

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
07 February 2018 at 13:00 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/gnsso/gnsso-ssc-07feb18-en.mp3>

AC recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p74zp62fk12/>

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

Attendees:

Maxim Alzoba
Renata Aquino Ribeiro
Susan Kawaguchi
Osvaldo Novoa
Frederic Guillemaut
Lori Schulman

Apologies:

Erika Mann
Poncelet Illelji

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Emily Barabas
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recordings are now started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Iris). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Wednesday 7th of February, 2018. On the call today we have Susan Kawaguchi, Maxim Alzoba, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Osvaldo Novoa and Frédéric Guillemaut. We received an apology from Poncelet Illelji. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Emily Barabas and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to please keep your lines muted to avoid any

background noise. I'd also like to note that Lori Schulman has just joined those in the Adobe Connect room. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you so much, Nathalie. And welcome all. Thanks for joining. It looks like we almost have everyone except Poncelet. So first thing on the agenda does anybody have any SOI updates? Looks like Lori is typing. Oh I'm glad you did – you got the confluence issue figured out, that's really important.

Okay doesn't look like we have any SOI updates so thank you all for filling out the poll. I was late in doing so and thank you, Emily, for sending the poll. But it looks like we've got everybody now. And so that will be our first job today is to review those updates. Just as a reminder, you know, we have – we need to select the candidate to nominate to the GNSO Council for the SSR2 and it's either Scott or Rao unless we make some other decisions. Those are our two candidates out of the original seven left.

So Emily, I was wondering if you could present the poll results just since we – because you're probably more familiar with them. I read them this morning but – yes, Emily, go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan. This is Emily from staff. Actually before we get started with the poll results would it be helpful to provide an update about the discussions during the strategic Council session and sort of where we are in terms of goals for the process and deadlines? I'm happy to cover that or if you'd like to speak to that, Susan, maybe we could start with that?

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh, that's a good idea. And I'm going to let you cover that because it's a little fuzzy in my brain right now what we did last week, so.

Emily Barabas: Sure, no problem. This is Emily from staff again. So last – I guess it was last week, it feels like quite a long time ago but the Council held a strategic

session to discuss a number of high level issues but one of the topics that came up was this particular selection process. And the original plan was for the SSC to just do an initial evaluation of the skills matrix to see if there was an obvious place where one of these two candidates would fill a need or a gap in the existing skill set and then sort of stop there and wait further instruction.

But it sounds like now there's a bit more urgency around the selection process because the other SOs and ACs feel that it's important to fill this position before the SSR2 review team can sort of unpause or restart. So because the GNSO doesn't want to be the limiting factor on restarting the process that means that they would very much like the SSC to make a selection, ideally one of these two candidates sooner rather than later.

So that's my understanding. Marika or Susan, please feel free to chime in. But it sounds like the bottom line is that the time pressure around the selection is somewhat more pressing than it seemed to have been previously. So that's just a bit of context for our process. And Marika says nothing to add. Thanks.

So what you'll see here is we've got seven responses now which is great to the poll. And what everyone was asked to do as a reminder, was to look at this matrix of skills that the existing SSC – or I'm sorry, SSR2 review team members had filled out where they assessed themselves and said these are the skills we think we have. So again, none of this is really a hard and fast science but it should give us a little bit of an indication.

And then we asked for the two remaining candidates from the sort of existing pool of candidates do they have these skills from what we can tell from the materials. And I realize it's difficult to assess that. So this is the sort of summary document of, let me unsync this. And again, you know, we're seeing a lot of little numbers so it's a little bit hard to sort of assess what

you're looking at but I'm actually going to share a different document for a minute that might be a little bit easier to interpret so let's see.

So building on the matrix that was produced by the SSR2 review team members – and again this is just sort of a, you know, please don't take this as hard and fast science but just sort of one way to look at this. I'm going to unsync again. What I did here was take – in the second column a tally of all of the skills – the number of Xs or number of members who said that they had a particular skill and highlighted in green the ones where 11 or more had that skill so it's a skill that's already heavily represented; for 6-10 members having that skill it's yellow; and for 1-5, so one that's kind of an underrepresented skill it's highlighted in red.

