

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Panama City
GNSO ISPCP Open Meeting
Monday, 25 June 2018 at 15:15 EST**

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

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So hello. Good afternoon. Please take your seats. This is supposed to be the ISPCP Open Constituency Meeting here in Panama. Welcome to the participants here in the room and maybe we have also some remote participants.

My name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. I'm the Chair of the ISPCP. And so the question is why shouldn't we start? Is the recording, please. It's started already, yes, thank you very much, Chantelle.

We have an agenda displayed on Adobe Connect. Is it possible to enlarge the screen or, you know, just to focus on the agenda?

Chantelle Doerksen: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So these are the points. We have invited guests here today, Chris Mondini, welcome, here and later on also from the MSSSI - the Multistakeholder Strategic Initiatives people here, well, to help us and to give a presentation about the reviews. It's not about just only the GNSO review but it's about all these special reviews and I understand that they are prepared as well to do so.

Our agenda is going to start with preparation for the GNSO Council meeting. There are some motions drafted and we should talk about that and find our positions on that just in case. Then we are going to talk about a special - potential special outreach event in Barcelona and we will have a discussion about and presentation update on the specific reviews.

In addition, we have AOBs internal matters to discuss with regards to the Board election process and our handling of our constituency charter. I have two other AOBs for the agenda, it's the first thinking about the IRT on the IANA function and well filling up the team, there was a request coming in over the last days for that; as well as we should start thinking about the process on Council Chair election, which is due for the Barcelona meeting.

So why don't we just start? I would like to ask at first people and members whether they have to disclose some amendments on their statements of interest. Is there anything? Nothing, thank you very much.

Maybe we can - because we are a small group and we have new people here that we have just a short going around and everybody is going to introduce themselves and where they are coming from and that would be helpful to do so.

As I said, my name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, I'm the Chair of the ISPCP Constituency. We go on that way and then follow on.

Tony Harris: Start with me?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, please.

Tony Harris: Yes, I'm Tony Harris from CABASE, Argentina. And I'm currently a - representing the ISPCP on the GNSO Council.

Esteban Lescano: Esteban Lescano, also from CABASE Argentina.

Suman Lal Pradhan: Good afternoon. I'm Suman Lal Pradhan from Nepal. I represent ISPs in Nepal here.

Philippe Fouquart: Philippe Fouquart, I'm with Orange. I'm based in France and I'm at the GNSO Council.

Negar Farzinnia: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN Org, MSSI Department.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Could you introduce yourself please?

Khalid Samara: Khalid Samara, Middle East Networks Group Organization

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: May I ask you in the back seats, you can also step forward to the front side, you know, is not a problem, so we have seats available, that would be more familiar yes, so but please, stand up, introduce yourself.

Jose Gonzalez: Jose Gonzalez from Mexico, ICANN Fellow.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Jim Salinas: Hi. I'm Jim Salinas from Brazil. I'm also ICANN Fellowship.

Maria Elena Garcia: Hi, my name is Maria Elena. I am a NextGen.

Viter: My name is Viter, I'm from Brazil. I am a Fellow.

Chung: Hello, my name Chung from the Vietnam (Information) Center. Nice to meet everyone.

Oliver Elste: Hi, I'm Oliver from the Eco Association that has already seat at the table with Lars.

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes representing BT here and I'm Vice Chair of the Constituency.

Chantelle Doerksen: Hello. My name is Chantelle Doerksen. I'm the Secretariat for the ISPCP and the CSG and I just wanted to let everyone know we have flyers in the back that can give you more information about the ISPCP if you're a guest and you're looking to join. And I also have a mailing list that we can get your information if you'd like to us to reach out and contact you. Thanks.

Fiona Asonga: Hello, everyone. I'm Fiona Asonga, member of the ISPCP representing the Internet Service Providers Association of Kenya.

Chris Mondini: My name is Chris Mondini. I work for the ICANN Organization in the Stakeholder Engagement Department.

Christian Dawson: My name is Christian Dawson and I'm Executive Director of the i2Coalition, or Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

Lars Steffen: I'm Lars Steffen. I'm Director International of Eco Association (Internet) industry.

Malcolm Hutty: Malcolm Hutty from LINX, the London Internet Exchange.

Teresa Wankin: Teresa Wankin, (CANTO) and newcomer.

Jimmy Rodrigues: Jimmy Rodrigues from CANTO in Trinidad.

Akinori Maemura: My name is Akinori Maemura from the Japan Network Information Center, JPNIC. And I happen to be the ASO appointee to the ICANN Board.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you very much and special welcome for - in particular to the newcomers and the Next Gen people so we like to have you here so it's helpful for you as well and if you have any question so either personally or so just approach us and we are ready, well, to give answers as we can.

So let's dive into the agenda. So we have to prepare for the Council meeting and who would like to guide us through what is going on on Council at the time being with regards to motions and something else which is going to be decided, Tony or Philippe? Philippe, please. Would you like me to make a couple of introductory comments?

Philippe Fouquart: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: ...while you're getting...

((Crosstalk))

Philippe Fouquart: ...uploading my documents, yes. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: At the Council we have a motion for our meeting, I believe it's Wednesday, to initiate the EPDP process and approve the charter. And one of the main issues which is under discussion and which will involve us, we'll need a representative, is for those people who are going to be on the working group that will work on the policy - on the consensus policy that has to be developed in the EPDP.

It has to be defined who's going to sit on that working group and the Commercial Stakeholder Group will have three representatives, one for each constituency. So there was also discussion in a meeting we just had about what the GAC is considering related to this because they will want to have a presence on this working group also and there were some rumors they had

intentions of wanting several people to participate so that is something new; we don't know exactly where that's going but it was discussed today in a GAC meeting.

And so basically that - the substance of our discussions during the day in the GNSO were about not getting behind the process, the Registrars are represented by Michele Neylon, were very concerned about the fact that the ICANN Board might come up with changes during this year period where we have to - well this has to be worked on and completed by 25 May next year and that if there are changes which result because something that happens in the European Union or court issues these things might derail whatever progress is being made by the working group and the EPDP.

