

**ICANN
Transcription
First meeting of the reconvened IGO-INGO Protections in all gTLDs PDP Working
Group on Red Cross Names
Wednesday, 14 June 2017 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-pdp-14jun17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p39bvnr2rpw/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/I0fwAw>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, (Kristine). Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the first meeting of the Reconvened PDP Working Group call on Red Cross Names on the 14th of June, 2017. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. So if you're on the audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now? Okay...

Jim Bikoff: This is Jim Bikoff.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, Jim. We'll note that. Okay. Hearing no further names I would also like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn the call back over to James Bladel.

James Bladel: Thank you, Michelle. And thank you, everyone, for joining. Welcome to what we believe to be the first instance of a reconvened PDP under the GNSO's

process, which I believe is under Section 16 to review and revisit some of its PDP recommendations and – at the request of the GNSO Council.

Thomas Rickert, who was the Chair of this PDP the first time around, was – and has volunteered to take the reins once again but unfortunately we're having some difficulty connecting to him so I'll fill in as best I can and see if we can get through part of our agenda.

The first thing that we want to confirm, because this has been such a – quite a bit of time has elapsed since the PDP concluded, in late 2013, versus this process to reconvene the working group, I would ask everyone to please go back and take a look at your statement of interest, normally that's just a formality; I think in this particular case there is a high degree of likelihood that that statement of interest has changed in the intervening two, three, four years, and would ask everyone to please make sure that that is current for the purposes of, you know, transparency into your interests.

It looks like we do have Thomas now so, thank you, Thomas for joining. I was just kind of kicking off some of the administrative stuff and I'll just continue on and then probably turn it over to you here in a moment.

Just want to provide a little bit of background as well for this group, the purpose of this process is to take a look at recommendations that were developed and agreed upon via consensus by the PDP working group and submitted to the GNSO Council, and in fact in this case were approved by the GNSO Council.

But in the intervening elapsed time, ran somewhat counter to items that were contained in (unintelligible). And so I think ideally the way this process was envisioned is that the GNSO Council would immediately reconvene the PDP and ask (unintelligible) closer look at a couple of its recommendations. This is all made much more complicated by the fact that so much time has elapsed and that perhaps some of the folks who participated in the original PDP have

left the industry or moved onto different jobs or retired or, you know, or just for whatever reason have no interest in participating in the second round.

I note that that has prompted some discussions about membership and I would say, you know, let's try to apply common sense approach to that. You know, I think we don't want to necessarily throw the doors open to all brand new members including folks who maybe didn't participate on the previous PDP. That wouldn't be the case if the – between the PDP and Section 16 were a matter of weeks or months, so we probably shouldn't expect that now.

I think that on the other side of the coin, if we have an organization that has a different group of folks or a different delegation to ICANN and to PDPs, you know, those folks should be allowed to select alternates to participate on their behalf. So, you know, I don't really have any hard and fast guidance here except to say let's try to exercise some common sense as far as membership.

And I think the same goes for the subject matter and the scope of the review. This isn't starting with I think what Thomas had characterized as one of the largest and longest final reports ever issued by a PDP, and just start over with a blank page and see where we end up; it's meant to take a closer look at a narrow subset of the recommendations and to examine those recommendations in light of some new information or some questions that weren't considered perhaps in the first time around. And it should be as narrow a scope as possible to facilitate the most lightweight and expeditious route towards a final report.

And the outcome of this work could be that this group says, you know what, we looked at these recommendations and we got it right. We got it right the first time around. Thanks for bringing this new information to our attention, but we got it right. Or this group could say, you know what, we looked at this and we missed a spot. We're going to go back, we're going to tweak a couple of

recommendations and ask that the Council instead approve these edits or these amended recommendations.

There's no – neither of those outcomes is guaranteed or is a forgone conclusion. I think what this simply provides is an opportunity to revisit some of the decisions that were taken earlier in light of some new facts or new information.

