CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Capacity Building webinar on the topic of Policy Comments on Monday, 3 December 2018, at 21:00 UTC.

Our speakers for today are Alan Greenberg and Mary Wong.

We will not be doing a roll call as this is a webinar, but if I could please remind all participants on the phone bridge as well as computers to mute their speakers and microphones when not speaking. Please do not forget to state your name before speaking not only for the transcription purposes but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the different language channels. We have English, Spanish, and French interpretation for this webinar.

Thank you all for joining, and I will leave the floor back to Tijani Ben Jemaa, the chair of the At-Large Capacity Building working group. Over to you, Tijani. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Claudia. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the tenth webinar of the year, and it is about Policy Comments.

You know that each year we make a small survey to collect the topics requested by the community and we add them to all the topics that you asked for during the webinars and we make a selection. And the selection is according to the hot topics in ICANN at that moment and also according to the number of requests for each topic. So this topic

was requested by the community, and that's why we are organizing this webinar about it.

Our two speakers are Alan Greenberg, our former chair and one of the best and the most contributors at At-Large, and Mary Wong who is policy staff. She is one of the high policy staff.

Before giving the floor to Alan, I will give the floor back to the staff to announce some housekeeping items. Claudia?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, Tijani, one second. Okay, thank you very much, Tijani. Let me cover the housekeeping items. For those on Adobe Connect, please take a quick look at the housekeeping presentation displayed now. I'm just going to move to the next slide. We have a question and answer form during this webinar. As you see, it is located on the left-hand side of the Adobe Connect room. If you have any questions, we do encourage you to type them here and they will be directed to the presenter. We will not be having a pop quiz portion for this webinar today, so please type your questions there. That is all for now, and I turn it back over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Claudia. We will start the presentations, and the first one will be Alan Greenberg. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and thank you for inviting me. I'm going to give a very brief introduction, and then we'll turn it over to Mary to talk about the public comment process. Now logically, that should come after I give my full presentation, but Mary has some time limitations so my brief introduction will serve to address essentially the overview of what we're talking about.

What we're talking about today is how At-Large can participate in the various activities. One of the main purposes of At-Large is to give advice and contribute to various policy and other processes within ICANN. We do that in a number of ways, but one of the more important ways we do that is at critical times in every process ICANN issues a statement and asks for comments on it. It will happen when, for instance, there is a report issued by some group or ICANN is looking at doing something on some subject and wants community input before proceeding.

All of those fall under the general auspices of a public comment. And Mary will talk a little bit about how that process works, the timing, and how we get involved. I'll look at both the public comment from an At-Large perspective when I come back plus I'll look at the other ways that we can get involved in the various activities that ICANN does. I'll turn it over to Mary now.

MARY WONG: Thank you so much, Alan, and thanks for your thoughtfulness. And, of course, thanks, Tijani and everybody, for inviting me. Claudia, if we can switch to the slides that I sent you recently, and I apologize for sending it at the last minute.

I do want to say to everyone that these slides are actually pretty minimal because Alan and I did talk about this a little before the weekend and it seems it might be more helpful and I and he were able to answer questions that any of you might have rather than just having our presentations. So just put together a few slides to frame that conversation that hopefully we can have.

I see that I think I've been made a presenter so what I'm going to do actually is, if you don't mind, I'm going to make this a little bigger. I hope people can see it. If you look at just the introductory slides, really I don't think this group needs it. But because we are situating this conversation in the context of the At-Large Advisory Committee and the At-Large community and your role in providing important advice on policy proposals that come before the ICANN board, I thought it might be helpful to just start with a quick reminder and refresher that the role of the advisory committees are different from the roles of the supporting organizations.

In many ways, the advisory committees have a remit that, while limited by the nature of their structures and users in terms of what they can comment on their remits, it can be seen as more broadly ranging than the supporting organizations. The other difference, of course, is that the actual policy development work as Alan mentioned earlier is initiated within one of the three supporting organizations, depending on the policy topic under consideration. So there is a distinct difference between the function of an SO and an AC.