And this - these concerns were not allayed by any of the replies we had from the Board during lunch either. So there is still a little bit of uncertainty and impatience on some people in the Council about how we will actually get started and keeps this going successfully. So basically that would be a summary of where we're at. The immediate thing will be approving the charter, which will be done during this week, and also well initiating - approving the initiation of the PDP, those two steps.

I don't know, Philippe, if you want to add anything at this point or you're not ready yet?

Philippe Fouquart: No, I think there's - for those of you who - and apologies, my PC is dying. For those of you who turned the session just earlier this afternoon, you would have noticed that the - on the Council agenda, it's essentially a placeholder, the charter is by and large to be defined between now and then - then being Wednesday I think. So pretty much everything has to be defined in terms of the size of the team, the scope, whether we have one PDP or two PDPs, the respective scopes of those PDPs, were they (unintelligible) so everything has to be discussed.

The discussion we've just had is in terms of whether - what are the things that we can agree upon on Wednesday and what are the things that can be deferred to either an exception meeting between now and July or the Council meeting in July. The things that I think would be useful to discuss here are the formation of the team, what are the redlines that we would have in terms of forming the team, in terms of sizing.

I appreciate that obviously it depends on the scope, it may depend on the scope, I don't know, it may depend on the scope. But referring back to what I said earlier, whether we have two PDPs or two work tracks for instance, the workforce, might have to be different. That's the sort of discussion we need to have now as to the sort of things that we want to push within Council.

My - and also as to the approach that we want to take, i.e. do we want to have parallel tracks or do we want to have things in succession? My personal view, for what it's worth, is that given the timeframe I think first things first. I think we must work on what should - what should we do with the temporary spec at first and then maybe further work on the annexes.

I know that some people at Council are not comfortable with working on those two things in succession. I'm not sure that I understand why. But should there been parallel tracks I think - and the point had been made during the discussion that there needs to be a strong relationship between those two things. So in essence I hope I'm being somewhat clear, that's the sort of discussion we need to have now; the size of the team and the kind of scope we want to frame in terms of articulating the two tracks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks, Philippe. Before I hand over to Tony, but just a question to understand, you know, when you say that's what we have to discuss, so you are looking for some input from the constituency as well what you could take to Council, yes, for the debate. I understand well, there is also a - will be a session after this session, you know, a public session here of high interest

topic so related to that in order to solicit information from the general community on all these things, yes, that's the case, yes.

Philippe Fouquart: Yes, thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Indeed there are two questions. Well, certainly everyone is welcome to take part in the discussions that we'll have at five o'clock on the charter, etcetera. My question was more on the sort of redlines that we need to, should there be any at Council, since that was your question on the Council agenda. But you're right, certainly everyone is welcome to take part in the discussions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Philippe. So Tony Holmes please. Please introduce yourselves.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Tony Holmes for the record. Philippe, the issue that was raised about the session that's going to follow later today, that could obviously impact our thinking and the way that things go as well. But just for clarity, you said that this is going to be raised at the Council meeting as a motion. So something magical has got to happen between now and the Council meeting, either that or you're going to be working very late during the evenings to resolve that. But just a couple comments on this, and I must admit I'm struggling with the idea of having two PDPs.

In terms of the Registrars and in particular, not wishing for any delay, well we're already late really so I think we've delayed already, but just to make the point whether it's one PDP or two, I think we need to be very cognizant of the fact that this is going to be really demanding piece of work over the next year; it's going to take an awful lot of effort so anyone that stands up to this task really needs to be aware of that.

And the other thing that I would suggest is that this is so fundamentally important, whoever takes on that role I think we may need to have or consider having additional catch-up calls across that period because I think this is going to be quit fast-moving and from what I gather there are plans to hold extraordinary meetings, face to face meetings as well as the phone calls

that will obviously take place. So I think we're in a difficult position in terms of trying to make decisions here today.

And just for clarity, at the moment there is no deadline for us to meet in terms of putting forward names to represent the constituency, is that correct? Okay.

Philippe Fouquart: No, there isn't. Sorry, Philippe Fouquart. No, there isn't. There's no deadline at this point. Yes, indeed, to just follow up on what you've just said, there's been a number of comments to that particular point. The fact that the team members have to be committed, there will be probably several face to face meetings. It's not only a matter of being committed but also being ready to come to consensus and that means make concessions that - to their respective approaches, so it's going to be a tough effort for everyone in the team and I think the point was made by several constituencies during the discussions. So it's a tough effort. Point well made.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Christian Dawson.

Christian Dawson: Thank you very much. This is Christian Dawson for the record. I wanted to take a moment - well sorry, that was loud - to reflect upon the meeting that we had earlier today, the CSG and Board. And it was like the meeting we just walked out of, a very contentious meeting. But there in our community we heard lots of voices from the IPC and BC that were to my ears, very radical.

And I do have a concern that I think is worth bringing up at this moment. I said on one of our recent calls that I believe this to be a very important PDP; that means more than what it is we're faced with in this - the course of this year. It really is a test of the multistakeholder model that is going to be looked at by many within the ICANN community and from external to the ICANN community about whether this can be successful - a successful model, this grand experiment in being able to solve problems. I don't want to see this fail.

And I think that we need to be reflective about who gets on this because if we get a lot of radical voices who are unwilling to compromise it could be bad. And it could lead us down a path that could have negative ramifications for the entire ICANN community. Therefore, I think that we are better off having a very small group, as small a group as we can get, and we should push back on efforts to try and expand it too wide, and we should also do our best to try and bring people into the group who have experience in compromise. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Christian. We have Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Just a quick comment on Christian's point. I would agree certainly in terms of keeping the group workable and manageable, not making it too big. But what you talked about redlines to start with and just to make it quite clear because I know things have a habit of changing, I believe one redline for us is definitely not one CSG representative. That is totally unacceptable and that should be a redline. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, very clear. Thanks very much. So Philippe, one last question to that, you know, with regards to the question of one or two PDPs, is there - what is the decisive point, you know, which makes it, you know, either this way or two? So is there - is it just a debate about, you know, is there a group they want to have two PDPs or is it a rationale behind that so just for the understanding, yes.