So, with that said, I'm trying to think if there's any other sort of context setting, materials that have been left off. Otherwise I can certainly just start to hand it over to Thomas who can talk a little bit more about why we're here and what, you know, what our goal and what our path forward looks like and then what the ultimate deliverable work product of this working group will be. So, Thomas, if you're on the line, you can hear, I'll stand down now and turn this all over to you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, James. And hello, everyone. This is Thomas Rickert speaking. And I do apologize for being a couple of minutes late; I had a few technical issues getting online but now I'm with you and it's good that we got the band back together. I think some of you would have hoped that we do not have to work on this issue anymore but in fact this is, you know, a new situation and we can now invoke and ultimately test how Section 16 that you see quoted in the Adobe room actually works and can be operationalized.

So I think this is to a certain extent uncharted territory for all of us but I'm sure that we will work in the same collaborative spirit as we did a couple of years back when we originally worked on the recommendations.

So since I missed a few minutes into the call, I do not know exactly what's been discussed but as you will surely recall, we had originally done our consensus recommendations as a PDP working group. These were then passed onto the GNSO Council. They were unanimously adopted by the GNSO Council and then sent onto the Board.

And then there were conflicting – there were conflicting GAC advice and GNSO policy recommendations which, you know, left the topic unresolved for quite some time and then in Helsinki, you know, under the – or with help from Bruce Tonkin who did an excellent job as a facilitator, this topic was discussed and ultimately brought back to the GNSO Council, which then invoked the Section 16 of the – I think operating principles for the GNSO which brought us back together.

And actually we're looking at a very focused question so this is not for – it is not for our group to add things to the list of topics that we're going to discuss. So we have quite a limited scope, so and I guess this is important to bear in mind when you talk to your respective groups that this is not an opportunity to otherwise change or get additional requests into our work plan. You know, even if we wanted to the rules would prohibit us from doing more than what absolutely necessary and required to revisit a few of the policy recommendations.

So I think that James has given you an overview of the policy amendment process. And if there's anything missing to that point, please do speak up so that I think we can now move onto the third agenda item which is the review and discussion of the scope of the GNSO Council request. And I would like to hear from you, James, whether that's something that the Council leadership would like to go through or whether this is something that potentially been done by staff, i.e. probably Mary Wong. James, your hand is raised. The floor is yours.

James Bladel: Thank you, Thomas. And, yes, correct, I would probably then ask Mary to load the text of the motion itself where it looks like they've done so. And then Mary, if you wouldn't mind, I think we want to outline – we've said repeatedly this is a narrow scope work effort, and I think what we're asking you to do then is can you define the boundaries of what it is specifically, A, what we're going to be looking at, and, B, what new information or new data or facts that

will be considered as the working group reexamines those recommendations.
Go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Thank you, James. Thank you, Thomas. And hi, everybody. This is Mary from staff. As James noted, what you see on the Adobe screen is the GNSO Council resolution that kicked us off in this reconvening period and that was the resolution that was voted on at passed by the council in early May, just about a month ago.

So in going through the scope as mentioned, the narrow scope, of this consultation, I think two things should be noted in context. One is that this resolution and hence the scope of the request to this working group, tracks very closely the Board's request to the GNSO Council that facilitated discussion that Thomas described, which took place in Copenhagen, that I think several folks on the call either attended or were involved in, in some way.

Secondly, the scope was also determined in part by some of what we're calling new facts or certainly agreements that came out from that discussion about certain matters that you actually see in one of the whereas clauses here and that's in this document on screen, the bottom of Page 1 going into the top of Page 2. And so you see essentially four numbered sub points that describe those matters that were noted that first the Board and now the Council considers relevant to this reconsideration of the PDP recommendation.

Then coming to the actual consideration and the scope, if you look at the resolve clause, that's laid out in Resolve Clause 1 in the sub bullet points A, B and C. And you'll note that this really concerns Recommendation 5 in the working group's final report as it relates to the Red Cross. That is Section 3.1 of the report, in other words, Section 3.1 in the report is that section that talks about the various recommendations from the PDP on the Red Cross

movement and this one, as I mentioned, specifically is limited to Recommendation 5 in that section.

And I won't read the three sub bullet points numbered A, E and C, except to note that we are looking at the names of the Red Cross National Societies which number 190, as well as the name of International Committee of the Red Cross and the named International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies together with a agreed limited set of variants of those names which we can get into as to what those look like and what those are as we go further along.

