

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Auction Proceeds Drafting Team
31 August 2016 at 19:30 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: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-31aug16-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

ALAC
Alan Greenberg

ASO
Sylvia Cadena

ccNSO
Will not be participating in the drafting team

GAC
Olga Cavalli

GNSO
Jonathan Robinson
Tony Harris

RSSAC
None

SSAC
Russ Mundy

Board
Board Liaisons

Erika Mann

Board appointed staff advisors
Samantha Eisner

Apologies:
Asha Hemrajani

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Julie Hedlund
Lauren Allison
David Tait
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG Charter Drafting Team call held on the 31st of August, 2016.

On the call today we have Olga Cavalli, Alan Greenberg, Sylvia Cadena, Tony Harris and Jonathan Robinson. Our Board liaison is Erika Mann. Our Board staff support will be Samantha Eisner. We have listed apologies from Asha Hemrajani.

From staff we have Marika Konings, David Tait, Julie Hedlund, Lauren Allison and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With this I'll back over to our moderator today, Jonathan Robinson. But, Jonathan, before we start, we also have Russ Mundy joining us. Please begin.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Terri. Welcome, everyone. Welcome to those of you who have a bit of a break. Welcome back to you. And you'll have seen the agenda circulated by Marika, who is able to listen in but probably not contribute too

much. And we've got adequate staff support with David, Julie and Terri. And so we should be fine I'm sure.

So you will have seen that there was a, any agenda there, and I guess we should take any comments on the agenda first of all and make sure that if anyone has any concerns about that and then we can go to the latest version of the charter that you've seen circulated.

Okay so that latest version of the draft was circulated. And what we thought we'd cover under this is really it feels like it's worth under 2C actually going through and discussing the items, the various items flagged.

But before we do that there is, you know, we've previously gone through the comments review tool and there is really any questions around that or any items that need to be discussed are not flagged as yellow. I suspect we can pick up on B as we walk – take a walk through the charter as it currently stands and deal with that.

So any sort of comments or questions in and around the way in which the public comments were addressed or items that you'd particularly like to call out before we take a walk through of the charter? Any comments or input at this stage?

Okay so seeing no hands, and a couple of comments in the chat, thank you Sylvia and Olga, and let's move on then to actually if we could ask – not sure who's loading the document that someone from staff, whoever is doing that.

Erika, the agenda is up in the top right in the notes section so it's not in the main portrait of the screen.

So if we could pull up the charter? And you will see that that's a reasonably large scale anyway know. But you have scrolling and scaling rights. I will walk you through that and just pick up on the various points.

Now there is one point I just want to check if there's that yellow – oh there is – I see we've got, wondering about the yellow – I'm sure I understand, I understood, I should have asked Marika about this, I'm not sure I understand the point on things flagged as yellow. I can see the various changes from a redline point of view, but is that yellow the highlights on the comments or where is the yellow flagging us. Make sure I understand exactly where that is.

David, are you able to clarify that? Go ahead.

David Tait: Thanks, Jonathan. Yes, my understanding is the yellow comments – the yellow highlighted comments that Marika was referring to is the outstanding issue.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. I can add to that as well. And apologies, I'm on audio only and a bit in a noisy place. But indeed, the yellow comments are either issues that may need further input or where I just wasn't 100% sure that I could make that change without further drafting team discussion. So in some of them it may be pretty straightforward because a certain suggestion is made but it's just something where the drafting team may just need to say we're fine with that, make that change, and we can do it.

And some of them, I think, there was as well a couple of questions that I had.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. That's helpful. So what we will do is we will walk through and work through the charter now as it currently stands. And I will call out the various points where there's opportunity for input and discussion. And if there is none it's fine, we don't need to dwell on things that there is effectively consensus to accept them as they are. It's really if you (unintelligible) the way they've been interpreted or there's an obvious question with where things need to go.

So in that spirit I will start with the first point is at the end of the problem statement. And although the Board's recent input is covered elsewhere I added that in on my most recent edit. And so you'll see just ahead of goals and objectives on Page 1, at the bottom of the problem statement, normally it says the historic position where we had the letter – the February 16 letter from Steve Crocker.

We also indicated that – further that the Board has committed to enter into dialogue with CCWG, etcetera. I guess my question, and this is what I wanted to ask is perhaps of the liaisons, perhaps of others if we need further work on this, does this mean that the Board is essentially committing to implementing the recommendations unless it doesn't believe it can accept them? Or it feels slightly, it's not quite clear to me.

So Alan, you put your hand up, perhaps you want to add something from this first section and then we will come to Erika on that question.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I put my hand up actually about something earlier in this section I want to talk about. I'm presuming that that's what it means. And if it does, some clarity would be nice but maybe there's a subtle difference though, I'll defer to Erika.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Let's go to Erika on this point and then you come back on your previous one...

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Jonathan Robinson: So if you could drop your hand and reraise it.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Jonathan, Alan. I can't see it on Page 1 just it's a technical comment first. I find the reference to the Board on Page 2, but probably this is just that I see it in a different way in the document than you do. So I – just to give you a little bit of background, the Board was – want to ensure that if a

conflict arises, similar to what we discussed in the (unintelligible) that's a way of communicating between the different entities involved in this discussion.

So I would recommend to keep the text as it is in the moment and not try to go back to the Board and to express further, you know, further clarification. I think it is something we will have to test once or twice as it arises if the current language will satisfy all engaged and involved players.

And my advice would be, and I think Asha would agree if she would be with us, and Sam probably as well, I know she's on the call, I would recommend to leave it as it is. The Board is willing to do – communicate and the Board is more than willing to find a way in case a conflict arises.

And I would not want – my personal opinion is not to elaborate on this any further but just keep it as it is.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Erika. And since I originated this particular comment, I mean, I would say two things. One, I'm perfectly fine with that. I think it's a reasonable position and I'm happy to close the issue at this point.

But I would still like to keep that second sentence (unintelligible) it completes that final paragraph in that section which commences from the (unintelligible).