Philippe Fouquart: I think the - I'm not sure there's a - there are strong positions on this. The idea behind that is essentially the differences in terms of timing, that there are things that need to be done very quickly and there are others that might have to be deferred and that the workforce is limited therefore first things first and that's pretty much the rationale. Now whether that translate into - that translates into two PDPs or two work tracks, or whatever, is just to me that's just the work process, that's not a big deal. The more - the most important

issue to me I think is how we deal with those two things. Do we deal with those in parallel or do we accept as some of them have higher priority?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thanks, very clear. Christian.

Christian Dawson: I can share what I - this is Christian Dawson for the record. I can share what I've heard around that for what it's worth, so a lot of the very controversial bits of this center around criterion for accreditation, should we enter into a gated model? And it's very difficult to move from - to not head towards a gated model. And so one of the conversations I believe centers around putting accreditation criteria into a second PDP, which honestly I can see why people would gravitate towards there to try to put the hot button issues second.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay thanks very much. So what my idea is here, what I would like to suggest since I understand so at the time being it might be too early, well, to dive in and to decide upon, you know, how to fill that group and - but there will be meetings in between here in Panama on Council level different ones, and we shall have our closed meeting on Thursday, which is - the biggest part is, well, allocated to the exercise with Theresa in our group but we shall have time I think so 15 or 20 minutes, so we should come back to that point, I would suggest on Thursday morning, yes, when we have our closed meeting.

And wrap up, you know, the status and getting updated and then we could decide upon, you know, what - how to go forward with that. So in the afternoon session also this afternoon, you know, with the GNSO Council, we should take care about that, that this is not going to happen with the idea people have well to minimize the participation in the group and then to the - to the disadvantage of the CSG, for example. So that's not what we would like to see and we should take care about that. Is there any further comment?
Tony, please, yes.

Tony Holmes: Just - Tony Holmes - just one further comment on that, Philippe, you said that part of the rationale for two groups is recognition of limited resource. To me

that's argued the other way; if you've got limited resource why would you have two groups? It makes the situation worse, because I believe the idea with two groups is that they would both be chartered and be working across the same timeframe. And I think for us that probably isn't the preferred solution.

Philippe Fouquart: No, no I agree, that's just what I said. I apologize if that sounded as the opposite, but that's really what I meant.

Tony Holmes: You raised it as a question...

((Crosstalk))

Philippe Fouquart: Yes, exactly.

Tony Holmes: Just a comment on that. I don't really understand the rationale for two groups, if one of the arguments being put forward is limited resource; it doesn't stand up.

Philippe Fouquart: No, I agree, it wouldn't. On that - on that question of sizing the team, the other - it's an odd exercise. There are other dependencies, one of them being the involvement of GAC and something that may also have an impact is how much, how many GAC members would be involved. And from that, there might be a repercussion on the number of participants if you see what I mean, from that could be acceptable from the GNSO.

I can feel that there's strong push from GAC to be involved and if there's a minimum number of members, I don't know, Tony, how you understood the discussions this afternoon but it seems that there's a minimum number of participants that are - that is expected hence you would have to match with a certain number of members from the GNSO. So all of these will have to settle down within a couple of days and it's a bit of a challenge. But I agree, Wolf-

Ulrich, we need to figure out as we move forward and discuss that more thoroughly during the closed session. So that's what we can do.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, I agree, sure. That's a very good summary. Okay, thank you very much, Philippe. So we will come back on Thursday to that point. Let's move to the next agenda item and happy to have Chris Mondini here. You remember we have circulated, and he has sent to us and to the - I think to all the CSG constituencies, you have sent a first ideas draft for an outreach event or a kind of business event in Barcelona. We had also on one of our calls we had a first round of discussion, a first round of thinking about this.

And so now since we have then to decide well, which way to go, I would like to suggest that briefly, well, Chris, you should just introduce that again and then we are going to make up our minds and think about how to go forward. One of the major questions to me is, because I was sending this question to you, is how the contracted parties are they involved or not, you know, because there some confusing message in your paper and because that is very important to us, you know. Chris, can I hand over to you?

Chris Mondini: Thank you. This is Chris Mondini. I appreciate the introduction and the thoughtful consideration. For those of you that haven't been following, we wanted to, in my role doing business engagement, partner with the ISPCP but also the other parts of the Commercial Stakeholder Group to do business outreach with the idea of reaching the business community, the European business community, Barcelona is a business hub, it's easy to get to relatively.

The ICANN meeting, which is going to be October 20 through that week, is having also a high level government meeting so it'll be a prominent meeting with the possibility of attracting a good audience. And for the ISPCP at least we've had a couple of very successful outreach events in Abu Dhabi, also in Hyderabad, working together and with your help.

What I sent around for consideration was followed really a formula we've used in the past which is to have a high level executive as a keynote to hope attract the audience and then to have some panels on business topics that would include a little bit of ICANN content but the business topics, the panel topics are broader to attract a more - a broad audience.

One thing that I think we did not decide upon, on our last call, was whether to do it in conjunction with other constituencies within ICANN. We had talked about possibly partnering with the BC, which is the only other constituency group which has come to my team to ask to do something similar. Frequently the IPC partners with a local like the local INTA chapter, the trademark attorneys and do their own thing.

But I do also have to - I owe you a little bit of an apology because while we were becoming very excited about doing the event, I was in a parallel way asking our Meetings team and asking about the venue and the availability of a room because in the past we've been fortunate enough to have a big room - big space usually just get an extra room at the ICANN venue, usually just get the services of the ICANN audio visual support team. And because of the cost cutting that's around ICANN meetings and other parts of ICANN, we don't have this luxury anymore.

So what has come in and which I shared is some preliminary estimates. There are three hotels that are directly next to where the ICANN meeting is being held. One is the Hilton, one is the AC, one is the Princess. That's in declining level of cost. But the AC hotel, which is in the middle, has quoted €108 per person for the day for the room and then an additional €2500 for audio visual support and that includes I think the - the €108 includes also coffee breaks and lunch. And again, that's for a full day.

So if you want about 100 people, I don't know, that's something to discuss, where maybe 25 or 30 of you are able to interact with you know, a good group of local executives, I think that the budget would be about €15,000.

