ICANN
Transcription
IGO-INGO Protections Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group
Wednesday 27 March 2013 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IGO-INGO Protections Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Wednesday 27 March 2013 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-20130327-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar

Attendees:
Lanre Ajayi - NCA
Jim Bikoff – IPC/IOC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Elizabeth Finberg – RySG
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Catherine Gribbin - Red Cross
Stephane Hankins - NCSG
David Heasley - IPC/IOC
Debra Hughes – Red Cross
Wolgang Kleinwaechter – NCSG
David Maher - RySG
Kiran Malancharuvil - IPC/IOC
Christopher Rassi - Red Cross
Thomas Rickert – NCA –Working group chair
Greg Shatan - IPC
Claudia MacMaster Tamarit – ISO
Mary Wong – NCUC
Alain Berranger - NPOC

Apologies:
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Evan Leibovitch - ALAC
Guilaine Fournet – IEC
Wilson Abigaba – NCSG
Mason Cole – GNSO Council Vice Chair

ICANN Staff:
Brian Peck
Berry Cobb
Marika Konings
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the IGO-INGO PDP working group call on Wednesday, 27 March 2013.

On the call today we have Lanre Ajayi, Jim Bikoff, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg, Catherine Gribbin, Stephane Hankins, Debra Hughes, Volker Greimann will be joining shortly in about 20 minutes, David Maher, Christopher Rassi, Thomas Rickert, Greg Shatan and Claudia MacMaster Tamarit.

We have apologies from Chuck Gomes, Evan Leibovitch, Guilaine Fournet, and Mason Cole, Alain Berranger who will be joining for the second hour and Wilson Abigaba.

And from staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Brian Peck, and myself Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Thank you very much Julia. My name is Thomas Rickert. And I'm chairing this working group. Before we move to the next agenda item as usual I'd like to ask whether there are any updates to the statement of interest?

Hearing and reading none in the chat we can now move on to the next agenda item which is the discussion of the state of the working group deliberations and the potential to have two consensus recommendations.

Now to give you a little bit of background for this agenda item I guess that as chair I'm running out of ideas to stimulate the group to provide substantive

input and propose changes to the proposed recommendations that are on the table.

We have a couple of documents that are - that have been circulated. And these documents include both the state of the art of the potential qualification criteria, they include the state of the art of the potential protection mechanisms.

We have a draft for the exemption process and I guess there is even a fourth document with - whose name I'm looking at at the moment.

But despite my repeated encouragement for those who don't like certain positions or proposals that have been made to refine those so that they could agree to them we virtually heard nothing rather than confirmations of the positions that have been voiced of the representatives of various groups in the community before.

So I guess the situation that we're in at the moment according to the working group guidelines would need to be called divergent.

You can see in the Adobe Room the classification or the definitions of the various levels of consensus or the absence thereof.

And divergence means a position where there isn't strong support for any particular position but many different points of view.

Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinions. And sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particular strong - a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint but the members of the group agree that it's worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless.

That is my observation. I will give the group the opportunity to comment on that but as working group chair I guess it's my duty to let you know what the status of my thinking is.

So I have also mentioned to you multiple times that I want to save everybody's time and save the group from moving in circles but I guess that we have already started to do that at least to a certain extent.

So I guess that is high time for us to consider potential options to move forward. And there are actually different strategic approaches to proceed.

We can certainly do what is laid down in the working group guidelines and, you know, take the routine as it is detailed in there to try and come closer to a common view by the group.

But I think that given the exchange both in the telephone conferences as well as on the mailing lists chances are slim that we're going to make significant process.

To give you an example we have been discussing basic parameters for exemption procedure. There have been some in the community or in the working group that have opposed to the parameters that have been laid out in this relatively rough catch of the exemption process.

I have done ask on the list as well is on to the calls. But those who don't like what's written down in the exemption procedure should let the group know whether they have fundamental opposition against a protection mechanism that would include such exemption procedure or if that weren't the case they should specify what changes should be made to the exemption procedure as cached so that they would like it.

But even to that I have seen no response at all. So that I have to assume that the - that there is fundamental opposition to that.

So I see little point in trying to further refine the existing proposals because I think chances for the group to get closer to consensus as I said before are quite slim.

And in order to give the group a little bit more background on what options we have we have asked Marika Konings to join us for the first half hour of the call to enlighten us a little bit about the potential way forward.

