not too complicated 1.10.

From the GNSO registry group.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sorry Fiona we are at 2.03 now. Thank you.

>> FIONA ASOGNA: Yes 2.03 yes sorry.

Thank you Bernard.

2.03 in which the registry stakeholder group of the GNSO is asking us to provide, it would be ideal to specify timelines or propose that or a process that defines timelines for SO and AC groups to complete initial assessments, create baselines and then publish the results on the official websites before the data could be used further.

I think what they are proposing is relevant. I see Julie's hand is up. Julie?

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. I think we shouldn't do that. That is implementation issue. And I think that if these recommendations are accepted by the SO and ACs then we start thinking about implementation and timelines and processes. And so on. They transparency subgroup had -- no sorry, SO, AC accountability subgroup had a great many recommendations that similarly impacted SOs and ACs there were no timeline specified there. So I don't think we should go there either. Thank you.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much Julie for that. It's not there's another group also that has got somewhat similar recommendations that require timelines and have been able to work around it. So we will be careful not to get into implementation issues.

Then, we will keep -- there are other comments who will keep 2.04 and move on to 2.05 which is from the Indian government. It looks similar to what we -- on earlier.

It has been stated that SO groups agree on the 7 elements of diversity can be used as a common starting point for all diversity considerations in ICANN. The following aspects or aspects dimensions to be taken into account for diversity. It is imperative to ensure diversity in SO/AC/Groups. While speaking of diversity, the importance of the geographic cannot be over stated therefore it's the strongly recommended that geographies countries where the largest number of Internet users. Come from -- it's exactly the same comment. I propose that we deal with it in the same manner as the previous

EN

comment. Because we cannot force the ACs and SOs to address issues of race and ethnicity. And to align themselves according to populations. When we don't exactly have numbers of all those populations as Ribeiro mentioned earlier. My suggestion. Unless someone is strongly opposed to it I suggest we move on to 2.06.

Which is in yellow.

The summary comment from the staff has been presented as follows. The ICANN board presents three main concerns from this recommendation much recommendation 2. Although it fully supports the diversity of the board it's very limited to what it can do to improve different beyond what is crude independent the bylaws with respect to these. Although fully supports different of staff it's significantly constrained as to what it can do to improve diversity in this area by employment law in the various countries where it's operates. As noted in the privacy concern ICANN maybe significantly constrained as to what information it can collect and keep with respect to the diversity by various privacy laws.

Any comment on that?

Cheryl I see your comment.

Okay.

Any other comments on that? I see none.

So the last comment on recommendation 2, in 2.07, from INTA.

And it is in agreement.

Having gone through those comments, do we need to change our recommendation 2 which reads SOAC group should identify which elements of diversity amended in the charters or ICANN bylaws or any other elements that are relevant and applicable to each of its levels and including leadership in the diversity criteria and publish the results of the exercise on the official websites. Do we need to change that recommendation? Any comments?

There being none, this is a fast read. No changes are required.

To recommendation 2.

EN

With that, and looking at our time, I would like to just take this opportunity to thank you for being on the call. Because if we get into the next discussion I will not be able to make use of them additional time requested from staff. So next call we should continue from recommendation 3.

So unless anyone has any other business, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank you for your participation. Thanks for your comments, your feedback. Please read the comments. Because you are going to emphasize on the red, the yellows. And the light greens.

And I hope that you will all be able to participate in the next level of the discussion which is the next call. Thank you very much. And bye.

Ak

Ak

Ak

Ak

A

K

K

K

K

K

K

EN

K

K

K

K

K