Now, which leaves us the question of can we locate a sponsor? Are there, among your organizations, the possibility to contribute the - and I have some budgets but not for the whole meeting. I could contribute, say, for the audio visual or for the meal or something like that. And again I just was getting the prices before this meeting so I didn't have time to really go into detail with you about what might be possible. And I know you have limited time here to discuss it but it would be good to get a sense of if we together can go out to look for sponsorship.

The other factor is that the Business Constituency, which collects membership fees, has funds and they are talking about spending their funds to rent a room to do an event. And so to that end, that goes back to the question of whether you would want to do something combined with them or if you would like to do your own thing, possibly using the room at different times of the day. So again, I apologize, I'm putting more questions on the table than I am answers but I, you know, welcome the feedback and we have the next few days here to spend time trying to coordinate both with the BC, if you would like to do that, and even to make a short list of who we might approach to be a potential sponsor.

We do have local business associations in Barcelona that are very eager to help drive attendance and to help in publicity and so forth. So and they may also be able to link us to sponsorship funds as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks very much, so I think it's helpful, you know, to have this draft of rough ideas available. I think we should focus on as I understand at first on the question with - or together with the BC or not. Yes, that's one of the points. The other thing is then, well, with regard to the budget, you know, thinking about that. I think there are ideas here in our group as well, you know, because the telecom sector, mobile sector is very well represented in Spain especially in the Barcelona area. So and we can just have a talk about that and then focus on these ideas.

So I have at first I think it was Tony Harris here, and you would like also - and then Tony Holmes, please

Tony Holmes: Yes, Christian, this is very interesting, Chris Mondini, sorry. Although you're welcome. Basically I don't think as a constituency we could raise €14,000 to do this. But my question is if you have business associations and I think you mentioned Telefonica, were eager to help this, why don't we ask them to provide a room? I mean, they probably have - Telefonica must have business - rooms for business meetings and association would also have a hall probably available. And it would be a lot cheaper to rent a bus and get people from the ICANN meeting to that place and then spending - because you were mentioning €14,000, does that include catering? It's still a lot of money. But that is the first idea.

And the second thing is, although we did these things on our own in previous meetings, this seems to be complicated to achieve here unless we can do what I just mentioned. And the problem is if we get together with another constituencies we're mixing apples and pears, different objectives, different points of - focus points that are interesting, and that may not produce perhaps the best result. But I mean, maybe yes, but I'm not too sure. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Tony. So the other Tony, please, go ahead.

Tony Holmes: Thank you, Wolf. Tony Holmes. Chris, I think I've known you long enough to be quite frank in a response here. You mentioned that in the past the ISPs, we've held two what I consider to be pretty successful events, in fact very successful events, I think they were excellent. And one of the reasons they were good was because they were ISP-focused on issues that ISPs are interested in. And that I think drew in additional attendance. So there was a technical slant on those events which really drew them in.

Here representing a large ISP, I know that if we have an event that's billed as a business event, you're going to get a different audience coming, certainly from a large ISP, you're not going to get the people that would be really focused on what I consider to be the nuts and bolts of ISP business and how that relates to ICANN. So I think that we lose from that and Barcelona obviously with the Mobile World Congress there's it's got a reputation and I saw that as an opportunity where we could go a step further possibly along the path that we've trodden before because the last event we had was very much focused on IoT.

One of the big issues around IoT is access to IoT applications, particularly in terms of how 5G may shape some of that space. Now that is quite a technical discussion and I think from an ISP perspective that would draw in people and it would be a good debate to have. There are elements of naming that come into that both DNS related and additional requirements for IoT as well, which ICANN definitely should have an interest in. So there is an opportunity there. I think if we were to form a partnership with another constituency and make this more business focused, I believe that the participation from ISPs may be limited because of that, that's a personal view.

And as a result of that I think our ability to undertake outreach that helps galvanize interest in our constituency and grow this part of ICANN probably won't happen. So I have some mixed views around that. I'd be very interested to hear views of other - the ISPs here, whether they share that view or whether it's just my perspective as well. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: We can go on...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, Tony - Tony Harris please.

Tony Harris: Lars, if I'm not mistaken you mentioned that you know as DE-CIX you the a relationship with a large ISP in Barcelona, is that correct or in Spain?

Lars Steffen: This is Lars Steffen for the record. DE-CIX is having an ISP in Madrid. So that's close by but particularly that's too far away for a day trip.

Tony Harris: Okay, just wondered.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good, Chris, yes please.

Chris Mondini: So thank you. This is Chris Mondini. It's very helpful to hear your views and also in the presence of your constituency. So but so with the permission to go forward I think that what I'm hearing from you is that we should - that we should do an ISP specific focused event as we have in the past, it's been successful, that the budget for renting rooms is too high, the - and we should look for donated space rather than donated sponsorship money.

And so we'll try that first. I'll need help though, again, you know, I know Lars's contact is in Madrid, not Barcelona, at least on Telefonica I have a connection there and I know they have offices in Barcelona, but if any of your companies have offices or - and the funny thing about the business association that I've been talking to is that they usually have meetings in the meetings that the ICANN meeting is in strangely and so they - just their space is not available.

But I'll continue - so I'll - separate events from the BC, look for donated space, so we're only renting busses and maybe paying for the catering or something. Is there any other feedback because based on that we can try to start revising what we did in the sort of straw person agenda and circulating that with you as we find also volunteers from among you to help us make it happen.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. First Philippe, yes please.

Philippe Fouquart: Just if you would keep me in the loop. I know we - I know we operate in Spain so I don't know if we've got offices in Barcelona, I can't remember. We do have offices in Madrid but maybe we can find a room or something.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, with regards to communication, you know, I think that is, you know, how it started also last year with Abu Dhabi. And thinking about well to establish a small circle at first, you know, so within our constituency and an email list for that and then people are in line, you know, if it comes closer, you know, and more detailed then depending on what kind of experts and so we need in addition, yes, to join, yes. Thanks. Tony please.