We - in preparation of this call we've already discussed a couple of options. And at this stage I'd like to hand over to Marika to share those thoughts with the whole group. Marika will you be would you please?

Marika Konings: Thanks Thomas. Hi everyone. This is Marika. Just wanted to share with you a little bit, you know, from my experiences on the working groups and how they've handled, you know, producing an initial report even in the possible absence of consensus.

And just wanted to note as well that actually according to the PDP manual what is required to be included in an initial report is a statement of the level of consensus.

It doesn't necessarily need to be a formal consensus call as described in the working group guidelines which is a requirement for the final report.

At that time it's expected if there are recommendations in there that the formal consensus call is taken that really identifies the different positions and the level of consensus received.

So in this phase at what the initial report typically looks for is a statement of the level of consensus. And that said working groups have taken different approaches in how to go about that.

And I can give you an example from one of the recent initial reports that has been published by the UDRP domain name lock working group.

They were actually in a position where they didn't really have the time to go through a formal consensus call, you know, giving people enough time on the mailing list to object or provide their statements. But they did have the good sense that there was consensus for the recommendation.

So the way they've approached it is what they have included in the report is basically just saying, you know, the preliminary level of consensus that we were able to assess for these recommendations we appear to have consensus but we're going to do a formal consensus call once the recommendations are finalized following the review of public comments received on the initial report.

So that may be a way forward where, you know, you give an indication of the level of support received even if that means that you're saying, you know, there is no consensus at this stage.

But at least lay out the options in the initial report and as well encourage community input on, you know, the different options or the different approaches that have been suggested.

And again, you know, something to note there as well that I think in other groups it has been a triggering point as well for people to actually, you know, put the pen to the paper is having a first draft of an initial report.

And having some of those thoughts out in an initial report and trying to describe that kind of, you know, these are the areas where, you know, we may have agreement.

These are some of the areas where we are actually far apart but we'd really welcome community input or concrete suggestions on how to bridge the different positions as a way forward.

And again one of the things that is an option for anyone of course is to include a minority viewpoints.

So is there certain parts where there is a designation or where there is a belief that there is consensus or is it always opportunities for individuals or certain groups to provide a minority viewpoint and include that in the report.

And again allowing the opportunity for the community as part of an initial report to provide input and that may help the working group as it continues its discussions and work on a final report to build that in. And at that stage, you know, conduct a formal consensus call.

So those are some of the things you may want to consider. As said I think there's quite a bit of flexibility in how you build your initial report as long as you give indeed a sense to the community as where things stand.

And, you know,, that helps them as well the community inputs you focus on that. And hopefully as well help you to come to a higher level of consensus that may be where you are at the moment. I hope that's helpful.

Thomas Rickert: Marika I guess that's very helpful. And at this point I'd like to open it up to the group for questions or comments?

So again I think that it's premature because I haven't given up hope that we will get closer to consensus.

I guess it's premature to do a formal consensus call now. But the plan would be actually that we would have the draft report ready hopefully prior to the Beijing meeting work on that in Beijing with the working group.

Hopefully as Marika said that's going to be a wakeup call for those that haven't spoken up so far to provide their input.

And then in the timeframe of maybe two weeks after Beijing unless we see that there is some substantial progress that helps the group further define the consensus position we would then put the report out for public comment. I see Alan's hand please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Thomas. I guess I've worked with Marika on a number of these reports and in working groups in various statuses.

And certainly we can produce an interim report. And I would call it an interim not a preliminary because we're really all we're doing - that we could do at that point is identify to the community the various positions that have been taken because at this point we're closer to deadlock the not quite consensus.

And I'm not quite sure where - what the way forward is. Certainly putting a report out may push some people on to putting things in writing which otherwise they'd just voiced.

But I really think our challenge is to figure ways to come to consensus not just to get a report out. And I mean I have an idea that I've raised a number of times is I think that the way forward is to divide up the types of protections.

And then for each of those types of protections work through what the criteria are and what the eligibility is. I think there's a chance for some of the lower protections of actually coming to closure.

If we continue to look at the overall picture as we have been and trying to do everything in parallel I think we're a lot closer to the vertical integration working group than anything else.

And for those who aren't familiar with it it ended eventually in deadlock. And I don't...

Thomas Rickert: Well the...

Alan Greenberg: ...want that to happen to this group. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Well Alan that's certainly something that I don't want to see happening. And I - I'm sure that (unintelligible) subject will be mentioned as we move along in our discussion.