Even within the three supporting organizations – that is the Address Supporting Organization (ASO), the Country Code Names Supporting

Organizations (ccNSO), and of course the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) – these make up the three policy development bodies at ICANN just as the four advisory committees make up the advisory capacity of the ICANN community. But within each of these three SOs, the actual rules and processes for how you initiate a policy development piece of work and how you contribute to it can differ.

This is not the time and the place to go through the differences, but we do have a chart that shows what that might look like at a very, very high level and I've inserted that in this presentation. Then if you want to take a look at it in a more textual form, what my GNSO colleagues very kindly did for a different presentation is to try to summarize those differences that you saw in that visual chart. Thank you very much, Heidi, for putting the link to the infographic in the chat.

Like I mentioned, the remit of each of the three supporting organizations where policy making is concerned or rather the scope of their mission is different, as you see here. Even how they do it is different, as you also see here. This slide concludes with examples of some current global policy work that's being done in each of the three groups.

From experience amongst this community – and I note that besides Alan and Cheryl there are actually quite a few veterans amongst us so please feel free to jump in and add your comments – as well as the fact that the GNSO is the group that is responsible for developing policies relating to generic top-level domain names, that is where much of the actual policy development activity on an ongoing basis does tend to happen. I

think you see it in this slide when you see the current examples at the bottom.

For that and for many other reasons, the GNSO's policy development process tends to be the one that gets the most attention. The GNSO has certainly seen a lot of participation from many members of At-Large in various working groups and, of course, there is also the liaison function between the At-Large and the GNSO that has been built by very many stalwarts of our community and so thank you all very much, some of you are on the call.

But as a result, a lot of the focus when we talk about policy making, policy participation, public comments tends to focus on the GNSO like I said for many good reasons. But it's important to remember that there are periodically policy proposals that come out of the other two supporting organizations as well. When I move on to public comments, you'll see that there is no distinction at that point between whether a policy proposal comes out of the ASO, ccNSO, or GNSO.

And, Cheryl, I think you are right. While I can't comment on a replacement, maybe the word replacement [inaudible], but certainly we have seen quite a lot of the liaisons very, very active from the At-Large and the GNSO, and many of you continue to be very good advisors and mentors to newcomers to all of our communities.

I have a slide here that many of you have seen before. I will not speak to this slide. This is the famous "snake" diagram from the GNSO. But what I will do is highlight to you that at various points in the GNSO policy making process starting from the top on the left all the way down to the

bottom right where the board votes on a policy, approves it, and moves it to implementation, there are various points along this snake or this ladder or this Z, whichever you want to call it, where public and community input is critical.

There's really two parts to this. One of my [briefs] today was to not talk about how you participate in the working group. That is certainly one way you can affect and make policy, but that's not the topic for today. For today, I think it's important to note that besides participating in a working group either as a member or perhaps as an observer as a supporting organization or an advisory committee in this case as a group your input will be solicited by every GNSO working group PDP as a requirement. So it is possible, in fact it is mandatory, for the GNSO to reach out to you as the At-Large community early on in any PDP that they may start. That is a mandatory step in this diagram or process.

But in addition and for the focus of today, at various points it is also either mandated or recommended that public comments be open on certain points and at certain points in the process. This can include the point early on before the GNSO has even started to convene a working group. They're thinking about it. They're thinking about the policy topic. They have decided that the policy topic is within their remit, but how should it be scoped? What should be the main question? What is the best mechanism to get good policy?

They issue something called an Issue Report, and that goes out for public comment. And like I said, at various points, let's say the Issue Report goes out, the GNSO Council takes a look at the comments and says let's start a PDP. Then at that point, as I mentioned earlier, the

input of other SOs and ACs are sought at that early point. But then as the working group proceeds through its deliberations and especially toward the end where they issue an Initial Report contains proposals, recommendations, even questions for the community, that goes out for public comment too.

If you'd like some recent examples, I think it's pretty obvious. The one that may be on most people's minds being the most recent and the most time-sensitive is, of course, the recent Initial Report from the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification [relating to] gTLD Registration Data. That is now open for public comment. Prior to that, the GNSO also had a public comment on its Subsequent Procedures PDP for the next round of new gTLDs. I believe it is in the process of issuing a Supplemental Report concerning some other issues that are being worked on by the group, including on geographic names.