Tony Harris: Chris - sorry, just before you, I have two possibilities where you can get donated space, GSMA, I'm pretty sure they'd be interested, and the other one is (RCIET). (RCIET) is the Latin American telco association which is pretty much dominated by Telefonica. And I think Osvaldo is not here in the meeting, right, Osvaldo Novoa, I don't see him. Osvaldo has - he sits in that association and...

Esteban Lescano: Esteban Lescano for the record. And also the executive director of (RCIET) is Pablo (unintelligible) was one of the participants in the Regional Newcomers Program for this meeting but he unfortunately he couldn't come but I think that he would be very interested in support us in Spain for this kind of outreach event.

((Crosstalk))

Esteban Lescano: He was my mentee in the program, that's why...

Chris Mondini: I know him. We spent time with him Montevideo...

Esteban Lescano: Yes, but I can make the connection for...

Chris Mondini: Please.

((Crosstalk))

Esteban Lescano: ...outreach activity.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, please provide the information to Chris, yes, well, for the connections. Tony.

Tony Holmes: Yes, just to say I still welcome some feedback from other ISPs whether they think that for us as a constituency that's the best path to tread. But Chris, I was just going to mention if we are going to have an event focused towards ISPs and with a fair sprinkling of technology issues around that, I think most of us are aware now that ICANN has an MOU with GSMA association, maybe we could investigate whether through that relationship we could work alongside them to make that a successful event because it seems a really good opportunity to do that.

Chris Mondini: This is Chris Mondini. That's a great idea and also that reminds me that I should work with also our office of the CTO, David Conrad and others, to help make the agenda very substantive. The - we've just in the last - and I should make a point to update this constituency when we make little progress on implementing the MOU, but we did just speak with the head of - the head of Technology Issues at GSMA who was a person named (David Hutton), who we had not met before, so we now have an in for exactly what you're proposing, Tony, so thanks for the reminder.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Last comment, Tony please.

Tony Harris: Yes, very quickly. You probably know what the GSMA has a technical support group which is located in Spain so that would be a really good fit.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank very much, Chris. Well, very last point is, you know, before we close this point is also understand, you know, it's our approach well to go

separate from the BC. What would that mean from your point of view, you know, with regard to the organization? Of these kind of events and overlapping and all these things, so that should be kept in mind because, you know, Business Constituency is covering (unintelligible) business, yes, so we are doing also business. We wouldn't like to get our attendance moved away, you know, from our event. So if that could be really separate in the sense that would be helpful.

Chris Mondini: Yes, this is Chris Mondini. So I understand what you're saying is make sure that the events - the programming is distinct enough so that the audiences won't be overlapped or in conflict. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay I think we've got a step further on. Thank you. I informed you about our small group and we will continue the discussion in future about that. Thanks very much. So now we turn over to the next point and I welcome Larisa and her staff. Thank you very much coming in on short term. So we would like to talk about not just about the GNSO review so that's not the case, so we are - because the review is almost over, but about the ongoing specific reviews and I understood you have also prepared some slides for that so I've been through - that is covering what we would like to know and what would like to discuss.

May I just hand over to you? Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you very much. This is Larisa Gurnick. And thank you for having me and Negar to speak to you about reviews. Just to clarify, I think you wanted to hear about progress on the various specific reviews and also talk about the proposals that out for public comment short term and long term options to adjust the timing of reviews, that - okay, very good.

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: And we can also give a quick update on the GNSO review. So I will hand this over to Negar first and then I'll come back to you about the review options.

Negar Farzinnia: Thank you, Larisa. Negar Farzinnia for the record. Good afternoon everyone. To provide a - if you can advance the slide forward please? Thank you. The first review I wanted to talk to everyone about is the SSR2 review. As of 7 of June, 2018, I am happy to announce that the SSR2 review has officially restarted again in response to the letter that the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board and ICANN Organization received from the chairs of the supporting organization and advisory committees. We looked into finding a facilitator that could help the review team conduct their review and resume their activities.

The facilitator has been engaged, the SOs and ACs have nominated additional review team members to supplement the skill set of the review team and they have successfully held their first meeting, telephonic meeting to start their review back up again. And the work of the review team is now continuing. The review team is going to have a face to face meeting for three days sometime in August or September, the dates are being finalized still, to continue their face to face engagement with the facilitator and resolve all remaining issues that the SOs and ACs have identified in their communications so that they can continue with their work and finish the second security, stability and resiliency review.

The CCT review is in its very final stages. The review team held two public comment periods on their draft reports. And at this point in time with the two public comment periods closed, they are in the process of modifying their recommendations, incorporating comments as appropriate, incorporating the feedback they also received from the ICANN Board to finalize their report. They are holding a face to face meeting at the ICANN's DC office in July and they are looking forward to finalizing their report and submitting it to the ICANN Board for consideration in August 2018. So please keep an eye out for that exciting report coming up.

And last but not least, the RDS Whois 2 review has made tremendous progress in the work of their review. They are in the process of finalizing their draft report so that they can open up a public comment period on the draft report. They are holding a face to face meeting at the ICANN's Brussels office location in July as well to finalize their findings, draft their recommendations and are targeting to publish their draft report in August of 2018. We of course welcome the community's feedback and input on all of the draft reports and the final reports that are going to be open for public comment.

Review team has made, again, a tremendous progress on their work and are targeting to finalize their review and finish off their report by the end of this year so that work is advancing fairly quickly and with just a few more months of work they'll be able to wrap everything up. And with that...

((Crosstalk))

Negar Farzinnia: Yes, of course, let me provide a quick update on the GNSO 2 review. As you all know, it is in implementation phase. The review working party is also making fantastic progress in implementing all of the recommendations. Their plan from the beginning was to finish implementation by December of 2018 and they are well on their way to reaching that target. So far they've provided two updates on the progress of their implementation to the ICANN Board and of course to the GNSO Council. And we are looking forward to having that work wrapped up and submitting the final report for the implementation to the Board. And with that, allow me to pass it on over to Larisa for - yes, please go ahead, if there is a question.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. Thanks very much for this. Well, just to this ongoing reviews, I have the question, with regard to the facilitator for the SSR2, can we know who it is?