But essentially, that is the scope of the consultation that the Council has kicked off with this working group and so the beginning for this working group we would think, would be to look at this proposed amendment as encapsulated in this Resolve Clause 1.

James, Thomas, I hope that's helpful and I'll turn it back to you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Mary. I guess that was an excellent introduction to the scope of our work. Let me open it up to the group to ask questions. I don't see any hands raised except for a comment that was made by Avri in the chat where she says, "So, were we to just accept what they want, we would be done?" Anyone? So let me throw it out there. Does anyone wish to comment or speak to Mary's point or comment on Avri's comment in the chat? James, I see your hand raised.

James Bladel: Hi, thanks, Thomas. And thanks, Avri, for the question. I think if the question is so if we simply modify Recommendation 5 to track the request as it exists in the GAC communiqué, would that be it, you know, would that be done? And I think, well, the answer is yes, but we don't want to presume that's necessarily the right answer.

I think that one of the things that we discussed in Copenhagen was that the rationale behind revisiting this was that the National Societies did have a status perhaps that wasn't clear during the first go around of the PDP and that the list was not, you know, infinite in the number of National Society names, in fact it was relatively small in DNS terms with just a couple of hundred of strings, and also that the strings were so distinctive that perhaps they could have not have been reasonably confused or legitimately reused for other purposes.

So I think it would be important to – if the result of this group and the work would be to go back and revisit Recommendation 5 and make changes, it would be important to capture those rationales because some of the future requests to do the same thing and reserve you know, big chunks of alphabet, might not be able to cross those thresholds and so therefore I think it's important to establish why Recommendation 5 would be revisited as opposed to just, you know, just making it match. But, yes, hypothetically that is one possible outcome.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, James. I guess that's very helpful. And I'd just like to add that even if we said yes to the request today, the work wouldn't be done, you know, we need to write up a report and this report will be put out for public comment so there's a process that we have to follow and we will surely discuss this process in more detail.

But I think what's important in all of this that we – as we always did, try to stick to the process, make sure that the integrity of the process is not damaged and therefore I think we should be very diligently working on this as we did in the original PDP and just for you to remember, and I'm sure that most of you know this, but it was not negligence or stubbornness that the protections that we're discussing now were not granted at the time but actually the list of strings was only introduced via GAC advice after we had done our consensus recommendations at the time.

And, you know, with the topic such as this, that was quite heatedly debated we have to be very careful that we're doing our homework correctly and diligently because otherwise we might be setting dangerous precedent for other requests. So this is neither to say that I would favor or that I would oppose to the protections that are requested, and in fact, and I think I said this on multiple occasions, as chair I'm interested in the integrity of the process. I'm passionate about the process, I'm not passionate about the outcome. We need to do – to produce the right outcome based on the information and the assessment that this group can come up with.

So are there any further wishes to speak? That doesn't seem to be the case which would allow us to move to the next agenda item and that is Agenda Item 4, which is recap of why and what brought us here, overview of the Copenhagen facilitated discussions, highlighting the post-PDP development such as GAC advice and the limited nature of the list of Red Cross names.

And I do not exactly know whether – what we plan to say here has already been mentioned in other agenda items so I'm virtually looking at James and/or Mary to double check whether there's anything on top of what we already briefly summarized that we want to discuss. James, please, go ahead.

James Bladel: Thanks, Thomas. I just wanted to note that I think we, in a roundabout way, have already covered all of the points that were enumerated under Agenda Item Number 4, so I think we've got it. I guess I would turn it around to the group, is there anything in background materials to open questions or gaps in context that you would have at this time that maybe we can answer or we can go out and research and get back to you.

Thomas Rickert: Can you please repeat the last sentence for me, I had some background noise here so I couldn't hear. Apologize.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, Thomas. I was just noting that, you know, I would – I think we've covered everything under Agenda Item Number 4 so I would ask the group if they're missing anything or lacking anything or if they have questions or spot any ambiguities about the information that we've provided thus far, now would be a great time to answer some questions.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, James. And I see Stephane's hand is raised. Welcome, Stephane. And the floor is yours. Please go ahead.