And then in the final two columns for each of the candidates I tallied the number of times that SSC members felt that a person had this particular skill, so for example mitigating unique identifier abuse, six people felt that Scott McCormick seemed to have that skill based on his application whereas Rao only three people did. And it's a skill that's somewhat in need because nine people have that skill so maybe that's not the most urgent; the ones that are in red, for example, contractual compliance, might be one to look at a little more closely.

So that's one was to start looking at this. I think what you'll see if you just kind of scan through this is that in general Scott McCormick had higher scores for kind of across the board but also for – pulling down – oh actually for those sort of red items, the most needed items are actually it looks like roughly equal but overall Scott had higher scores.

So that might be a starting point and another starting point might also be to look at the poll from 2017, which was very, very basic which basically just said "Who do you think has more of the skilled needed for this role?" And Scott also came out on top there and I can display that in a few minutes if that's helpful.

So perhaps we could just start a bit of a conversation around where to go from here and I noticed that there are a few comments as well in the poll that I'm just going to drop into the chat from three of the members who followed up on the poll and that might also fuel the conversation. Oh, those all came out as one chat. Hang on one second. I'm going to have to drop those all in one by one. And, Susan, I'll pass it back to you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, thanks Emily. Frédéric has lost sound. Can we help Frédéric out? So one of my questions that I put in, and I did this late at night last night, what was PTI? I could not for the life of me remember what PTI was and I was hoping somebody on the staff could remind me.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It used to be Post Transition IANA, but now it's called something else, they renamed it...

Susan Kawaguchi: Public Technical Identifier.

Marika Konings: Exactly, that's the one.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, I don't feel so bad that I didn't remember since it could have been two different things, well same thing. Okay. Well thank you and thank you, Lori, I should have Googled it so that one was of my, you know, I think I might have indicated that in the poll. I'm not sure I answered that. So but obviously everybody else knew what it was. So let's scroll back up to the questions.

So one of the first questions I extrapolated to a large extent the scope was what was indicated as experienced resume but that doesn't mean they are accurate essentially, may need more details from applicants with regard to requested skills. And that is what I did also is – I mean, I read all the documents but the resume is where I took most of my thought process from.

So long list of criteria, some of them were wide and it's difficult to judge with yes or no. Hope we reach a consensus.

There are concerns in the Registry Stakeholder Group that diversity should be taken into account from geo and constituency points of view from perspective of leaving SSR2 member of the candidates with the scientific background might bring scientific point of view which would allow SSR2 more holistic approach to the review. So those are all good comments. And I'm glad you're back, Frédéric.

Oh does anybody have any thoughts about the candidates and how we can move forward with the discussion? Maxim, please go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually I also think that we need to take into consideration the diversity from the geo perspective to have balanced membership from different parts of world. And also from perspective of the constituency, which sent candidates, so we should balance achieved here too.

And my thinking beyond these comment about scientific point of view, actually looking at these questions my feeling that these questions are answered yes for enterprise kind of security specialist and enterprise means usually the waste more money. And scientific approach is to see the picture and to review it from (unintelligible) point of view. So we don't need something which is not obviously tied to earning more money. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So I should have thought of this before but from a stakeholder group diversity we have Denise, which is the BC; we had James which was he more of a registrar? Can staff help me remember? I'm just remembering we had Emily who was registrar.

Emily Barabas: Yes, Susan, it's Emily. I can...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh James was – okay thank you, Emily.

Emily Barabas: Sure. So Scott McCormick is from the BC and Rao Naveed Bin Rais is from the NCUC. And you're asking about James Gannon as well? He was also NCUC.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Emily Barabas: And then did you want the affiliations of the folks who are currently on the SSR2 as well?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, that would help if you don't mind.