Negar Farzinnia: Absolutely. The facilitator that's been engaged, his name is (Phil Corey), he's from the (Cameron, Ralph Corey) Consulting firm. They are located in Australia, very long-standing extensive experience in consulting with various businesses. In the past I believe they've also been engaged to help the ICANN community with the ombudsman review and had done a great job with that. And so we are happy to announce that (Phil) has been selected to help us facilitate the SSR2 review restart.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So he was - just for my knowledge - he was selected by the team itself or...

Negar Farzinnia: He was selected by the ICANN Organization per the request of the chairs of the SOs and ACs.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: But he's accepted?

Negar Farzinnia: Correct. He's accepted, he's on board and contracted to do this work and has already engaged with the review team members, he's already held conversations with them. The next steps of his work are going to be to conduct one on one interviews with the review team members and gather information and fact and schedule and plan for the face to face meeting when the whole review team collectively get together.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks very much. The other question would be, you know, with regards to the timeline of these reviews, these three which are - as mentioned here, usually - I don't have that in mind what is the timeline from the beginning of the review until the implementation of these things, and is that - well is that realistic of - is there any sign, indication that this timeline could be kept or not?

Negar Farzinnia: Are you specifically referring to the SSR2 review?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: SSR2, also the others.

Negar Farzinnia: The SSR2 review given the fact that the review team per the request of the SOs and ACs have to look at the scope of their work, it is a little unknown at the moment what the timeline of the review is going to be until they're finalized with the help of the facilitator what their new scope is going to be. That will determine how much work they have left and what the timeline of the review is going to be.

The CCT review actually is a very lengthy review, it is now 2.5 years in its cycle. It hasn't finalized yet so by the time the CCT review wraps up we are way past 2.5 years for the duration of the review, which is not something that has happened really in the past. But it's the first of its kind so there was a lot of unknowns at the time this review was being conducted.

The RDS review actually is one of the few reviews that has done a tremendous job, their review team has done a great job sticking to a very short timeline. Their review was expected to last no more than a year. Our typical estimates for the duration of the specific reviews is anywhere between 12-18 months on average based on the scope that the review team selects to work on. And again, RDS is going to be one of the shortest reviews.

The ATRT review, the Accountability and Transparency review is the only review in the bylaws that has a mandated one-year duration. Other than for ATRT review, none of the other specific reviews are mandated to have a particular timeline for duration, and so it's just based on the estimates of how much work is going to be undertaken by the review team.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Any more question here from the floor? This is not the case. Thanks. And Larisa, well, please.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you very much. I wanted to flag for you the two proposals that are out for public comment to adjust the timeline of reviews, we have a short term option paper and a long term option paper. And yesterday there was a

request that we extend the due date for both public comment periods, so happy to tell you that the deadline may not yet reflect this in the public comment on the webpage but we're working on making the changes and the deadline will be extended to 31st of July for both of those public comments so I hope that that helps with the load a little bit and that you will be able to submit a comment.

The reason we're talking about this issue now is probably already pretty well known. There's a number of reviews going on at the same time; currently 11, and they're all in different phases of work, some of them are in implementation phase, such as the GNSO review, so the count is pretty comprehensive. And this is - we're only talking about specific reviews and organizational reviews. There's other kinds of reviews happening you know, within the ICANN community that are on top of this number so this is - this discussion here is only for those two types of reviews.

So there's a large number of reviews and of course the load on the community is on top of all the other significant work that is already underway so there's been lots of discussion within the community and with the Board and especially so in San Juan and the request that we take a look and offer up some proposal, some options for how the timeline could be streamlined and how these important accountability mechanisms could still continue in a more rational and sustainable manner. So that's where the two proposals came from.

And then in terms of the short term options, so there's two separate proposals. The short term is impacting the accountability and transparency review, that's the ATRT 3. So in the interest of time I'll just tell you really quickly what the options are and then move onto long term, and then I'm happy to answer questions. Short term options, there's three, one is for the review to continue as scheduled so it's no change, so status quo.

And with the expectation that once the SO/AC chairs confirm all the nominations and appoint the review team, the work could begin as quickly as in July of 2018. The second option, option B is to also start the review on schedule but make a suggestion to the review team to limit the scope of the review where they would only look at the implementation of review recommendations from ATRT 2, so it's a limited scope option.

And then Option C would be to defer the start of the review until the Board has had a chance to take action on the recommendations from CCWG Work Stream 2 and of course the connection there is that Work Stream 2 recommendations touch on many of the same topics that are also addressed or could be addressed by the ATRT 3.

So the third option is to defer the review until the Board has taken action but no later than - the work would start no later than June of 2019 so essentially that would be a deferral of one year.

On the long-term options, the choices are a little bit broader and quite different and we're really looking for feedback on the principles and the different ideas that are discussed in much more detail in the document. But the principles that inform the options aim to limit the number of reviews that happen at the same time, so for example to have one specific review and perhaps two organizational reviews running concurrently but not more than that.

It's also to recognize limited community resources specific reviews, as you probably know, are comprised of community volunteers, up to 21 members on a given review, and as you heard from Negar, work in some cases continues for as long as a year or a year and a half, so it's a significant commitment of time from the volunteers.

And also ensure adequate funding for reviews. Reviews - specific reviews typically cost in the vicinity - on average in the vicinity of \$600,000 to

\$700,000 so it's quite a sizeable investment of time and resources. And finally, we're also looking for additional options besides the timing and would very much welcome any discussion around other ways that these important accountability mechanisms could be made more efficient and more effective and achieve the purpose for which they were designed.

So on the long-term options, it's not so much a matter of choices A, B, C, as it is a matter of gathering feedback on whether there's community support for these various ideas which could be combined together, they're not an either/or choice so one would be staggering the reviews, as we already discussed; another one would be to add timing criteria so for example, that a review would not be started until the implementation work is completed or nearly completed or something along those; as well as perhaps adding a timing requirement so that just like the ATRT review the other specific reviews would be limited to a 12-month period or something like that.