Erika Mann: I have no problem with this, Jonathan. And I don't think that anybody would have a problem. I just can't find it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Erika Mann: That's all. I can't see it.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, and by the way my previous description. It is in the section, Erika, that begins in fact on Page 1, Section 2, problem statement goals and objectives and then we say problem statement (unintelligible), we go on to

state the problem and it's at the bottom – the very last sentence in that section. But it's really a copy from the note that Laurent sent to us. So I wouldn't expect anyone would have a problem and I'm happy to accept your point that this doesn't need further work.

Erika Mann: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: So I think we can probably move on...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Erika. Alan, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'm back a couple of paragraphs, the one about proceeds, the one that starts, "The new gTLD auction proceeds are distinct." Second paragraph on the page. We asked the question about asking for some detail and clarity on how the money is segregated, how it's invested and where the interest accrues. And I think to avoid having – for – first of all for transparency and to avoid having to answer that question multiple times I think we should put it into that paragraph.

So I think we should include a statement saying where it says they have a separate bank investment accounts I think we should say the money is invested very conservatively and any interest accrues to the fund.

Jonathan Robinson: Seems uncontroversial. And assume no one disagrees we can simply accept that there's an additional further detail for that paragraph to cover what has been previously communicated in that regard. Thanks, Alan.

Going down then through the document further, the next point of discussion we get to will be just check, is on now Page 3. And this is a topic which

we've, excuse me, touched on once or twice before if not more. And this is when we in fact it first comes up, it's the use of not inconsistent in two cases at the top of Page 3.

Frankly, I thought we'd rolled back to "consistent with" but perhaps not. And Sylvia has suggested that we essentially make this comment or this input consistent with the other comments in the document and use the term "align" so unbiased distribution of auction proceeds aligned with.

Frankly, I think consistent and aligned are in some ways similar. Personally if it was a choice between the two I would think – I'd prefer consistent but I understand why Sylvia suggested "align" it's being used elsewhere in the document.

So where do we stand on this point now? Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, we are using align; in some places we use not inconsistent. And I think in fact we use another variation somewhere else. I actually favor the multiple terms because it conveys more of the flavor, if you will, of what we're trying to say and since aligned with is not a really well defined term I think fleshing it out more with multiple terms will support – will provide more insight into the CCWG members than just using a single term, which is not well defined.

I don't feel adamant about this but I, you know, I think it does give a better tone. That's it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. And then we talked about whether or not the use of consistent was more in a sense narrow than not inconsistent. So why don't you come in on this point, Sylvia, since it's a point you've raised. Please come in on audio.

Sylvia Cadena: Can you hear me now?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Sylvia Cadena: Thank you, Jonathan. Well, I refer then to all of you that are English speakers as (unintelligible) to be able to find a word that is better. But I do think that it's way more important to have consistence in the document because I tried to imagine how an applicant in what position we will – the CCWG and later on the mechanism to allocate the funds will put an applicant that is trying to explain how their mission is not inconsistent with ICANN.

And that organization is coming also from a developing country that their English is not as good as yours. So in trying to be inclusive and as clear as possible I think that consistency is way more important. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Sylvia, I see that point actually, the double negative is potentially confusing in its own use there. And second, that to the extent that it's possible the document should be self-consistent. Personally, what I would expect to do is once we have substance of the document, I personally, from a chair point of view, want to at least go through the document sort of editorially to make sure it is as self-consistent as possible and expressive and doesn't have grammatical and other weaknesses.

But on the substance there is, I mean, it has previously been discussed that not inconsistent is potentially broader than consistent. So if we go with align I prefer consistent. But I do think we need some guidance from others. I mean, I note Erika said in the chat that she prefers consistent. And I note that Alan's hand is up so go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. I think I'm the one who originally proposed not inconsistent because it is broader than consistent. You know, the gray ground is excluded from consistent but is not excluded from not inconsistent.

However, with regard to what Sylvia said, I totally agree that by the time it comes – by the time we come to the place where applicants are submitting applications, they have to be given better guidance than this varied number of words.

But what we're drafting are the rules for the CCWG. They may end up with something much more – much narrower than what we're talking about as a result of their deliberations or they may end up with things that are very specifically targeted. What we're doing is giving them their guidelines, not providing the guidelines for the future applicants. And that's why I think broadness and a flexibility is something that we want to allow them to have so we don't limit what they're doing.

And that's why I like, you know, using my flowery terms, why I like different flavors presented to them so they can work and come up with something that is indeed consistent and clear for the final applicants. But we're at a different level than that at this point. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan, notwithstanding that point, which I think I understand and you've articulated well, we've got Sylvia wanting consistent; Erika preferring consistent. Can you live with us going back to the use of consistent with ICANN's mission? Because that will get us past this point potentially.

Alan Greenberg: I – very reluctantly because I think we've narrowed the focus a lot from the original intent when the Applicant Guidebook was written. And the Board may well provide guidance during the CCWG that narrows it again. I would not like us to narrow it at this point and I think that's what we're doing. So that's my worry.

Ultimately it may end up being very narrow but I don't think we're – I don't think we're the balance group that should be making that decision.

Jonathan Robinson: Sylvia and Erika are lined up to speak after you so let's hear from Sylvia.
Sylvia, your mic looks open but we don't hear you. Not sure what's going on there.

Erika Mann: Do you want Sylvia first or do you want me first?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...hear her Erika. So why don't we...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Sylvia wrote her comment.

Jonathan Robinson: See that, okay, so why don't you pick things up? So Sylvia's comment is that notwithstanding the acceptance of different words to the document she's still not happy with the double negative and would prefer to go with essentially consistent.

Go ahead.

Erika Mann: We had this discussion before (unintelligible) and I see Alan's point. And I think he has a very valid point and he made the comment before because we are at the place where more openness as recommendation to the CCWG might make more sense. And I think it's a danger (unintelligible) in the future.

I'm more than willing to support Alan. I supported him before and I back-stepped to consistent, but I'm happy to support him because I think from a strategic point, looking at the process – and I don't think it is super important and super relevant so it's whatever we go with to more – that's a broader context Alan is giving us (unintelligible) and during the CCWG process if needed it can always be narrowed down again.