To your point that we should go through the individual protections and discuss criteria for them individually you will remember that we've at least in two calls gone through them.

And I have asked the group to say what exactly they would like to see attached to the various stages of protections or the various options for protections meaning top level protections versus second level protections, you know preventive versus curative mechanisms what have you.

We have a spreadsheet detailing all of this. And the response from the working group was almost like zero.

So there haven't been any complete proposals, you know, to further specify what there should be attached to the individual items.

So - and this is basically why I guess as chair whether or not to waste everybody's time I wanted to come up with a proposal to, you know, bring this to an end and hopefully to stimulate constructive feedback from the group and a meaningful discussion.

And certainly as chair my intention is to bring this group to a consensus position but I think we can't move on as we did. Greg please.

Greg Shatan: I agree with Alan that we - that this is not a monolithic proposal and we do need to break it down.

And I think see where along the spectrum of mechanisms we can find some - something closer to consensus or maybe even through consensus.

And the criteria for those I think it's premature in the lifecycle to start discarding proposals where there is a lack of consensus.

I think that, you know, they should be reflected in the preliminary report. And, you know, perhaps in the writing of it we can either achieve some form - something along the spectrum of consensus.

I don't know. I think where - I think it's premature to say they we're at deadlock. And terms of counting those as whether it's deadlock or something else along the spectrum where there are opposed positions without getting into, you know, counting noses or formal calls for consensus.

I think that, you know, maybe that we have things in the preliminary report that don't survive to the final report.

But I don't think, you know, they should be buried just because, you know, one or two members have kind of thrown their body on the railroad tracks on things.

Thomas Rickert: Greg hopefully nobody's going to commit suicide in the cause of our work. But...

Greg Shatan: Oh I know - I think their plan is fully to stop the train and not to commit suicide nor I think would anybody here keep their foot on the gas pedal.

Thomas Rickert: No certainly not but Greg just in - a quick response. None of the options that are on the table shall be suppressed or discarded.

So as Marika said the idea of the proposal would be to include the current state of our discussions in the report and seek community input that would hopefully help the group shape a consensus position or something closer to consensus then we have at the moment.

Okay I guess I'll leave it at that. And I see Avri first. Please Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. This is Avri speaking. I find myself in the happy circumstance I'm agreeing with just about a bit of what all the people have said so far and disagreeing probably with a bit of it.

I think it's a great idea for there to be a Marika led writing exercise that gets all the positions down and all of them clearly.

I tend to think we're not near deadlock. What I think may be deadlocked is discussions that are based on stages and the notion that we have to have all of these pieces or we have none of these pieces.

I think that for a lot of the pieces there are various levels of support. And there may even be full or rough consensus on some of those issues. And I think on some of them we're evenly divided and perhaps deadlocked on particular elements.

And I think part of the writing what will be important is for each person to be able to look and say yes that is an accurate representation of where I'm at at this moment, that is an accurate representation of the way I see this issue. I understand other people see it other ways.

So I find myself having agreed with almost everything Greg said except for this notion that there are people here that deserve to be accused of throwing themselves in the way of the train to stop it.

I think there are some very strong views here. And some people that want to protect some harms that they see coming to their constituency their interests.

And yes they're going to argue very strongly to prevent those harms. But I haven't noticed anyone really being, you know, a full block to everything. I've noticed all of us seem to be a block at something.

So I think you've got the right idea about a way to proceed. I think it's good to hold in advance both the notion of deadlock or accusations of who's trying to create deadlock. And yes I think it'll be hard and thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Avri. I guess I should clarify that I don't necessarily see deadlock. I think, you know, maybe that's a language thing.

But I think that the absence of progress is not necessarily deadlock but, you know, that might be a different discussion.

I guess my plan would certainly be to display as accurately as I can with the help of staff the current state of the discussions.

And you're certainly right that level of consensus or the absence thereof is not the same for each and every item that we have been discussing.

So there has been quite - or there has been substantial support for the notion of opening up the existing RPMs.

Just to give one example that would certainly be reflected in the report. But I think that we need to ensure that we don't get stuck by working group members -- and I'm not picking or looking - picking on or looking at any of the

members individually or specifically -- but there have been other requests that further work needs to be done on certain items.

But then when it comes to actually coming up with complete proposals that we can discuss well the nothing happens. And I guess we need to come over that.