Emily Barabas: Okay, one moment. I'll just pop those in the chat in one second.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So from the stakeholder diversity, Rao would replace James from you know, as being NCUC but I can't remember besides Denis who else – which shame on me I should have looked it up. And Eric we had originally selected but he was then selected by RSAC.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe the other member is Norm Ritchie but I don't recall if he is formally affiliated with any SO/AC – Emily just confirms that he's unaffiliated.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So currently it's Norm and Denise and Eric, but we didn't put Eric on the – even though he's from a registry he was nominated by RSAC. There's got to be one more. Anyway let's figure that one out so we have one more – we should have one more current member, right? Or no, so we're replacing James, I'm sorry, it's early in the morning for me.

So James would have been the – so it was Denise, James and Norm because we lost Emily and replaced Emily with Norm. So just looking at, you know, geo diversity and stakeholder group or constituency point of views, as Maxim pointed out, you know, Rao provides that diversity; Scott is definitely from the US and from the BC. And Denise already is from that – or from the CSG really. So any other thoughts? And Renata would – oh somebody is answering that.

So we do have two different types of skills in the – within these two candidates. You know, my viewpoint, and I could be wrong, but even though Rao has worked as an engineer and participated in ICANN, he has more of an academic background. Scott is purely information security with a military background. So both of them bring different perspectives, I would think, to security issues.

I think Scott probably has more real life experience but in looking at the chart – the skill matrix, and that was very helpful, Emily, that you color coded them and presented it this way – they both probably fill areas that, you know, the red – the most needed areas I guess or unencumbered areas. And, you know, in the yellow sections, you know, they may help out in those areas. So, Maxim, please go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for transcript. Actually given that I have some, yes, experience in ICANN Compliance both from registry and registrar perspective, because we have, yes, cross control between registries and registrars of our own, I can say that it would be enough to recommend the candidate whoever he is, to pass additional training with ICANN Compliance just about the structure of the documents which they check for, yes, like registry registrar contracts and set of policies and yes, temporary policies and RFCs.

So and I think few hours would be enough because I do not expect that the security expert is going to read these more than 100 pages long registry contact or, yes, quite long registrar contract and all non-technical policies

because technical specialists tend to read technical policies and the RFCs, that's it, they don't read legal obligations usually because it's other department's headache.

So I think since we see that, yes, this core legal talking contractual compliance and legal background is quite long, we might recommend, yes, additional training of small scale. And from this perspective two candidates are almost equal. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Maxim. I'm not – are we in a – staff, do you think we're in a position to make a recommendation for additional training or is that something we would just sort of informally call out? Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And it's potentially something that I think the Council as a communicate its recommendations to the SO/AC chairs can say maybe in a general way that, you know, the SSR2 needs to make sure that, you know, where needed appropriate training or time is spent in areas where review team members may have less experience. I think you can maybe do it in such a general way but I would caution against, you know, telling specific candidates, you know, we'll only consider you if you follow this or do that.

Because again, I think that, you know, run you into an area where it may not be appropriate for this group to ask, but I think in a general manner providing that feedback from a Council perspective when it communicates the candidates I think would be appropriate.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. That makes sense. All right, so is there any other information or review we need to do of these candidates to make a decision? It looks like Maxim is typing. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And I don't know if it's possible to do on this call or I guess it depends a bit as well on, you know, how familiar people are with the other members of the review team, but I've noted in the chat that indeed

there seemed to be, you know, two different choices, one more of a security professional, the other one more of academic nature. So I think the question is indeed in the overall makeup of the SSR2 which of the skills is more complementary and more in need? And as said, you know, I don't have any suggestions in that regard to – I'm not very familiar with the other members of the review team but I'm wondering if that could be a consideration as well that you already look not only just at the GNSO candidates but also to the broader picture.

And I think, you know, Emily's table probably helps a bit with that as it did indicate kind of which areas they wanted – or they felt they were less represented in, although the standard it doesn't necessarily give kind of a breakthrough or a clear cut difference between the two candidates. Similarly, and I put it in the chat as well, some were talking about diversity.