Jonathan Robinson: Erika, unfortunately for me, at least, and I suspect others, your audio come in and out. Can Terri or David (unintelligible) just confirm.

Terri Agnew: Hi, Jonathan. It's Terri. I confirm, Erika, your audio was cutting in and out. I see you're only connected...

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: ...on the Adobe Connect.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Terri. And so – and David confirmed in the chat. So it was – but, I mean, okay thanks, Erika. Understood. It may be better to come in by phone if possible, Erika. But, anyway, so it looks like we've got on balance a view to stick with not inconsistent.

And, Sylvia, what I will commit to you is that we'll go through this document with a fine tooth comb once we settle on the substantial point, including this one, and try and do my best to work and possibly with Alan certainly I will do it and make sure that the document is self-consistent and as clear and plain English as possible even, again, recognizing Alan's point that the real essence of important clear communication will ultimately lead to end users and applicants. But I think that every stage of the way we should strive for clear plain English communication. And so we'll commit that to you.

So I suggest here we move on beyond that point now given the balance of views from Russ, Erika, Alan and so on. And for the moment and then just look at – making sure that the document is as clear as possible.

I'm going to scroll down now to – we go onto as part of its deliberations and we have the second use of not inconsistent with. And before I go on to Marika Koning's comments I see one, two, three, four (unintelligible) hear from Alan because your hand...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm – I want to talk about the one (off) campaign funds. I think that's the one Marika is going to address also. So – I'll make my comment let her cover any further things.

My understanding is this one is not a limitation that we're putting on for some philosophical reason but it is one of the things that the US tax law requires. And therefore I think we should explicitly say that as per US tax law, the CCWG must include a limitation or something like that because it's not something that we're pushing for on our own philosophy; it's to protect our tax status.

And the subtleties of how we – what we will have to do is other jurisdictions to make sure our US tax status is protected is something that's going to require some investigation. But that's going to be the driver of how narrowly or widely we set the restrictions in other jurisdictions. So I think we should make it clear to the CCWG why we're – why this one is there. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Very good point, Alan. I mean, I think what we've attempted to do here, and maybe you're criticizing the way in which we've actually – where we've landed is that what we've said is that clearly a tax-driven or tax status-driven point which says that funds must not be used to lobby in terms that that means in the US.

But I think we've also attempted to make this globally fair. And so perhaps the way to fix it – so Sam plus one. I've got Olga saying plus one too. So I just wonder whether we, I mean, clearly what we need in the wording of that bullet point, and maybe we need to go back to Sam or someone to help us with actually rewording that point to say exactly what we mean and why we mean it.

I think the second intent there, and we might want to think about that intent is, we wouldn't want to, in a sense, I suppose we'd want to be fair to applicants from all over the world. So if this in some way we wouldn't want to create a

sort of loophole which permitted activities outside of the US that weren't permitted within the US. So that's the only other point I would say, is how we make it sort of globally inclusive rather than applying to US applicants only.

Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, but that's exactly the point. The term "lobbying" has very different meanings outside of the US with – compared to the US. But since we are trying to satisfy US tax law I suspect, and I'm not a lawyer on this so I'm not going to say definitively, I suspect it is the US definition of lobbying that we are – that we are prohibiting not someone else's definition of something that is perfectly illegal within the US and therefore it will not cause a problem with US tax law.

So that's the way I read it and therefore if that's correct we need to make sure that's how the CCWG interprets it. Have we lost – okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Sylvia, go ahead. Sylvia, would you like to speak? And of course...

Terri Agnew: Jonathan, this is Terri. Earlier in the chat Sylvia had commented that she's having difficulties with her mic and she would type in the chat area.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I'll recognize that that remains the point. Okay so here's my suggestion to you, that we need here it seems is we need to get – revert back to the wording here perhaps from Sam but – that was in the previous memo. And we need to get – wording that deals with this specific problem.

It may be another item as to how that applies if at all outside of the US. But I think the point is well taken that we really want to clarify what the issue is in the US and make sure that's properly and singularly worded for and then decide if there's any additions we want to make.

Go ahead, Sam.

Samantha Eisner: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Sam Eisner for the record. I'm happy to look at this and try to clean up the language to reflect that. I think that it makes sense, as Alan suggested, to make that tie into US tax laws so that people understand which jurisdiction's definition you look for when you're looking at this type of activity and then also, Jonathan, as you noted, you know, bring in that concept of that global application so that we're not favoring one jurisdiction over another but we have some sort of reference in the document as to the standard that we're looking at that would be applied globally so I'm happy to take a look at that language.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Sam. I think that'll be helpful. And thank you, David, because you seem to be on it in terms of capturing these points. Sylvia, if that's a new hand, please feel free to contribute. If not, do lower your hand.

Sylvia Cadena: I just hope that the audio works.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes it does.

Sylvia Cadena: And I think, Sam, I think it would be really good that you take also a look at the how this kind of limitation is used, for example, (unintelligible) and that actually has an impact, I mean (unintelligible) in the U.S. that are located far from the U.S. government, let's say to organizations overseas but it also has an impact on something that I mentioned before when we started and tried to make a bit more global (unintelligible) issue.

If parts of that can be used for comparing and influence legislation overseas, let's say and it doesn't act (unintelligible), some governments might actually preclude limitations from ICANN to receive those funds or apply for them because they might (unintelligible). So that (unintelligible) although it is good that (unintelligible). It will also allow or encourage other organizations from other countries to apply with the same or even tighter restrictions apply.
Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Sylvia. And to respond to that point, would you like to come back on it?

Samantha Eisner: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Sam again. Thanks, Sylvia, for that. You know, I think that what - my inclination would be to leave this edit at a principle level within the drafting team - within the charter and allow some of that further research to happen at the - during the drafting - or I'm sorry, during the CCWG proceeds. I'm worried that that level of research would push back the timeline of us getting to the charter and would, you know, still require a lot of intensive look at that during the work of the CCWG itself.