Stephane Hankin: Good afternoon, good evening. My microphone is a little bit bizarre so I hope it's not understandable what I would like to say. But to say that we're very happy to see that this process is beginning and to thank the GNSO and all of those present on the call for taking up this – their participation in this reconvened group. I had just one question, which is to note that indeed the scope of what this reconvened group is looking at is limited as it is defined in the resolution of the GNSO Council.

And I was just wanting to clarify that those parts of the recommendations that were adopted in November 2013 and that after reexamination they may remain as they are or they may be revised as may be decided. But I just wanted to note that the Scope 2 identifiers as they were defined in 2013, extend beyond the names of the 190 national societies of the Red Cross Red Crescent and the full names of the International Federation and the RCRC. And if you see in the list there is a mention of the acronyms.

So I just wanted as a point of clarification, what would – what will be the outcome for the acronyms of the revision of the fifth wing of the recommendations under 3.1 of the report? Because as it now stands, the acronyms would be added to the single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse if my understanding is correct.

So I just wanted to know if that question in some way needs to be addressed or not, bearing in mind that the conclusions and the recommendations of

2013 and bearing in mind also the GAC advice in this field that were subsequent and which recommends that the acronyms of the two international bodies in the Red Cross Red Crescent movement be subject to the same cross neutral protection mechanisms to be developed in the future in regard to IGO acronyms.

So it was just this point of clarification I wanted to put forward. I'm not sure I made myself clear. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stephane. And I'd like to ask Mary whether she has a spontaneous answer to this clarification.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Thomas. And thanks, Stephane, for the question. This is Mary from staff. My – from what you're saying, Stephane, my understanding is that you're asking about the acronyms. And as you noted, the original PDP working group did have a recommendation on those acronyms and that was for entry into the 90-day claims system through the Clearinghouse.

Our understanding in looking at the first the Board request to the GNSO following the Copenhagen dialogue, and secondly, at the GNSO Council request is that what this PDP working group has been asked to do at the moment is to look at the names portion of that recommendation. And that I think is based on the fact that the discussion in Copenhagen really largely focused on the names primarily the National Society names and to some extent the International Movement names.

So for what it's worth, the Board resolution and the Council resolution speaks of the names. So in relation to the acronyms, I would imagine that it is something that the Board may request or not, and it may be something that the Board will act on in relation to the original PDP working group recommendation or otherwise. I don't know if this is helpful.

Thomas Rickert: Stephane, do you have a follow up?

Stephane Hankin: Thank you very much, Mary, for that clarification. It is also my understanding of course that what is to be discussed here does not cover the acronyms, and I think that was also made clear in the discussions that we had in Copenhagen. So I take note of that.

It was just, you know, if the GNSO is reexamining those particular elements of the recommendations of 2013, these points – Point 5 in particular I – my assumption is that those parts that are not affected by this renewed discussion will remain in place. But it's just a question that I raise and I don't know whether, you know, we're in a position now to receive you know, clarity on that. But it is maybe something to be looked at without complicating of course of what this reconvened group is due to examine. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stephane. So I would suggest that we try to capture this part of the discussion in sort of a minutes or notes you know, your request for – or your desire to clarify this, your question about the acronym and also the response that we have for this. What I can say at the moment, without having looked into this further, is that this group has not been asked to look at acronyms and therefore I would consider this out of scope of this exercise. But I think it would be helpful to just try to capture that in the minutes so that we have something in writing to lean on.

So there was some discussion going on in the chat between Avri and Mary. Just for the benefit of Steve – of Jim – excuse me, I'd like to just bring that to your attention. I would assume it is like asking to have an exam regraded; one can lose with what they had especially any interim decisions made by the Board, and then in brackets were there any question mark? And Mary responded at Avri, the Red Cross names and acronyms currently reserved as an interim measure so once the Board acts on the GNSO recommendations, whether to approve or otherwise, the interim protections will go away and the final Board approval will govern.

And then Avri responds, "So, Mary, we would bring a decision different from the Board's interim decision and remove those names from the reservation list which I think would be the consequence." So unless there are further interventions on this point, I see Stephane's hand is up. I'm not sure Stephane is that an old or a new hand?

Stephane Hankin: Sorry about that.