And I'm assuming from a regional perspective that the current makeup, at least between North America and Asia Pacific is fairly equal, so that may not either be a tie breaker in this regard because I think if I quickly look at the list there are currently four representatives from the Asia Pacific region versus four from the north American region. So again, I'm not sure how much it will help you but I thought it might worth so I mentioned it.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So that is actually very helpful. Thank you, Marika. This is Susan for the record. So maybe the geo diversity doesn't – isn't quite as crucial. The other you know, what we've heard from the suspension of the SSR2 is that there was some in SSAC you know, and this isn't very clear but this is my understanding so please, anybody else has a different understanding, correct me. But what I've heard is the SSAC was concerned with the sort of technical and information security abilities on the team and felt that more members need to be added in that realm, you know, with that experience.

So it could be that, you know, Scott has more of that actual real life experience and maybe Rao, from an academic point of view has more of a –

more research, you know, experience in information security and fighting abuse. You know, I'm not quite sure from his resume. I do happen to know Scott a little bit so, you know, felt more confident about responding on the poll about him just because some personal knowledge.

But – and that's interesting, Lori, you know, so you're saying Rao's soft skills seem to be ranked higher and Scott's hard skills seem to be ranked higher. So we need to pick one. Of course we don't have – Poncelet couldn't make it so we're going to do this via email I would say. So would everyone be – and Lori is saying she leads towards Scott because of the nature of the review. Oh and Erika, I'm sorry, I was missing Erika too.

So previously we've had, you know, numerous candidates and we ranked them in a poll once we'd had a discussion about them. And so we could do the same thing is go ahead and have a quick poll assessed or just do it via email. And it looks like you've already – oh okay, these are – so this is the poll results from last time is that what you put up, Emily?

Emily Barabas: Hi, Susan. Yes, this is Emily. This is – it was actually just a one question poll essentially from the last time around in 2007 when we ultimately selected Norm Ritchie. And here was the question basically just ranking in order of preference based on matching the requirements for the position. And as you can see Scott ranked slightly higher than Rao in that poll.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Emily Barabas: Lori, correct, 2017, last year.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, 2007, that would have been a long time ago.

Emily Barabas: Oh dear, yes, sorry, 2017.

Susan Kawaguchi: Very good. So, you know, we could do the same just with two names too and see how everybody comes out. Lori is saying she would vote for Scott, so would Osvaldo. And due to his profile and the actual group profile, Renata is stating, "I think Rao has more experience than he was ranked but I would interpret that comes from his resume which focuses on is academic side even though he did have professional experience."

Yes, Renata, I was having a little bit hard of a time distinguishing what his – how in depth his professional experience was. And Frédéric was saying he would also think Rao would bring a less business like point of view. So it looks like we have two good candidates. And okay I'm calling him Rao, you're – Renata, you're calling him Naveed so I am sure I'm wrong so I'll switch to Naveed, lead of all fellowship coaches so training will be what he does.

I did notice he was – he was part of the Fellowship program and the DNS operational – go ahead, Renata, I'm sorry, I missed your hand. Please go ahead and speak.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thanks, Susan. Renata here. Yes, my comment is more about Rao Naveed's background that I know from my side, I do not know him personally. I think I might have crossed into ICANN meetings a few times. But I do not know him that well. But I know that he is- he comes from a very technical area of security. He is an academic but he had experience in companies as well because the university he's in is sort of in a technical park and they do have these hands one experiences of international companies.

And now he is the lead of the code working group so it's a group that's building the new materials for training in ICANN and presenting the – all the SO/AC in ICANN for the fellows. So he does have this broader knowledge of ICANN in an extensive contact network. Indeed I do see that Scott has a lot of the industry experience and has more of a – as an individual affiliations, he probably has also knowledge of the SO ACs, but from not really being identified with one or another.