And so what I'd like to do is try to present some language that helps reflect this is a principled - the principled state of we have a law that or some tax regulations that we have to be mindful of and they preclude this. We need to make sure that's it's reflected appropriately at the global stage that is, you know, so we're treating applicants equally, and maybe even add in something that chartering - or I'm sorry, the CCWG itself could consider how these types of restrictions are included at other international grant making levels so that we don't hold up the delivery of the charter any further to get some additional research at this point.

Jonathan Robinson: It seems to capture it well. I see a check from Alan. And let's give you the opportunity to do that. And I do recognize your point about making sure we capture the essence or the principle of the charter drafting stage without, again, unduly restrict the work of the CCWG. So let's give you an opportunity to take a crack at that and hopefully that can get us to where we need to be, you know, having heard the various inputs.

All right. The next comment is it's called comment J5, and that's further - just one further down on Page 3. And I simply was looking for with my comment where we dealt with the mandatory disclosures. And in fact it is dealt with later in the document, so we can simply move on beyond that mandatory

disclosures. We've really only got one bullet on mandatory disclosures, but we'll come to that at a later stage.

Of course if there is any other of the highlighted text, you know, or the redline text, which is coming up on my screen as a blue line anyway, but please do come in. But the next comment that I see is from Sylvia, her comment 6, which is on Page 4 and the bullet point 4, that's comment SC6. And Sylvia was looking here for consideration to be taken to ensure the timeframe focuses on effective use of funds, not only for speed at disbursement and expenditure, it's important throughout the use for the long term. Okay.

Alan, did you want to...?

Alan Greenberg: I'm on another item so let's finish this one first.

Jonathan Robinson: So what we have here is when we say that the group must - the CWG must deal with the expected timeframe for disbursements and termination of the framework. And Sylvia's looking for consideration to ensure that the timeframe focuses on the effective use of funds. A question I would put to the group is is it necessary to go - to specify this with detail or is this something we can understand that will be able to be handled in the CCWG? Because at this point, we've said - we've just said what is the expected timeframe for disbursements and termination.

It's a good point I think, Sylvia. The question is, from my point of view, is does it need to be - and I see Erika says - Erika tends to be a bit more cautious and not to recommend language that keeps the timeframe too open. Any other comments or thoughts on this point?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Why are we worried about it taking too long? If this money lasts forever because disbursing it in a reasonable, rational, useful way allows it to continue to be used for 15 years, why is that bad? I don't understand the compulsion. And I'm agreeing with Sylvia. I worry that if we're saying focus on

the termination, that may be taken to be in lieu of doing it properly. So I do have the similar concern to Sylvia.

Jonathan Robinson: You too have a concern about the use of the termination in this point. So maybe it would be adequate to say what is the expected timeframe for disbursement. So perhaps termination is what's causing the problem here, because in essence one you have a timeframe, you do have a termination, but the CCWG could deal with that. So maybe just what is the expected timeframe determination. Maybe that gets around the problem.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I have no problem asking it, as long as it's not interpreted as that is there a compelling reason that this has to be over quickly. And maybe there is, but I don't understand what it is. So.

Jonathan Robinson: Well as it turns out, I mean I don't - to my mind, termination doesn't - but I see Erika seems happy to delete termination. So why don't I put that proposal to you, we just say what is the expected timeframe for disbursements of the framework -- from the framework is probably more correct. Because by definition, if you have a timeframe, you have an end point to that timeframe.

Yes and I think Sylvia's point goes beyond that and seeks to see say well make sure you don't only consider disbursement but effective use. So I mean, what I would read Sylvia's modification is the expected timeframe for disbursement and effective funds. Sylvia, would you like to come in on audio?

Sylvia Cadena: Thank you, Jonathan. I - look, the way I interpret it is that if we only refer to the term disbursement and the termination is imminent and there are no guidelines to the CWG on what the timeframe might actually be, then they might want quickly to say let's get this over, let's allocate these funds very quickly so that we can forget about them and there's less chances for discussion or controversy or problems in the future.

The problem is that when you decide what the expected timeframe for disbursement are, in reality what you are deciding is how long proposals or work to be funded through this type of funding let's say, not to (unintelligible), will take. So for example if someone applies for a project that is a long-term project that is the stability of the network and it's a five-, ten-year implementation process, they cannot receive the funding all up front. That would be very irregular.

So you will be saying okay the timeframe for disbursement is three years, and then everybody will receive the money over three years. If the projects are implemented over the long period of time, then ICANN will require reporting as we are saying later on in the document. So if we are requiring reporting, this process has to (unintelligible) or follow or get some sense of what's going on within (unintelligible).

If we say the timeframe for our location for disbursement are determine X number of years or whatever to get rid of the millions of dollars that are in the specific fund, then in reality what we are saying is how long projects can that can apply for this funding can be. And then we might restrict ourselves to very short term periods. So that's my concern. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Sylvia. I think I understand your concern. I'm just not sure that I understand that the wording necessarily causes that concern, but let's be thoughtful about this and see. Erika, you go ahead next.

Erika Mann: Yes I'm not sure if you can hear me. No you can't hear me. So...

Jonathan Robinson: We can hear you, Erika.

Erika Mann: You can?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. There's a delay so just be patient and just pause but it's fine.

Erika Mann: So I understand Sylvia (unintelligible). So I think the concern Sylvia raised I think it's not - I don't think that we have to reframe the text because of her concerns. But maybe what Jonathan said is more appropriate and covers which is not careful and which will not allow long-term projects to be supported.

Jonathan Robinson: Erika, I'm sorry. It's very difficult to hear you. It seems like there's a weak connection and what's happening it's buffering you and we're getting just - we get a little bit and then it kind of goes quiet and we get a little bit. So it's not - it's hard to get a coherent output from you. David suggests that perhaps a call out is arranged. I think that would be helpful if you could be on telephone or a mobile phone if you have a signal there. So we'll make a call out to Erika.