Thomas Rickert: No worries. No problem. So that allows us to move on and to Agenda Item Number 5, which is recap and review of the original policy recommendations. Let me bluntly ask whether this is something that in the light of what we've discussed already that you want to go through in detail or does everyone know? Otherwise I would suggest that maybe Mary, who knows, this – these recommendations better than anyone else because she's been drafting the language at the time, gives us a quick run through so that we're all aligned.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Thomas. This is Mary from staff again. And I do want to say on the record that I would share that honor with Berry Cobb who was leading the staff support at the time, and I think the two of us together, with you Thomas, have been looking at this report for quite some time too.

What I have on the screen is the excerpt from Recommendation 5. We didn't think it would be too helpful to have the entire report up on Adobe Connect for everyone. One thing to note here is that at the time of the PDP report, there were 189 national Red Cross Red Crescent societies that were recognized. As we know, but I think it's helpful to state this for the record, since then, one more National Society has been formally recognized. And so now we are looking as the GNSO Council's request makes clear at 190 National Societies of the Red Cross.

So you'll see that the language of the working group report talks about Scope 1 and Scope 2 identifiers. What we're doing here is really about some of the Scope 2 identifiers as defined, and you see the definition on screen. And as

Stephane was asking earlier, we are concerned with those Scope 2 identifiers that are the names of the National Societies and the International Movement.

At the moment, we have not been requested to look at the acronyms. And as we also noted earlier, the working group recommendation that was adopted by the GNSO Council unanimously was for an exact match of these identifiers in the Trademark Clearinghouse to participate in a 90-days claims notification process.

These recommendations received a consensus level designation from the working group and you'll note here that from the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group there was support but it was noted that even within the stakeholder group there was some opposition to this. So the final designation was of consensus.

The only other thing we have up on screen here, Thomas and everyone, is an excerpt from the minority statement at the Red Cross submitted to the working group's final report on this recommendation. And we can circulate this to the list as well as a reminder of some of the rationale that was offered by the Red Cross in making a request for protection for these National Society names, among others. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Mary. Are there any questions or comments on this overview that Mary gave us? That doesn't seem to be the case. So we can then move to the last agenda item which is the discussion of possible timeline for the working group and reporting back to the GNSO Council.

So I think it would be premature to give an exact timeline today because we need to get started first and the actually frame how we approach the work. But I guess it's important that we get things going, that it's good that we got this running prior to ICANN 59. And I'm sure that James will also share with us some ideas on how this group can report back to the GNSO Council during ICANN 59. Is that assumption correct, James?

James Bladel: Thanks, Thomas. Yes, I think it would be correct. And if I may, I agree it's probably too soon to put dates around a work plan, but I think that – or I would hope that this group could reach a relatively quick consensus on the idea that this should be a straightforward and lightweight work calendar.

Specifically because the recommendation or the language of the recommendation already exists and so there's something to kind of – there's something to start with and because the scope should be fairly narrow. Additionally because I think a lot of PDPs – a lot of the timeline is taken up by things like public comment, but in this case this working group – I'm expecting that it's output will be either before or as part of its consideration by the Council will be put out for public comment.

So I would just hope that the actual work of arriving at revised recommendations or either – or declining to revise the recommendations I would hope that one of those two outcomes could be arrived at fairly quickly, just given that what we're starting from not starting from scratch and we have a limited scope on what we need to look at. So that's just my input to the idea of the work calendar. I don't know that this has to be something that goes on for the you know, for months and months like a regular PDP.

Thomas Rickert: I guess there will likely be no one on this call who would object to your hope or would not share the hope that we can deal with this relatively quickly. Okay, so, you know, let's try to keep this rather to a few months and then what's the shortest lifecycle of a PDP working group which I think would be at least like 13 months or so, but let's try to be substantially quicker than that.

And I guess that the information that we have in the minority statement speaking to the legal background is a good starting point for us to take a look at when it comes to discussing legal justification for granting protections. And maybe we can go a little bit further, and I don't mean to put you on the spot, Stephane but I guess it would be helpful particularly since there have been

some new laws recently, if you could share with the group an updated list of the protections there are for the Red Cross Red Crescent Societies. Is that something that you could share with the group with hopefully relatively low effort?