Also there is the idea of focusing the work of the review team on specific areas on topics of highest priority to the community and there's much more discussion on how that could be set up and we're looking for input on that. As well as adding scheduling flexibility, currently we have a situation where the timing of reviews is pretty much hard coded into the bylaws because it's triggered by events of the past and there's no allowances to break that chain, if you will, so if no changes take place, the cycle will continue pretty much the way it is set up now.

So one of the options, one of the suggestions is to add some flexibility with appropriate controls, checks and balances by the community and the Board where a particular review could be started later or sooner even perhaps depending on circumstances in the environment, in our industry that would justify such an event, GDPR would be a good example of that.

With this I will pause, I know you have limited time so want to be respectful and have a chance to address any questions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much, Larisa. I think that's very helpful and transparent, well, to see that. And we were also talking in advance, you know, how we - to address this, you know, during the public comment period, so it's quite clear that we have to do this and we will have a small team to do so and to comment on that, so it's good to hear that we have more time but not too much because then it's summer time and vacation and all these things, you know, starting on that. So up to the end of July so that should be possible, well, to cover that.

Are there any questions from the floor or any first, let me say, ideas from your experience with reviews you might have had in the past which could be just brought up here immediately? I personally was thinking - I remember there was this call with you I think and Theresa as well, you know, on - and this is nice slide of the 11 parallel running reviews, you know, which shows really what the problem is here.

One point for me from my experience is you should also think about the - not just the balancing but, you know, how to allocate the workload between staff and the community. So there might be, you know, in the different phases there might be a way well to do it in a different way as it is right now. So looking at the GNSO review, for example, the implementation, you mentioned, well that we are ahead of scope, ahead of schedule, that's right, you know. But the reason is because we are a small team and that is the case why because, because not all of these people are participating really, you know.

This is to one point, that's good, yes because we you can work in a smaller team, you go - you make progress. But there's a danger as well, you know, that it will come back you as well when you come to the end with reports and then somebody is raising his fingers and saying, what is that, what did you do and why and all these things and then it's going to get a mess. So - so and so we are happy with the staff allocated to the GNSO review for example.

And I'm sure it's in other cases the same way. So but we should also review, think about, you know, how to - how the work is going to be done and shared between staff and the community so these are comments we will bring into the public comment period as well and then we can discuss that.

Are there any further points, well, Malcolm, I see and then Philippe. Yes, Malcolm please.

Malcolm Hutty: When there clearly is a problem with these mega-reviews, blockbuster reviews that go on for so long, take up so much time, takes long to take a conclusion, and take up so much resource and from the people involved, but at the same time, you know, these things are - it is important that things should be capable of being put to review. And solving those problems by narrowing things down like this could potentially undermine what's actually sought to be achieved by them.

So I wonder if really - I'm a little unsure about the first principle, the one about keeping the number of reviews down in that if a review were needed that were on a very specific and narrow area, a discrete area, that could be just got on with separately without bundling it into something the size of ATRT. The doing it, as a discrete project, might be much more manageable for the community members that take part in that team; might be delivered in a much more timely fashion. And might help to avoid the over complication of these mega- reviews that actually causes us difficulty that we're seeking to address now.

So while I sympathize with the notion that we should be careful about having too many as well, I wouldn't want to see that principle as being some kind of ironclad rule. I think there can be - there could be - I can imagine that there could be a very good case for - for some narrow and more specific ones that would be essentially set aside from that because it was, I don't know, you know, overview of the ombudsman function, for example, you know, or

something like that which is more discrete than the whole range of the accountability process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Point, so we will - we can bring it up, you know, as well, in a public comment period. Thanks. Philippe.

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you, yes. I was going to intervene on a separate point but I certainly subscribe to what Malcolm has just said. I think we're on in the quandary of trying to be as efficient as possible and also realizing that we have so little resources to commit to those reviews. One example - well I was going to say was about the incoming reviews that there's the Customer Standing Committee Review Team that's going to try and work by the end of the summer, I think. And in that - in that remit we're trying to see how we can sort of optimize this with the - what will happen by the end of this year on the broader IANA naming function review which is a bigger beast of sorts.

So and trying to see how the latter could be articulated with the former, that's the sort of optimization that we're looking into. And that's difficult bearing in mind that some of these things are overlapping, recurrent so it's a difficult task but I certainly agree, we shouldn't be too demanding as to - or set an arbitrary number of reviews that would be supposedly the maximum number of reviews that we should have. We should try and be as efficient as possible but probably not too efficient in that respect. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thanks, Philippe. Tony, you would like to - so otherwise I can wrap up I think. So as we started well - and the public comment period is on at the time being so I would suggest that we are going to start with commenting on that in a really small team, Tony and myself, just starting with drafting some points and then we circulate that and then we will have a conversation on that and adding comments and so as you did, Malcolm and others as well, so that we will have a comment paper available for the end of the - of July. I think that's it, so we both should start with that, yes.

Having said that, I'm very thankful to you, thanks very much for presenting that and have a nice time. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you very much and I appreciate that you will take on the task of developing comments so please, you know, where to find us if you have any questions or if there's anything we can do to help you with your comments. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So we have roughly 10 minutes left for the rest of the business. That is any other business. We have two points on that, there could be a third one. The one is the selection process for the Board Seat Number 14, that means, you know, from the NCPH appointed Board member. Just to wrap up this, you know, there was an exchange in Puerto Rico between the two stakeholder groups of our house and outcome was a paper which was agreed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group and which seemed to be agreed also by the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group, and I put it forward to them.

But there is - seems to be some more discussion needed on that. I'm not really clear about that. I was asking Farzaneh, who is leading that approach but she's not here at the time being. And she was pointing us right now to the other NCSG members who are available, so I approached the vice chair of the Council, Rafik, today asking, so he wasn't aware about any problem he was of the opinion that it has been agreed on on the NCSG.