I'm a little stuck on this one. What is the expected timeframe for disbursements and termination? I think I understand the concern. Perhaps we need to reflect on this. We can hear from Erika. Let's move on to Alan's other point for the moment, and once we have Erika on audio we can try and see if we can figure it out or we might have to do some work offline on dealing with the concern but not managing this point. I'm not quite sure where to go with this one.

Alan, why don't you go ahead? And we'll leave this open for the moment, David, just so you know.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'm talking about the addition that was added to point number two on the reference to distorting the domain name markers. We seem to have an echo. I'm a little bit worried about that. I'm not 100% sure I understand it, but one of the poster children, as it were, uses of this money might be in a future round to help, you know, applicants from developing economies, or something like that. And that implicitly could be viewed by those who are not in developing economies as distorting the domain name marketplace. And are we really forbidding that or does this have some other meaning?

Jonathan Robinson: Let's see if anyone else wants to respond to this. I read through this two or three times today and, you know, I actually started to type up potentially some alternative wording and then eventually I just sort of thought actually as it stands, it seems okay to me. I was prepared to accept it, because what it says is consideration is expected to be given to what safeguards, if any, need to be in place. It doesn't presume that they will, it's just it's recognizing that if they are - so that was just my - that's my two cents' worth, absent any other comments as to whether this is appropriate to retain as it is at the moment.

Alan Greenberg: Jonathan, if I may respond. It does say what safeguards, if any, but it then goes on to say to avoid providing advantages to companies and/or organizations that would distort the name - the domain name market. So there's an implied statement there that providing advantages to some companies is a bad thing, and that's my concern. Maybe it is a bad thing, but I thought that was one of the examples that people thought might be a good use of this money. So I just don't want to inadvertently rule out that kind of use if indeed that is, you know, one of the desired outcomes, or potentially desired outcome.

Jonathan Robinson: Well this is currently contained as a supplement to the primary pass of point two. If you - another way of looking at it would be without the supplement, is point two adequate? Let's hear from Russ and Tony because they've obviously got some inputs here. Russ?

Russ Mundy: Thank you, Jonathan. I think this is a very challenging issue to try to handle because the statement about not distorting or, you know, disturbing the domain name could really be extended to other things also. And it - when you have a large fund, you will have an impact on market forces whether it's intended or unintended.

And I'm not sure that there is anything that we can do in particular to say that that won't happen or certainly nothing that I can think of that would go in the

charter that would, you know, give guidance to the CCWG that would say don't do this. Because with this amount of money, it's almost impossible to not cause some amount of some type of market disruption. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Russ. I'll go straight to Tony since he hasn't had a chance to talk yet on this and other subjects. Go ahead, Tony.

Tony Harris: (Unintelligible)

Jonathan Robinson: I think someone's mic is open.

Terri Agnew: Tony, it's Terri. You were muted on the Verizon side just because there was some noise coming back from you, but you're unmuted now. Your line is open.

Tony Harris: Hello? Hello?

Alan Greenberg: I can hear you saying hello.

Tony Harris: Hello? Hello?

Alan Greenberg: We can hear you saying hello.

Tony Harris: Oh okay. I'm sorry. I was just told I was on mute for some echo problem. Can you hear me now without an echo?

Alan Greenberg: You're perfect.

Tony Harris: Oh fine. Thanks a lot. No, I just wanted to say that this is a very interesting issue and when things like this come up traditionally in ICANN, people in the registry and registrar industries get a little nervous sometimes. I've seen that happen when we've sort of presented things from the (LAT) region, sort of trying to get some consideration to promote people in Latin America

participating in these industries. And the first thing you get is of course well that's giving unfair advantage and that shouldn't happen. And I think this would be probably part of that same argument. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Tony. Alan, did you want to come back further on this point?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just I just wanted to give one other example. One of the things we also have talked about and something that ICANN has encouraged at some level, is what is the follow on to the DNS, you know, what is the son of the DNS, if there should be a project to investigate some alternative for instance or develop an alternative. That could kill the domain name market because something else is going to replace it, and certainly would change it as we know it now. And yet I would think that would be a dandy use of some of this money. So I think we need to be really careful here.

Jonathan Robinson: I was tempted to make a flippant remark, but I think it's a good point. So Sylvia propose something which I think is very helpful because we could strip it back, which is what I originally was wondering whether we strip it right back to the black text ending in a question mark.

But it's clear, as Sylvia points out, that this was raised a few times and it seems to me that the fix will to be do as Sylvia suggests, and my inclination is to agree with that, to include the sentence after the question mark that commences this should, and to include the sentence beginning furthermore, consideration is expected to give but to stop it at the point after place. So we remove from to avoid providing advantage. We just simply ask what safeguards, if any, need to be in place.

And I think to my mind that addresses the concern, gives the capacity to the CCWG to address the concern without going down too far into the second half of that sentence. So that's my proposal to you to get past this point. I see a checkmark from Alan and I'll pause for Sylvia, and Erika's typing. A checkmark from Russ. So, David, I think that's the direction, if you can record

that, I think that feels like the direction we're going in. And Sylvia also confirms here agreement there with a checkmark and a comment in the chat.

So, Russ - sorry, David, if you could deal with that in that way, that's the way to handle that modification. All right, moving then on to we acknowledge we didn't complete the work on SC6 but we go on to SC7. And here under item 7, we say should ICANN oversee the solicitation and valuation of proposal to delegate to another entity -- this is a question for the CCWG -- including for example a foundation created for this purpose.

And Sylvia suggests or a partnership with an existing organization. That doesn't seem to controversial to me. Any thoughts or any disagreement or agrees, or a foundation or partnership - a foundation created for this purpose or partnership within an existing organization. Okay and so Sam highlights that the interaction of both concepts of the partnership may be challenging from a legal point of view.