It's important to remember then that you don't have to be a member of a working group to participate. You can participate through formal solicitations of comments from your community, in this case At-Large. You can also participate either as an At-Large group or as an individual or as a group of individuals any time and every time a public comment proceeding is open at various stages in a policy development process. And as I mentioned, there were two recent examples of this, so there are quite a lot of public comment opportunities at any one point in time. I do have some links at the back of this presentation where you can check what those are.

Then actually finally here, I thought it would be helpful, Tijani, as you mentioned, to give a brief outline of what it means when we say public comment proceedings. I think it's really important to remember that one very big reason why we have so many opportunities for public comment, why we don't have a restriction on who can make a public comment – you can be an individual, you can represent a group, you can be a member of a supporting organization or an advisory committee and you don't have to – is because this all goes back to the need for accountability and transparency in ICANN's policy work.

Within that framework, who can launch an ICANN public comment forum? Often the misconception is that there are public comment proceedings only when there is a policy proposal on the table, usually the GNSO. That is true that when there is a policy proposal on the table prior to any approval by the relevant council and certainly prior to the board taking formal action, there is a public comment forum as I've described. But it's also important to remember that there are other forms of public comments, if I use the term very generally, including comments that may be solicited by ICANN organization itself.

An example here that I will give is our Global Domains Division. They work with all our contracted parties, such as the registries and the registrars. They are in charge of all implementation and operational questions in the gTLD space. So they would often open a public comment forum on maybe a proposed method of implementation of an adopted policy. They could also open a public comment proceeding if they are going to change the process by which they engage with registries and registrars.

The point here is that while we tend to think of public comments as only relating to GNSO policy proposals, that is not the case. And you'll see that if you go through our public comment pages. This also means, of course, that there are lots of public comment opportunities. So it really is a question for each group or individual to see when an issue comes up for public comment that is of interest to you or your group and then decide if you want to put in a public comment.

One thing I didn't say in this slide but it's so obvious actually – and I know, Alan, you and others who have participated will back me up on this – that every public comment is actually collated and whichever group is responsible for soliciting those comments in the first place is obligated to review the comments received. The comments received quite often range from very brief comments, it could be something like an e-mail where a person just says I agree what's being proposed is a good thing, to very substantive and voluminous arguments for or against the policy. But all are [inaudible] and logged and certainly reviewed carefully.

What this means is that there is a period of time that the public comment forum is open. I put here that typically if is 40 days minimum. What many of you have seen is that more often than not the 40 days is extended. This is usually done by the group that's initiating that proceeding because they want to give the community more time to reflect on the questions and the recommendations and so, therefore, getting more input rather than less. In exceptional circumstances, they're sometimes shorter and there are certain types of proceedings that under the ICANN bylaws do not have to be 40 days. But each public

comment proceeding when it's published will indicate very clearly when it is going to be closed.

After it's closed, the staff that ran that forum is obligated to publish a summary report. I put in here typically it's 14 days. So it's actually a very simple proceeding. It's actually quite consistent across all kinds of proposals that are soliciting public comments.

The last thing I want to end before handing it back to Alan and Tijani or taking questions which I really like, is to say that there are rules for submitting a public comment. There are no rules for who can submit, but once you do decide to submit I note here that it means that your submission must comply with the expected standards of behavior amongst the community which all of you are familiar with.

And your participation is also subject to our website terms of service, and I put the links in here. This is because, again going back to accountability and transparency, all comments submitted are published. For those of you who have sent in public comments, you'll see that actually you're informed of this before you actually hit send. The commentator's name and, if it's provided, the affiliation is also published. This is a very important component of public comment, and I thought I would highlight it for everyone.

But other than that, it's a very simple proceeding, and it's intentionally so because the idea is to encourage more rather than less community input. On that note, I think I've talked enough. Alan, Tijani, back to both of you and however you want to run the rest of this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Mary, how long can you stay with us?