So we will clarify the situation, yes, so I do hope I can get an answer well by the end of the meeting in Panama that will be clear about at the end when we have our wrap up meeting or during the CSG meeting, open meeting. So that's the status and just of the selection process. I think there is nothing to discuss or is that - Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Well just to comment on that. This is incredibly frustrating. This discussion has now gone on for nearly three years. And Wolf-Ulrich and I were both in

the room at the last meeting when we spent an hour discussing the finer points of the proposal. And there was agreement. And all of a sudden we hear there isn't agreement on this. So we should probably have some dialogue with our CSG counterparts because I think for our part we've given an awful lot in those discussions and we should now get them at least to ratify what their real problems are. And hearing the other members of the NCSG consider it was agreed as well, I don't think it reflects very well on our cooperation with those groups.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Fully agree to that so - but I do hope that we can make this right now. Okay so far to this process, there is another process which is not on the agenda which I mentioned before is thinking about the Council chair election which is due at the Barcelona meeting. So you all know that Heather's term is limited, will come to an end in Barcelona so somebody has to be elected and the CSG and the houses they have to think about potential candidates of that.

So I would like to make you aware about that and maybe we can discuss it again in our closed meeting in - on Thursday. If you have the chance well to talk to others - other constituencies, other houses, let me say as well, what's going on there, that would be helpful to know, you know. I can disclose just one information, I was approached by Rafik, he's the vice chair of the Council, and usually the vice chairs are looking to get appointed for as chair, yes, so we have two vice chairs, and Donna - but Donna's term is also term limited. And Rafik is looking for support, just as an information.

So Tony, please.

Tony Harris: I think I heard - maybe Philippe heard the same thing, Keith Drazek was interested from VeriSign, you remember that? It came up at a meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It may be. So we have to - well to keep our ears open to that. Just to adding to that, in a talk with Rafik, I friendly talked to him and told him, well, I think that's very hard to convince people in the CSG to support him so that's

what I openly spoke to him. So and I think he understood that but maybe he is still going around and trying well to get it. I just would - to convey this information, I will convey this information as well in our CSG meeting on Wednesday, so and that's it.

Tony Holmes: Just a quick point of clarification, the new chair has to be seated at the end of the Barcelona meeting, is that correct?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: That's correct. That's usual approach, you know, there will be a Council meeting in two parts where the first part is done by the old Council chair and then is going to hand over - maybe the old Council chair is going to lead the election process, which is a - the second part of the meeting. Okay, any more question to this point? Any comment? No, thank you.

So another point is - which is also not on the agenda is very late, you know, over the last days, is there shall be a review, yes, an IRT as well, to be launched with regards to the IANA naming function. And this is going to be discussed I learned also in Council but it should be combined with the review for the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee and in which way and so on. Well it's - there's a timeline outlined here which says that the filling up of the review team should be done by end of August I think so this year, but this is coming soon, yes, and we should think about also we have an interest in the IANA naming function, how to deal with that.

There is one slot allocated to the CSG, to the NCSG as well, and to other so ACs as well. So we should be prepared for the internal CSG discussion on that and we should well try well it's our interest, well, to put forward somebody, maybe also in our talks we should think about, you know, who could have an interest, who's interest personally who could be put forward in case from our point of view and then try well to support this candidate.

Any comment on that? Philippe, please.

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you. Just to let you know that as I said, we're considering the possibility of sort of merging the CSC review team and that broader IANA naming function review. So we'll be meeting with the ccNSO, some of the members of the ccNSO Council this week, Donna and myself, to figure out whether and how we could actually do that. So there is no parallel tracks working pretty much - not on the same thing but the CSC might address things that would have fallen on the broader IANA naming function review.

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes. Philippe, what's the rationale for that - the combining of those roles? Is it purely just a resource focused or...

Philippe Fouquart: No, thank you. It's not only a matter of resource optimization, but it's also the fact that the CSC review essentially - well by definition review the activities of the CSC over the last couple of years and considers potential improvements of that role and possibly metrics provided in the rendition of the IANA function while it's the IANA naming function review is much broader than that.

And the fact is because of the two year - I think the - off the top of my head the CSC review team has - review has to be done every two years and so that it's - there's this year - they happen together and so that it's probably opportune for us to at the very least work together if not merge our activities, I think that's the - that's basically part of the question that we'll be addressing with the ccNSO over the course of this week and possibly the next couple of weeks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks very much. Very last point is ISPCP Constituency charter, it came to my mind well to - because we have to follow up with some elections as well, confirmation of chair, chair election or follow up with new election of chair and vice chair and also Council - not Council members as well, I think so yes, Philippe, your term is for one-year, yes, okay..

Philippe Fouquart: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...okay so we have to come up with that. So the - what came up to my mind is that the charter is not consistent in this respect, so the charter we have. So we have really we have a look on the charter now with regards to make it operational and very clear in this regard. And what I have in mind well that we should establish a very small team also to work on that, you know, come with a proposal on that not just to discuss the basics of the charter itself but to operational - to adapt it in an operational way.

In addition, the team should - may look also to the new requirements coming in from Work Stream 2, you know, with regards to, for example, diversity issues and other things so balancing and maybe reporting and I don't know, there are some things which are related to stakeholder groups and constituencies which came up - out from the Work Stream 2 that maybe also points to look at and then to come with proposal so that we can really revisit the charter. Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Yes, thank you and I apologize for this but Chantelle has made me aware we have a unique opportunity if we can do it within the next 10 minutes of having an ISPCP photograph for our newsletter, but it must be before five o'clock so just to make you aware.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, so well just let's make it short, so my suggestion would be that so I'm personally I would like to be on this small team, maybe we have two or three people join.

Christian Dawson: I've expressed interest in the past and working on charters and be very happy to do that as well here.

Lars Steffen: Yes, I can also help with...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm so sorry, but okay why not five? Why not, so if it comes to calls and so we invite five of us, but somebody should start with that, so we take the existing charter, everybody should take, you know, of the five of us just take the existing charter, look at this from an operational way point of view, come back and so establish a mailing list and then we circulate that and we make - we will have a call on that and then I think that's the way how we can make progress on that. Is that agreed on? Did you get the names of the five people, Chantelle?

Chantelle Doerksen: I have Wolf-Ulrich, Tony Holmes, Christian, and (Esteban), and who else?

((Crosstalk))

Chantelle Doerksen: And Lars, okay thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Last question, are there any more questions? Not yet. Thank you very much, meeting is adjourned. Let's go for the photograph now. Thank you. Thanks very much.

END