Well again, there may be a quick fix here, and I'll come to you, Alan. But for example one way of doing it is just to exclude the example. Should ICANN oversee the solicitation and evaluation of proposed or delegate it to another entity, end of point. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes my hand was actually raised for another point later on but I think anything - I'm happy with any solution here. I think what Sylvia's saying is we should allowing flexibility and not prescribing a particular solution. And mentioning a foundation I think is useful for example - or as an example but not, you know, but not limiting a foundation can be created. Some words like - so yes, I think it's useful to mention the term foundation.

We've been talking about foundation for about six or seven years right now with the use of these funds. So I don't think it would be in appropriate to mention it, but we certainly don't want to limit it to that. I suspect we can come up with some words easily to say that.

Jonathan Robinson: I have a hand up from Erika so I'll go straight to Erika. Sylvia you've still got a checkmark checked, if you could just (unintelligible).

Erika Mann: I mean just a short comment. I'm not sure you have seen it. The - some made a recommendation to use the term coordination. I think this makes total sense. It's a big problem (unintelligible) sometimes problematic when you combine two organizations in financial and in terms. Indeed it can be problematic for legal reasons. So instead of partnership, I mean let's just (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. We've got an echo coming from you. We've got loud and clear audio but it's damaged by an echo, which is either coming from it seems your computer's microphone or speaker. So if you could try and deal with that.

It seems to me, as Alan says, we've got for example it is just an example. But the way to fix this might be to say should ICANN oversee the solicitation and evaluation of proposals or delegate or coordinate - or delegate it to another entity or coordinate with another entity, including for example a foundation. So we could bring in the coordination of the third party and without - and if Sam's okay with the use of that and not causing us a problem. So I would suggest, David, that we try and introduce coordination with - into that point and that should - the use of the word coordination. We may not be able to wordsmith it exactly now but to try and recognize that point.

Yes Alan suggested in the chat delegate it to or coordinate with another entity, including for example a - it seems we have an answer there. Alan, you had another point so let's go on to that point.

Alan Greenberg: Yes the - I'm not sure where we are. Okay I think I'm just not scrolled properly. This is on item number 12 in that section, to what extent and if so how ICANN, the organization - how could ICANN, the organization, be a

beneficiary of some of the auction funds. I would tend to say ICANN, the organization, or some - or one of its constituent parts.

I can imagine, I'll give, you know, the personal example, the ALAC or At Large getting some money to do some good, you know, partially using its own infrastructure. That would be different in my mind to the money being given to ICANN sort of in its general funds. You know, financially it would still clearly go to ICANN but it's targeted at a specific application. And I would - so I would add a couple of words to make that clear that it's not going to ICANN as the body itself but for a particular application or usage.

The other thing is, which is just the opposite, what if we were to say one of the uses that it could be put to is putting \$16 million into the reserve. That's going to ICANN, the organization.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point, Alan. As I read it, it was intended to - it reads as was intended, but I take your point that it could be - that it doesn't necessarily cover what you would want it to, or it's not full enough. So I understand your suggestion to be to what extent and if so how could ICANN, the organization, or a constituent part of - or a constituent part be the beneficiary. So you want to add or a constituent part.

Alan Greenberg: You phrased it much better than I had in my head, but yes that's exactly correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Alan. Let's just - we can provisionally accept that. Let's see if others have a response or a concern to that. Erika?

Erika Mann: Is the connection better this time? Can you hear me now?

Alan Greenberg: We can.

Erika Mann: Wonderful. So I think that's a good formulation. We just have to be cautious that we don't recommend that any money which shall be spent from the operational budget in the future should come from the auction proceed fund. So it must be clear that whatever - wherever the money will go to in case there's a request either from the community or from ICANN, for example for the reserve fund, it must be a clearly defined specific purpose, something which is bigger than the normal operational function of a - for a particular goal. So maybe we can infuse maybe one word so that it's clear it is something specific for a specific purpose or for a specific goal.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. I think that's a really good point, although in my view that's exactly - that argument that you've just put forward is exactly what one would put forward in answer to this question in the working group. Because at the moment the charter just says to what extent, how should this be limited. And your answer, your partial answer is well it shouldn't be used for operational funds. So I think in my opinion, that may be going a step too far, although I happen to I think understand and agree with you. My thought back to you would be is the question is adequate as it stands from the point of view of the drafting charter.

Erika Mann: Yes, makes sense. If we keep it with the questions and we don't go further, that's fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, Erika. Let's go to Tony next.

Tony Harris: Yes can you hear me? Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Tony.

Tony Harris: Okay fine. I just wanted to say that I agree with what Alan said about constituent parts. And a good example would be that some of those funds could reinforce the efforts on universal acceptance. Because getting universal

acceptance, people all over the world is going to benefit the Internet users in general. Did you hear me?

Alan Greenberg: We're hearing you well.

Tony Harris: Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Tony...

Tony Harris: Okay. I'm a little nervous because I keep getting muted by somebody. So. But thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Tony. We've got you loud and clear about the universal acceptance. So I think David you should have already got the suggested change from much earlier. And let me just check that indeed you did. Yes you've got it. Thank you. So that's good. The notes reflect that discussion. So to keep things moving, Sam asked to make a point on point 11. So Sam, point 11 is what governance framework should apply. Go ahead.

Samantha Eisner: Thanks, (Jonathan). My question was on 11, I understand that this language was brought in probably particularly in response to an item that the board raised in the note that it sent during Helsinki. When I look at just the language that says what governance framework should apply, I think it's a very broad statement and there could be a lot of effort used to try to define that.

I'd recommend, and I'd be happy to take a stab at putting in some additional language that brings in some of the context from that board, the board note so that this doesn't seem like it's a whole task onto itself and it's not trying to set up board or that sort of thing but really trying to get to the more measures of success type things that the board raised. So if the group would be amenable to that, I'd be happy to suggest some further defining language to make this a clearer and easier task for the CCWG to take on.

Jonathan Robinson: Any objections or concerns with that? I think - thank you for the suggestions there. Alan is supportive. Erika is supportive. All right, Sam, that would be great. Thank you. We'll record that and ask you to go ahead with providing us with some more specific wording. Because I agree, it's a little bit of a concern that it's so wide.