MARY WONG: I'm around for another 30 minutes, actually.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then let's go on to my presentation. It shouldn't take 30 minutes. Then we'll open up for questions.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now a lot of what Mary has talked about is also in my presentation, so I'll gloss over some parts of it. It's inevitable these two processes are so intertwined that it's hard to have something that's completely unique and separate them out. If we can go on to Slide 2, please. Oh, I see I have control. Thank you.

The purpose of At-Large is to represent the interests of Internet users within ICANN. Now if you go into the ICANN bylaws, the clause governing us is pretty clear. It says the role of At-Large "shall be to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN, insofar as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users. This includes policies

created through ICANN's Supporting Organizations, as well as the many other issues for which community input and advice is appropriate."

So our scope is unlike, for instance, a group within the GNSO which is related just to gTLDs. Our scope is anything that has to do with ICANN. You'll note the two keywords. We provide "advice" and we do things for which community "input and advice" is appropriate. That covers all of the kinds of things we'll be talking about.

What we do is we do statements and advice and participate. The term "advice" is a well-defined term within ICANN. We as an advisory committee, the ALAC gives advice and specifically may give it to the board. We may also give it to other parts of the organization. Now no one is bound to follow our advice, but if our advice is good, if we provide rationales for why we are providing our advice, then we have an opportunity to significantly input processes as it goes along. Now typically, we do not provide advice to groups other than the board, and we don't do that all that often. But we do provide statements to other groups on a regular basis and we participate as we go along.

Mary covered a little bit of this. We can join a GNSO working group, a PDP or a non-PDP working group, that is looking at some entity. In most cases, and the expedited PDP on temporary specification on GDPR that we're having now is a rather exceptional one in that there is participation that there is participation that is explicitly identified by the ALAC and only those members may participate actively. Other people may watch, but no one else may participate. But in a typical process within the GNSO it's pretty well open, and anyone who chooses to may participate.

Now that's a good and a bad thing, and there are discussions going on right now saying how do we keep the good parts but keep out the bad parts because anyone participating doesn't necessarily mean you even know anything or that you may be there as a paid lobbyist, for instance. Those are some negative parts of anyone participating, but from an At-Large point of view it's a really strong benefit that we can participate in any of these processes going forward.

But there are also working groups and discussion groups within other parts of ICANN. The ccNSO has them on occasion. There are cross-community working groups. The one on the IANA transition was a key one as was the one on ICANN accountability. There's currently one going on, on how to use the auction proceeds that came out of the last new gTLD process. So there are many different groups that do work within ICANN, and we have an opportunity to participate in many of them. And we have groups within At-Large that shadow those groups. So the Consolidated Policy Working Committee is the one right now that is the main group that looks at what's going on in other policy activities and how do we support the people who are working there. We can draft statements for ALAC consideration or join drafting groups. Somehow we just flipped back to Slide 2. I don't know why.

Now one of the questions that, of course, comes up is how do you participate in these groups if you don't really know anything about the subjects. Well, it's a difficult one because some of these discussions are very, very technical, are very specific to things that most people are not very familiar with. But there are a lot of activities, these kinds of webinars are one of them, that will help people get up to speed, understand what the issues are, and start participating. It does take

time if you want to go attend a monthly meeting or a weekly meeting, but typically what people find out is that by attending a few of the meetings they start getting a good understanding of what's going on and will start slowly participating.

As many of you know, we're in the process of an At-Large review which is going to make a number of changes. One of the key areas that we're looking at is how do we increase participation. What do we do to make sure that more people within the At-Large community have the knowledge, the skills, the background to be able to start work within ICANN? Among the things we'll be looking at is how do we get information out in small little bites, in languages that people can understand, that is both in a semi-nontechnical language so we don't dump all the ICANN acronyms on you and presume you know what they are and at the same time how do we do this in the different languages in the countries where many of our people reside. Most of the ICANN processes are carried out in English but it's certainly helpful, even if you speak English, to have background in your own language. So we're certainly looking at that going forward.

It is only with contributions from a wide number of people that we can be sure that we are actually representing the interests of all of the users.