And I'm all for the refining the proposals that are on the table but if you look at the history of proposals that is on the table you will find that a substantial portion of those is something that either ICANN staff or I myself have put together.

And I don't mind doing that. But I think that it's up for the group to specify what they would like to see being recommended by the group.

And it's not a matter of me as chair or ICANN staff trying to guess what you might like. And I guess that's the best way I can describe the way I'm thinking and the reason why I'm proposing to proceed as proposed in order to maybe encourage or trigger further input from the group so that we can make substantial progress which I think would be the best option.

Are there any further comments or responses to that? Let me put it the other way around, is there a position to a proceeding in a fashion that Marika has outlined?

Claudia please?

Claudia MacMaster Tamarit: Hello Thomas, Claudia here. Not a position just supporting fact and thinking about a - some conversations that we've had in the past especially with Alan about, you know, perhaps ideas of protections that might be sort of speak weaker that could actually encompass many of the groups that we're talking about.

I think we might be surprised in fact to echo - I hope I don't mistake Avri's position. I think we might be surprised that we might find some stronger areas of perhaps not full consensus -- that is almost certain -- but, you know, perhaps strong support where depending on the strength of the protection mechanism or the protection that's going to be granted or the reservation if it's a weaker one we might find that that we can actually stand behind the idea of granting some kind of protection to international organization.

And that encompasses perhaps more than one or more than two but organizations like my own and like other international organizations that are well established and have had a significant meetings with the Internet and with standards that reflect upon the Internet.

I think that we would very much support that kind of a report that would offer that option and say well we can stand behind this position, we might not all be able to stand behind this position, and there's a minority of us who stand behind this one and also get some of these comments.

So just to say that I definitely support Thomas your direction and I think that an interim report even if it is to as Marika says maybe inspire us to put pen to paper would be very, very wise I think at this point particularly in light of reality new gTLDs are being delegated, you know, in weeks. So thank you very much Thomas just very much.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Claudia. That's very helpful. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think Claudia captured a lot of what I was saying. And I think the challenge is on some of the weaker protections to use Claudia's words, I think we could get to the point where either we have support or at least I can live with by many of the participants in this working group.

The challenge is to get - is to ensure that people who want stronger levels of protection don't feel like they are waiving their rights to push for those by accepting a weaker one first.

And, you know, I think if we're going to get any closure on some of these issues we have to start at the bottom and work up. And it doesn't preclude stronger protections.

You know, I - my organization would easily agree to weaker, you know, trademark - not trademark, but claims noticed type protection, you know, from almost all the organizations that we're talking about here well at the same time we would strongly push for much stronger protection for some of the organizations.

So I think we need to somehow creep towards that end. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Alan. But I guess that there's no contradiction between what you said and what we're proposing.

I guess that it will or it might and hopefully it will help the group shape common view once we have something in the report that is due shortly for public comment and that will hopefully encourage people to actually come up with a mockup version and additional proposals and maybe even with a compromise positions that we haven't yet heard of.

Because everybody seems to be - and I'm not responding to you Alan because you have indicated that you would be willing to compromise on certain points, you know, those that haven't shown a willingness to compromise that even they might be willing to do so in the light of, you know, the risk of maybe losing their gain.

Vertical integration has been mentioned earlier during the call. And vertical integration I think is a good example to illustrate which should not happen to this project.

I think we, all of us we have much nicer and better things to do every Wednesday for two hours than discussing.

So we are all doing this because we want to achieve something. And I think that we should not allow this process to have the same fate or outcome as the vertical integration debate did.

And, you know, the result of that was that since the group -- and I'm paraphrasing -- and I know that most of you will be able to tell the story in much greater detail but to keep it short the group has not been able to reach consensus. And ultimately the board has made a decision.

So the work was, you know, stopped afterwards because it was pointless at that time.

And if you look at what we're doing now yes there are views in this group. And again I'm not looking at anybody specifically but just let me try to give you the perspective from an outside observer.

There are those requesting protections. And they think well we have the protections anyway because the board chose to grant certain protections.

So, you know, we might not need to compromise because we're going to get our way because the board's going to support us. And if the board doesn't do so than the GAC will give the required backup so that we get protections.

But this position might not be say forever. We're talking about the first round and the protections that have been granted by the board are protections for the first round.