Stephane Hankin: Thomas, is the question whether I should answer now or what is your question exactly? Do you want me to give some elements now?

Thomas Rickert: You don't have to answer now, I guess what I was interested in learning is whether you could share via the mailing list with the group the legal protections that are in place today because it's my understanding that there have been some changes and updates in the recent years, so that the group can dive into that and take a look at the existing protections.

Stephane Hankin: Well I can already confirm that the international protections have of course remained unchanged and that, you know, these are designations and the words Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Crystal, Red Lion and Sun are protected internationally and they're protected in their pure form, just the words Red Cross, for example, as well as in any other – as well as in any association with any other word.

And they're protected both as the designation of protective emblems in times of war as well as the names of identification of the respective components of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement which is what we are currently discussing in the context of this reconvened group.

In terms of the protections of these words and therefore the names under the legislation of a large number of countries, I think it's around 120 states, that have effective national implementing legislation for those protections including laws that provide for effective punishments and sanctions for misuse of those words and of those names.

So there has been of course since 2013, a slight evolution. There are new states that have adopted comprehensive legislation; Sweden is an example, for example. What we can do and we have done so in the past is of course share with the reconvened working group both an outline of the protections under the 1949 Geneva Conventions and their additional protocols, the international law protections and then a full list of the National Society legislation.

But there's no, you know, radical change to highlight here. These are absolute protections which states parties to the international treaties have obligations to implement and to ensure respect for. So this is what I can share for now. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stephane. Let me just pause for a second whether there are any further comments, and, you know, we're done with the agenda. I think it's – would make no sense for us to go any further than this today; this was really to kick things off and get us all on the same page on what's been requested by us.

I would suggest that we reconvene after ICANN 59 in Johannesburg, but before that I think it doesn't really make sense for us to schedule another meeting particularly since folks are starting to travel in the next couple of days. Avri's asking the question how often we will have meetings? And I guess this is for us to decide. I would firstly try to establish whether we can use this very time slot for the upcoming calls. So let me just ask you – and we're going to put this on the mailing list as well for those who haven't been able to join today, to comment on or object to, but is Wednesday at 18 UTC a workable time for everyone in this group? If not, please make yourself heard, otherwise we would take that as your agreement to this time slot.

And I would suggest that we do weekly or biweekly meetings depending on the work that probably needs to be done in between meetings. So maybe to start with we do weekly calls and so that everyone can mark their calendars

for this time slot. And then we can drop meetings if we don't really have anything to debate or we're waiting for information to come in.

Is this an okay proposal to, you know, because I think we really should try to get this off the table as soon as we can that we schedule a weekly meeting and that we drop meetings in case we can afford to drop them. Mary, your hand is raised, and after that I'm going to respond to Stephane's question in the chat.

Mary Wong: Actually, Thomas, I raised my hand just to note that Stephane had asked a question in chat so please go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. So the question that Stephane is asking is whether there's any intention for this to be in any way discussed in Johannesburg. And I think the only place where this is being discussed is – if memory doesn't fail me but I guess it would be for James to correct me if I'm wrong, there is a session planned during the GNSO Council session where I'm asked to – or I will be asked to give a status update. So basically I will just inform the GNSO Council and the wider GNSO community about basically this call today and our plans to deal with this as quickly as we can.

But there is no substantive discussion planned nor the face to face meeting during the Johannesburg meeting. And I think it would be too short notice to actually schedule that.

Okay so it looks like there are no hands raised. This actually that been a quite silent group today. So you're just listening and enjoying which is good. I expect more vivid discussions as we go into substance. It is good to see so many familiar faces/name in the Adobe room.

I think we're going to have a good time together working on this important topic and as I said earlier, let me quote Blues Brothers again, it's good we have the band back together, let's try to get this done in the same good

quality as we did last time around and I'm able to adjourn six minutes before the top of the hour so I can make a little donation of time to everyone of you. Thanks so much to the participants. Thanks to staff in particular Mary and Berry for preparing this. Thanks to the GNSO Council leadership for the prep work with this. And good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all of you. Bye for now.

Stephane Hankin: Thank you.

James Bladel: Bye.

END