Before we go to comments, the other thing is advice. We talked a little bit about advice a few minutes ago. Advice is an interesting thing. The ICANN structure creates us as an advisory committee. There was a concept that used to be popular saying, well, if we're an advisory committee, we should give advice and the best place to give advice is to

the board because the board has all the power. But that, in fact, is a rather poor way of doing things because if you look at the GNSO process, for instance, they will develop policy recommendations and go to the board, and the board can accept them or reject them.

But if we're going to give advice saying don't follow the GNSO policy, it's pretty hard for the board to reject it when if they ask the question say, well, did you participate in the process? Did you make sure your views and interests were known early in the game? And if we say no, we just sat around and didn't do anything but now we're giving advice, the chances of that advice being followed is not really strong.

If on the other hand we've participated and still we believe there are things that the GNSO or the ccNSO or whoever didn't get right and we want to give advice to the board, then we are in a position to make a strong case because we did go through all the normal processes and we believe there are still things the board should be aware of and thus we give advice on those.

With that, I'm going to end my presentation and open it up to any questions to both Mary and me. Tijani, would you like me to turn it back over to you for the questions?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you very much, Alan, for this presentation. Thank you, Mary, too. Any questions for our speakers? I don't see hands. If you are not on Adobe Connect, please speak up. It seems that the presentations were very, very clear. Ah, okay, Mary has her hand up, so Mary [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, Mary can ask a question and then I'll ask a question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Okay, Mary.

MARY WONG: Actually, I wasn't going to ask a question, although it might be quite interesting if I tried to ask myself a question and I can't answer it. But, Alan, I think that was really, really clear. What I wanted to just follow up on in your presentation was I think it was Slide 7 when you talked about how to get up to speed. I think we all recognize that it can be very difficult for various participants as volunteers whether it's a language issue, bandwidth time, day job, etc., those are all very real challenges.

But the bullet points [here certainly] give you a very good sense of what is available. So I just wanted to follow up to say that certainly within the At-Large community you have capacity building webinars, you have different spaces within your RALOs, and you have interactions on a regional basis with the different regional teams from ICANN.

So what we are doing internally in the organization is to look at better ways that we can communicate information to the community not just about where to find information but about what webinars are coming up, where to find the briefings, who to ask for what. And to the extent that, for example, after every ICANN meeting there's an event called an ICANN readout that happens in certain regions, how do we coordinate all that so that we ensure that all along throughout the calendar year

that the information that users are interested in is not just available but that you know where it is and that it can come to you rather than you having to dig for it?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Mary. [Alan, please?]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Mary. I realize there's something I didn't cover and that specifically is on public comments what is the At-Large process for how do we answer these public comments. Mary talked a lot about how they come about, but the process within At-Large is also interesting and it's something that's evolving.

In general, the process is first we need to decide is this a public comment that we need to respond to. In many cases, we feel that there is no unique At-Large perspective and we don't really need to weigh in on everything. So a significant number of public comments that come out, we look at them and say we're not going to answer. We're not going to respond.

But ones where we feel we do have something that is important to contribute, the process is we first of all announce that, that we are looking for input. And typically a wiki space is set up, and anyone who has any interest in it can put comments on the wiki. So they can talk about how they would respond to the particular questions if there are questions or just give any background they feel is appropriate.

At-Large identifies one or two people typically who will draft a statement. They will use the input that is on that, that people contribute to the wiki, plus their own information to draft a statement. That statement is posted, and it again is subject to comment from within At-Large. So the statement typically evolves over time. And although the overall time period we have is pretty short by the time we've decided to make a comment or not, very often there may be one or two or three iterations of the public comment going forward. So the final comment has been reviewed by hopefully a fair number of people and we can have some level of confidence that it, in fact, is representing the interests of users going forward.