And Naveed, I was using (unintelligible) because he is NCUC but he also has a work in RSAC. But I would then recommend Naveed for this because I think he can bring a balance which would be very useful to SSR2 because he has again lived through every SO/AC in ICANN and knows a lot of fellows and a lot of – has an extensive network and knowledge of ICANN itself and that I think would be a good addition for SSR2 in its resuming work.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay that's really helpful perspective. And it did seem like from his resume and his other materials that he was very active in ICANN. Oh that's interesting, Marika, would it be worth asking Norm and Denise what type of skills type of person would be most valuable to the SSR. So I think that would be worth asking Norm and Denise those questions if the committee agrees. Marika, go ahead and speak, I didn't see your hand.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I only just put it up. And I think this is also not just for this review but it may also be something you want to do for future review teams because I get a sense that we often talk about, you know, what we think or assume a review team might need but I think not a lot of us actually have been in a review, apart from you, Susan, but may not know, you know, what is actually required from review team members, and indeed what skills and experience are most important or valuable.

And I think in this case we're in a unique situation where a review team is actually already underway and it may be an opportunity to ask indeed those members that are already involved in the review team, you know, what is more important, is indeed is it more important that the hands on experience that Scott may have, you know, from his work or is, you know, the academic perspective more valuable or more needed within, you know, the makeup of the review team.

I know it's probably a tricky question, you know, to ask and I don't know if there's a way to ask them in the general way, you know, without maybe

having them choose between one or the other or expose the candidates in that way or just have them talk in general about, you know, what the review team work looks like and you know, the types of skills they believe, you know, would complement the review team as it currently stands. I don't know if that would facilitate in making the decision between, you know, two candidates that seem equally qualified but maybe equally qualified in different types of areas.

Susan Kawaguchi: So that would be interesting. And if we could get that input from them quickly I think it's probably worth a try. Does anybody have any objection to asking that question? And then I think we're very lucky to, again, have solid candidates to decide from, so no objection from Lori and none from Renata.

So maybe the way to move forward is to simply – go ahead, Maxim, your hand is up.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Susan, I lost sound for some time. What is the last question we were talking about where we are seeking for agreement or disagreement?

Susan Kawaguchi: So we were talking – Marika had suggested that we reach out to Norm Ritchie and Denise and get their perspective on in a general – from a general point of view, not ask them specifically, you know, which candidate would be better. But since there may be a consensus that Rao has more academic experience and Scott has more hands on experience to draft a question or email to them asking in a very general way which would be better in working on the review team and, you know, what type of candidate would they feel would fill some of the needs on the SSR2. So I was asking if anybody objected to actually reaching out to Norm and Denise with that question. Does that make sense?

Maxim Alzoba: It's Maxim again. As I understand, they didn't have a chance to actually work, they – I had conversations with Norm Ritchie in Abu Dhabi, he told me that

they were gathered and basically told that unfortunately we put you on hold. That's it. So I'm not sure if they had experience in working with the group because they were actually prohibited from doing that as I understand.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well I know Denise, she was, you know, in the beginning, you know, from the beginning so Norm was a replacement and he sort of came on board and then they were suspended so he would have less experience in that with the team as a whole but Denise would. And then Marika is also saying maybe we could reach out to James Gannon because he was there from the start. Norm replaced Emily so, you know, we could reach out to Emily too I think but I don't think she spent as much time.

So if there's no – so Renata is saying I think reaching out to currently leads would be best wouldn't it? So, Renata, on that point – oh on the co-chairs, yes. So, Eric and Denis are the co-chairs right now. So that is a point we could Eric. Denise would be already one of the people we sort of targeted but, okay so we could ask the co-chairs, is that more agreeable to everyone? Yes and I agree, Frédéric, we would need a – and I'm hoping that Marika or Emily could take the first draft on that email so we could approve that email via on the email thread. So it looks like everybody is agreement on that.

And then after we get that information back – Maxim, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Maxim Alzoba: It's a new hand. Maxim Alzoba for the record. Unfortunately I have to drop in a few minutes. And I'm not sure if we have enough time to go to the charter question. I suggest we move it to the next meeting of ours.