Samantha Eisner: Great thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's move on and keep things ticking over. Sylvia, yes I mean point on item 10, noted your point about a typo. Like I said, I personally will commit to going through this editorially. Erika, is that - I think that's an old hand but let me just defer to you in case there was something you wanted to come back on.

Erika Mann: Yes it's an old hand but I think you wanted to go back to point four because you couldn't hear me.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes please do. Thank you for reminding me of that because one of the reasons we didn't complete it was because we were waiting for your input. So go ahead, Erika.

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible) you couldn't hear me. So point four, I think what I would recommend because I think both ways of looking at it are right. The language is a little bit confusing and I think the confusing part comes from the work - framework in this context. Because framework - the determination of framework and the word framework has no context. What is the framework?

Framework could be the contract, the termination of an individual and single contract within the defined time period or it could have a meaning that the reference of the framework could reference to the total of the auction proceeds allocation of the total money. So it's a little bit confusing the term. So maybe we should be clear, a little bit clearer here. Because I can't see the text well where I am, it's a little bit difficult to make a recommendation.

But I'm happy to send a recommendation to you a bit later or tomorrow morning and maybe differentiate the points Sylvia was making and the way the language is framed right now. Because I think what we want to recommend to the CCWG is the careful and the - and have the program running in an open term results, looking for a time period, but on the other side, we want to have clearance or we want to make a recommendation about having clear procedures set up in the future for the way the individual programs are going to be allocated.

And this can include what Sylvia wants. She wants to be - she wants to have the possibility that if the longer program which take more time that they will be not cut off by any kind of recommendation to have a short period recommended. So I understand. If you allow me, I'm happy to make a recommendation for a language.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. Personally I welcome that contribution. I think that that would be great. I happen to agree with you that the use of framework is problematic here and it well may be worth deleting. And I think then you've got this natural tension, which you seem to have got, and Sylvia's grateful too for your offer of this.

The tension seems to be between recognizing that this is a what you might call a closed-ended fund. It's not necessarily going to be topped up, and therefore has to be finite but no so finite or terminal that it doesn't deal with longer term projects, which is Sylvia's concern. So yes please, do go ahead, and if you think you can deal with that, that would be most welcome. So let's allow you to make that contribution and that'll be great.

Erika Mann: Yes understood. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm going to work my way down to the next point, which comes under section four, page 8. And here we - I made a very minor suggestion, although

it did respond to Sylvia's concern and she had - Sylvia had said in the first bullet under this is section four, membership criteria, page five, the first bullet. And it says, "Have sufficient and appropriate interest and ideally expertise to participate."

And Sylvia was looking for something which meant desire or willingness. And when I looked at that, I thought motivation is really what we're talking about here. We want to at least state that we really want motivated and ideally qualified participants. But when we say interest, I think we mean motivation here. So that's my proposal to respond to Sylvia's concern or point here.

Sylvia, would that be helpful? Does that meet your requirement? And, you know, if others have concerns, let me know. Otherwise I think we'll go on. So Sylvia's concern that motivation that meets that requirement. I think it does as well. So let's keep moving.

And now we come to a point on page six of where we have a paragraph beginning about two-thirds of the way down, which says against all members. And we go on. And this goes to my earlier question, where do we specify the specific points on disclosures? And we go on to say that we're going to have certain - we're going to have a statement of interest from everyone and we're going to have mandatory disclosures.

And we then go on to say well our mandatory disclosure is that -- and in fact I modified this slightly so be aware that this is slightly modified in the latest version from me. It says, "Declaration on intention to apply for or in any way support the application for new gTLD auction proceeds, either as an individual and/or through the entity." In other words, we've got a strong disclosure we say and we want to know if you have any intention, not just that you're going to, if you have any intention to support or participate in the application for funds.

So the question is is that a good - is that well worded enough? I happen to think it's not bad as it stands. But second, are there more mandatory disclosures we require? What else do we need here? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I would tend to add to the end "or otherwise funded by or affiliated with." People don't always have employment relationships but have a vested interest. You know, we have the concept of lobbyists, we have the concept of people volunteering for something but, you know, they're not paid for it, but nevertheless they have a strong vested in seeing a specific outcome. So I think we need to cover all of our bases there.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point, Alan. That seems - you say it would be either as an individual and/or through the entity you're representing and/or employed by, and/or affiliated with.

Alan Greenberg: Otherwise funded by or affiliated with.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. And/or funded by or affiliated with. And then Sylvia also makes a point that or in any way support might be or in the application. I think this would need a bit of wordsmithing but the important thing to do is to capture that point there of endorsement. So if you could, David, in terms of modifying it, introduce endorsement there, so in any support/endorse. And we can always tidy up the wording. The key is to get the principles in here. Erika?

Erika Mann: I think there may be something else we would want to recommend. And so what is typical procedure, and I have worked in funding environments a big part of my life, so I think it could be good to recommend that if anything changes with regard to conflict of interest, there shall be - there not be a requirement included, that the member will have to report it.

Because keep in mind we might talk about a fund it could run between five and ten years, we don't know for how long, and the interest rate at the beginning or a conflict of interest might either fade away because in the end

the organization decides not to request a fund or during the period the interest changes and the request will be made. So I think it was important that whenever a change occurs, the person or the organization allocates a person at the CCWG that will have to declare this.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a very good point, and Sylvia supports you in addition, Erika. So I think that feels like a separate and second bullet point that it is mandatory to report any changes in...

Erika Mann: I agree with you. It should be separate.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, old hand.

Jonathan Robinson: Any further disclosures? If you do think of them, please come back because we're going to try and - we'll come on to timeframe but we are going to try and see if we can't do something about being ahead and making sure we don't want to keep this work on this charter group open forever. So. (Kara) points out that a bit of editing, it seems have the idea was lost. I've made some edits to simplify this sentence.

Yes I'm not worried about Marika's edits. That seems fine. And again, I'll reiterate that I would expect to go through this and review it for consistency and coherency of language, so personally I don't have a concern with Marika's edit. And it appears that Erika agrees with that. It's just a (unintelligible).