So it's a process you can certainly get involved with even if you're not an expert on the subject. But you can read the documents and comment on the statements that ALAC and At-Large are preparing as they're going forward. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan, for this detailed procedure how we draft comments on the public comment. Yes, my friend, Abdalmonem Galila, go ahead please.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Thank you, Tijani. This is Abdalmonem Galila from Egypt. To be honest, I [can't draft] my comment for any policy for ICANN in a professional way. That is the issue. The second issue is that I expect that [inaudible] policy document published by ICANN online for public comment I think the document will be very long to be read. So I suggest that [if there is]

[inaudible] webinars from ALAC to discuss the main issue inside this policy document and [draft our] [inaudible] notes in the [public comments] for this policy it would be good. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Abdalmonem. Okay, Alan, do you want to say something?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not really. The process varies depending on the subject and how many people are interested in [it]. It is true that typically there are not many people who can draft "the" statement. But very often even if you're not the person to draft the statement, you may have some thoughts on it. So we certainly welcome contributions once statements are drafted or just when we're at the early stages of looking for information. So you don't have to be the one to draft it. You don't have to worry about whether your writing skills or your knowledge of the subject is sufficient to do all of the work, but you might be able to contribute. Obviously, everyone has to judge for themselves which ones they may have some input in and which ones they don't.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Alan. And Abdalmonem, yes, I know that the documents are very long and your proposal was done by several people before. But I don't think it is reasonable to have each public comment summarized for the [inaudible] community so that they contribute. If you are interested in contributing, you will read and you will try to contribute.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah, and for any large documents there typically are executive summaries and background documents, and there very often will be webinars or things like that to help try to summarize the issue.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Exactly. Thank you, Alan. Any other remark? Any other question?
ALAN GREENBERG:	We should give an advertisement for the Consolidated Policy Working Group which typically is held on Wednesday. Each of those goes into one or more of the policy issues that we're looking at and talks about them on both the substance and the process of moving forward on them.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yes, [exactly]. This is a new process we are using now, and I think it is helping a lot people to contribute because now we have a new process, a new way to do it. And we have people who will be in charge of drafting as before, but our weekly meeting will help people to contribute and the work will be more a collective than a personal one.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you, Tijani. I'll point out the process is a new one for use with general policy comments, however it's a process we have used very successfully for about four years now going back to the IANA stewardship transition, the accountability exercise, and both phases one and two. So it's not a new process for us, it's just new in using it for

ICANN policy issues, not only the very specific targeted issues. But it's one that was used very, very successfully to make sure that we had lots of input into the statements we were making on those issues over the last few years.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. I meant that it is now used for all our policy comments. Before, it was used only for one kind of comments which was the comments on the transition and accountability. So now it is general and everything will go through this working group.

Any other question? Any other remark before we go to the evaluation questions? We still have time. We have a lot of time. So if there is no question, I will give the floor to the staff to start the evaluation questions. And in the meantime, you can think of questions and you can ask questions later. So, Claudia?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: One moment, Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Yes, and in the meantime I would like to say that, as Alan said at the beginning, we have the responsibility of commenting and of giving advice and of giving input to the board to any part in ICANN when it is necessary and about anything that may interest the end users. So it is not only about policy developed by the SOs. Those kinds of input can be comments in the public comments, can be an advice to the board even if there is not a public comment, and can be also about policy, and it can

be an advice to the board about anything, anything interesting to the end users.

So, Claudia, if you are ready.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, I was just checking, and it looks like we don't have any questions. And we will not be having a pop quiz for this session either.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, I am not speaking about pop quiz. I am speaking about evaluation questions. We don't have pop quiz questions. Okay?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes. We don't have any evaluation questions either.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Oh. How come? Okay, Gisella, can you please help?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: I'm Skyping with Gisella. She says we will send these around after the webinar.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: After the webinar?

GISELLA GRUBER:	Tijani?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yes, Gisella?
GISELLA GRUBER:	Apologies for this, Tijani. We've had a bit of a technical issue on the Adobe Connect, so we're not able to bring up the evaluation questions. What we will be doing is we will be sending them out after the webinar to all those who have participated in order to allow them to respond. Apologies for any inconvenience. Thank you.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you, Gisella. No problem. So any questions for our speakers? This webinar was asked by you, so normally you have a lot of interest in this topic. Except if the two speakers were very, very skilled and everything was really, really clear for you. I think they are.
	Okay, so thank you very much, all. And especially thank you, Alan and Mary. Thank you for the interpreters and for our staff. This webinar is now closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]