And I'm sure that during the evaluation of the first round those doing the evaluation will take a careful look at what we've been discussing. And they will find out that the protections might not be as absolute as some have claimed during our discussions.

And they might also understand the complexity of our discussions so they might as well say okay for the second round they aren't going to be any protections.

So we should not take for granted that per se preliminary protections that have been granted by the board might be perpetuated.

At the same time those opposing protections might take the position and say we're just going to say no to it regardless. The protection's actually not being granted at the moment and they might as well be perpetuated.

And a position might not help improve the position of those that want to prevent protections because more balanced protections than those that we have at the moment might actually be better for their interests or the interests of their groups.

So I know that I'm simplifying and I'm know that I'm - that this might be perceived as a bias at this stage. But I'm just trying to illustrate a little bit for you that nobody should take for granted that they're going to win. And we might all end up being losers in this and we might end up having spent a lot of time and nobody will actually gain from it.

If you look at the reserve names list for example this is a quite a quite un-flexible approach. So those requesting protections might be much better off if we put in some more flexibility for them.

You know, this is just some food for thought. You know, I'm really concerned that we are going to drive this into a dead-end street and actually have a dead-lock at the end of the day and that the board will actually make decisions that nobody in this group might be happy with.

I know this has been a long speech. I hope that you're going to speak up now and share some thoughts with the group.

But I, you know, regardless of the outcome I sincerely do hope that the group will be able to do better or provide better results than the results that we currently have at the table.

Does anybody if you want to comment on that or...

Wolfgang Kleinwaechter: This is (Wolfgang), Thomas. You're absolutely right. I'm 100% behind you. So it's difficult to add something so I just agree.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks. That's very helpful. So it's not just me. Anybody else, Greg please?

Greg Shatan: I would say overall I agree as well. And I think, you know, perhaps it's just, you know, we need to work harder on being responsive and trying to narrow our ideas down to implementation or to, you know, to taking, to not use a word that has too many meanings to some of us get down into the details more.

And this sounds like, you know, part of the frustration is that you're having is that we're not coming back to you with, you know, good, you know, workable things at this point that maybe we're, I don't know if the group is getting fatigued or the like.

But we need to maybe all have an energy drink and, you know, I'll - you know, I'm as guilty as anybody of not having produced, you know, a major,

you know, new piece of or revised piece of work that would help move a particular position forward or even a position I don't agree with for that matter.

Thomas Rickert: Well thanks Greg. That's much appreciated. But just to be clear I don't want anybody to feel guilty or say so.

I guess it's my point is more about community work and how community work should take place.

And you will remember that I have tried to absorb the thinking of the group not only in this working group but also from the previous phase of the drafting team and come up with concrete proposals for the group to further refine and work on.

And I also guess that with - by doing so I've gone further than other chairs would in order not to be seen to be biased or to lose their neutrality.

And I hope that I have made sufficiently clear that, you know, that I'm not trying to drive the discussion to one or the other direction but ultimately I guess that, you know, me trying to push things forward is not good enough for what, you know, ICANN deserves or the community deserves.

So I guess that we need more input from the various groups.

Okay I guess we should leave it - leave that and maybe you think about it and we talk more about this in Beijing.

Actually I've discussed with staff that - and actually the staff recommended that we shouldn't go over the individual protection again but that we should try to agree on a way forward.

So I'd like to move to the third item and certainly some of the parts that belong to the third agenda item which we've already touched upon.

And, you know, so for Beijing I guess the plan is to recap that hopefully we're going to have the preliminary report displaying the various options that are on the table in one document and that we will have the opportunity to discuss face to face how these should be refined.

We will also have the opportunity and please do note that the GNSO council meetings during the weekend are public meetings so please do come. There will be a half hour session on this working group which I'm going to be presenting at.

So hopefully the GNSO council is also going to provide some valuable input that helps us in our deliberation.

And then the plan would be that we have something that you as working group members can take back to your respective groups. And hopefully we're going to have something ready for public comment I would say in the timeframe of two weeks after Beijing.

And should actually we see that we make substantial progress and that we might be able to conduct a formal consensus call prior to putting it out for public comment we will do so and actually change our plans at that point in time. But I think that it's premature to anticipate that at the moment.

So I'd rather like to keep up the plan of trying to finalize something for public comment that sets out the current state of our discussion let's say two weeks after the Beijing meeting.

And then we will absorb the public comments and maybe we'll hopefully come up with a more unified position after we see that.