Let's keep working through then. There are, you know, you'll see some minor plurals and minor editorial changes. So look for if there's any other very substantial points. Okay so just to note here that in - under section at the top of Page 10, the mission of CCWG recommendations to the ICANN board is added for a second time that wording which was received from (Lauren),

representing the board view, which is that the ICANN board of directors will enter into a dialogue. So that's just at the bottom of that first section on Page 10. And then the modification of the charter we include reference to that memo on legal and financial considerations.

All right. I see no other points here. So before we move on and start to look at the deadline, I'd just remind you we're at ten to the hour, we're eight minutes before the top of the hour when ideally we'd finish, and Sylvia says we made it to the last one, which is a sigh of relief. So I think we now come onto timeframe for final review and comments and the target date for sharing the charter.

We've committed to making some minor points. We've got two coming in from Sam. We've got one from Erika. I'm certainly going to commit to a review. I mean I would imagine we could do this - let me just have a look at where we are in terms of the week itself and - our week finishes on the 2nd. If we could come back with these modifications in 48 hours, we could then give ourselves a week to review the document with those final modifications in it and potentially shipping this out to the chartering organizations shortly after that.

And bear in mind what we said here, this is key, we're not shipping them out to the charter and saying here's our draft charter, please approve it, we're saying here's our draft charter, can you give us feedback, anything of substance that will impede you from approving it? So that's the provisional time table I'd suggest to you. Modifications in 48 hours, review for another - up to another week, and then early the following week around the September 12, we post it to the chartering organizations for indications of whether there are any showstoppers as such to prevent them. And we take that round of feedback.

Personally it feels like it's putting a bit of speed on things but not unduly. It feels like we're right enough with this work that we could do something. So if you're okay with it, that's my suggested timeframe to try and work with. So I

guess Sam, Erika, anyone else who's committing, you know, can you come back within 48 hours on these points given how busy you might be with other things?

Great. So it seems we support that timeframe. I think an interesting one then when we might have our next meeting because the question is do we need to meet before sending this off? I mean our kind of meeting cycle would normally be we've got - we're meeting today, being the 31st, we would normally meet either on the 14th I guess, two weeks from now, but perhaps we might want to bring that forward and meet simply a week from now to do a final check.

Yes thank you, Terri. I was aware of that board workshop which will cause some problem anyway. So I just wonder if we shouldn't come back together in about a week's time and just do a final check with this, or at least - what do others feel about that? Alan supports it. Sylvia supports it. Well then staff I'd like you to please look at a meeting for us I guess let's give ourselves a bit of flexibility.

Look at the 7th, 8th, 9th, because really that's the back end of next week is when we want to try and wrap this up, having got - so our time table is comments from - changes that we've agreed to on this call to be worked on and produced by Friday 2nd. We then have a few days to further review on list, and then we come back together to meet 7th, 8th, or 9th. So staff if you could run us a doodle poll for those days, 7th, 8th, 9th, and we'll try and accommodate everyone as best as possible and (unintelligible).

Terri Agnew: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Terri.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Pardon the interruption. I have the doodle poll for the 7th, 8th, and 9th. Should that still - should we still target a two-hour but hopefully you'll end in an hour and a half?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I think we may even be done in an hour with good speed. Yes but certainly I would - let's look for an hour. Let's try and grab an hour slot, because I think this is not a massive meeting. This is about saying, you know, dealing with really the final pieces. So perhaps we should doodle for an hour. It would make it more ready availability. Yes let's target an hour.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, will do.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Terri. All right well that gives us the point where we're almost able to make a wrap at the top of the hour as we had hoped to. Any final comments or questions or issues you'd like to raise? Go ahead.

Russ Mundy: Jonathan, this is Russ. I don't know if other activities will have a similar constraint, but SSAC has a very challenging time deciding anything in a week timeframe even if there are any showstoppers here. So if we could do ten days or two weeks in that cycle, that would be much more achievable for me and in line with going through the review with SSAC.

Jonathan Robinson: Russ, I assume we'll do quite a bit longer than that. I perhaps wasn't clear enough. The week is simply for this group to decide for ourselves are we (unintelligible) to chartering organizations. I expect we'll - and I'll come back to you with the (unintelligible). I mean I think we're more like three or four weeks or something for the chartering organizations, or even possibly longer. So we certainly wouldn't expect a chartering organization to turn it around in a week or ten days.

Russ Mundy: Oh thank you, Jonathan. I misunderstood. I thought there was going to be what I'll call an informal cycle with the chartering organizations, giving them

an opportunity to jump up and holler if they saw any showstoppers. But if that was just for our group, a week is fine thank you. Sorry, I misunderstood.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. So I - let me see. So we would, just to reiterate that time table, we would by Friday the 2nd of September we'd put in our comments that we've committed to do on this call. We then meet in approximately one week's time to finally review those last changes that hopefully we've had some chance to look at in the interim. And then any further minor changes are made. And on the 12th of September or thereabouts, we send the document out to the chartering organizations and ask them if they have any major concerns.

And the timeframe for that possibly by the 30th of September. So there we're talking about maybe a couple of weeks, slightly more than a couple of weeks. It's really are there any showstoppers here, are there any significant concerns and to confirm back to us by the 3rd of October so that we can then send it out for potential adoption in the October/November timeframe. But let's look at the time table, like Sylvia says, to confirm that and see if there are any concerns.

So if you could make an action on chair and staff to circulate an update of the time table or current version of the time table, please, David, that will help the others as well. (Unintelligible). Thanks. I'm just letting David capture that.

All right good. Well thanks everyone. That was - seemed to me to be a very productive meeting with good input all around and a commitment to getting it through the work. So thank you again. And you'll see David's taking some good notes there so we're in good shape. Thank you and we'll look forward to seeing you in around about a week's time. Goodbye for now.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you all. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Bye.

Man: Thank you everyone. Bye.

Terri Agnew: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Operator, (Jay), if you could please stop all recordings. To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END