Susan Kawaguchi: I absolutely agree on that, I don't think we'd have enough time to dig into it. So we'll schedule another meeting for the charter review, and that would also give everybody time to review it a little bit. And Emily saying yes, we could draft something. It sounds like we're asking of a general recommendation about the skills or profile types that is most helpful. Yes.

And I agree, Marika, that then we could run a poll. So that – so we have two steps here for the selection of the candidate is to get some feedback in a very – from a very general question to the co-chairs and then run the poll on which of the two candidates. As always, we're attempting for consensus so we may need an online discussion, you know, maybe email thread discussion on who is the final candidate but I think we can do that.

One other – thanks, Maxim, for joining. And then one other issue we have is it Monday is the deadline for the motion submission, correct Emily? So...

Emily Barabas: Hi, Susan, it's Emily. We can draft a placeholder motion.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Emily Barabas: And get that in and that will give us a bit more time for the meeting itself.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So we need three – we need to do three things. We need to draft the question and agree upon it and send it out to the co-chairs. After that if we receive that then we'll run the poll and then we'll also submit a draft placeholder motion. And then we could make our decision next week on – yes, Lori, that's what I was thinking too that maybe we just give them a couple of days to respond. I think we could get that so, you know, we're not asking any extensive questions, pretty high level.

All right, so is there anything else in selecting this candidate that we need to discuss? Looks like Renata is typing. So she's saying I think we should get back to the list. Yes, because we're missing two members so that's Erika and Poncelet and it's just always good to put everything in writing and so everybody can agree on the list.

All right, so I don't think we have enough time really to start into the charter. I would encourage everybody to, you know, take the extra time to review the

charter and if you have concerns. We could also work on the charter on the list. So – and then hopefully when we schedule another meeting we'll definitely have to schedule a meeting for the charter.

One – on the charter, Emily, do we need to – we need to send that over to the GNSO Council but is there a formal process to that? Would that have to hit the – a motion deadline to send that over? Thanks, Renata. Thanks, Emily, go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Hi, Susan. This is Emily. So Marika please hop in if I'm getting this incorrectly. But I think the idea is that we would submit the document to the Council for the Council's review and I think for it to be considered at a meeting it would need to be in before the document deadline but we could probably also submit it, you know, as it becomes available and then the Council will consider it, you know, when it's possible to get it on the agenda essentially. So I don't think we have to aim for a particular date although sooner is better, but there's not a specific deadline.

((Crosstalk))

Emily Barabas: And Marika, please chime in if there's anything else there. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: So if we get it, you know, say we – by the end of next week or something decided it was finalized and we could send it over to the Council we might miss this Council meeting but at least they would have it to review and have more time to think about it that way.

Emily Barabas: Correct. I think once it's ready it would make sense to submit it so that there's time to review, discuss and get it on the agenda for – to be addressed further.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Emily Barabas: And Marika just said you can have it for discussion at the upcoming meeting if feasible but for formal consideration it would need to be submitted with a motion by the deadline for the following meeting.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Well we'll keep that in mind then. Because we do need to get this done, I know we're a little late which is mainly my fault on that. Okay, so we're going to – everybody, watch the list and we'll have a draft of that – the email to go out to the co-chairs. And then after we receive that the feedback and hopefully and we'll try to get that in two to three days from them, then run a poll on – and make a decision on the candidates, and we'll – and staff will help us – or we'll provide a placeholder motion so that we can provide a name prior to the February 22 meeting which will fulfill the request of the other SOs and ACs that we fill this spot before they decide to put the team back to work.

Anything else we need to cover? If not I – oh, looks like Frédéric is typing. We'll wait. Okay, thanks Frédéric. So we'll give you 10 minutes back of your day and thanks for the good discussion and we'll talk again soon. Thanks, all.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for joining, everybody. This concludes today's call. You may now disconnect the lines.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Operator, please stop the recordings. Thank you.

Frédéric Guillemaut: Au revoir.

END