Is that something that you would be willing to subscribe to or do you have any better proposals? You know it's - don't get me wrong, my suggestions are suggestions. The working group that's we, that's not me.

So if you - I'm very open to criticism or suggestions to if you have an idea how we can better steer the process.

Okay I'm hearing and seeing nothing on that point. So - yes Berry?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Just to carry on with what you said. So our Saturday session is - or our working group sorry, our status session for the GNSO council is on Saturday. I forget the exact time. I believe it's in the earlier part of the morning or shortly after lunch -- one of the two.

The format of that 30 minute session we're putting together a slide deck just to provide a status to the column so as to where we're at with the state of deliberations with the working group and a touch on some of that - maybe some of the high-level positions that we have thus far.

That presentation will only probably take about ten or 15 minutes and then we'll use the remainder of the time for the council to ask Thomas and staff any questions for the working group.

Then on Monday we have our session which I believe is around 4:00 PM Beijing time. It's a 90 minute session. And what we'll do since most of - more of the community will hopefully arrive and be there to participate with the working group we'll spend the first ten minutes just to basically provide the same kind of status out to the community about where we're at with the working group.

Then the remainder of the time will be to go through as what Thomas said to basically dive into the report and go detail by detail about possible recommendations that we could have, open dialogue and hopefully try to

attain some kind of a formulation of consensus around certain recommendations that will help feedback into our interim report.

And then of course the last part of that probably ten, 15 minutes will be available for questions from the community as well so that's kind of the general outline of how we're going to structure this format and (how) Beijing. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Berry. Also in terms of the next agenda item Berry I know that you've done some changes or made some changes to the last version of the document. And can you maybe highlight those to the group?

Berry Cobb: Yes Thomas this is Berry. So I sent this out last night with the agenda. Essentially I just made a few updates as to the document primarily from the basis of our last call as there were possible two other.

I will be changing this to say proposals instead of outcomes and do some restructuring.

But the registry stakeholder group mentioned that that they're working on a proposal within their stakeholder group. And they're deliberating and voting on that.

Hopefully in the near future we'll be able to get the content of what that proposal will look like and we'll import it into this document.

And so right now this is just kind of a placeholder. The same thing for two delta is also Avri had mentioned another possible proposal.

And Avri I don't know if you recall or not but if you can possibly write up a couple of short paragraphs about maybe what that would look like I'd be more than happy to include this in the document as well.

And what you see here is essentially an extract of the transcript from last week's meeting. But certainly I can use some assistance in finishing out that secondary proposal.

But those are really the only primary changes I made to the - to this document. The other change is kind of listed further down which is for proposal number three and just made some slight adjustments for recommendations eight and nine and in regards to if there was recommendations to have access to trademark claim and leaving the options open and what that may do with the succeeding recommendation.

So that's about it. Last thing I'll state is essentially this document and as Thomas mentioned there were two other documents, exceptions procedure and the draft format that it is in as well as the qualification criteria.

Essentially these will be imported into our interim report draft.

And like we said we hope to have that all put together in one document to send out to the working group hopefully next week prior to Bejiing.

Thomas Rickert: Well thanks Berry. I guess that's very helpful. And you will have noted that the various protections that have been enshrined in the latest spreadsheet now have all gone into this Word document.

So you have all the proposals in one place which hopefully will facilitate your work.

Do you have any questions or comments on this document?

Okay so I guess you should take a closer look at that prior to our meeting because in fact this is the last telephone conference that we have before our face to face meeting.

And I'm looking forward to that meeting very much. I guess it makes a huge difference whether you work remotely or whether you're sitting with people in one room.

And I do hope that we're going to make substantial progress there.

So with this, you know, the next meeting has been confirmed. Berry has given us some details on the format. We're going to reconvene on April 8 for a 90 minute session.

So this would basically be your last option to use the telephone bridge to communicate with the working group.

Because if you don't take this chance we - I guess we can end this call early. And Alan will have the opportunity to even have a drink before he - or some other relaxation, you know, before he goes to his next call.

Okay thank you very much everybody. I'm looking forward to seeing you in Bejiing and hopefully we're going to have remote participation set up for that meeting so that we will have some of you on-site and some of you participating remotely. Thank you very much and have a great day. Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you Thomas.

Man: Thank you Thomas.

Man: Thank you. Bye.

Man: Thank you Thomas. Bye-bye.

END