

**Locking of the Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings Drafting Team  
Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 19 July 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Locking of the Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings Drafting Team Meeting on Thursday 19 July 2012 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-locking-domain-name-20120719->

**Attendees:**

Randy Ferguson, IPC  
Alan Greenberg, ALAC (Vice-Chair)  
Luc Seufer, RrSG  
Jonathan D. Tenenbaum, RrSG  
Laurie Anderson, RrSG  
Matt Schneller - IPC  
Juan Manuel Rojas, At-Large  
Celia Lerman Friedman, CBUC  
Hago Dafalla, NCUC  
Brian Beckham, WIPO  
Volker Greimann, RrSG  
Michele Neylon, RrSG (Chair)  
Lisa Garono, IPC  
Kristine Dorrain, NAF

**Apologies:**

Gabriela Szlak, CBUC  
David Maher, RySG  
David Roache-Turner, WIPO

**Staff Support:**

Marika Konings  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Go ahead, we're now recording.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the UDRP Domain Name Lock meeting on the 19th of July, 2012.

On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Matt Schneller, Hago Dafalla, Juan Manuel Rojas, Michele Neylon, Luc Seufer, Laurie Anderson, Brian Beckham, Jonathan Tenenbaum and Volker Greimann has just joined the Adobe Connect.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have two apologies from David Maher and Gabriella Szlak.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Good afternoon, good morning, good evening, good whatever other options are available to us. Thanks to Alan for looking at everything last week. Unfortunately, as I was explaining before we started recording I was somewhere where - well, A, I was on holiday and, B, I didn't have access to Wi-Fi where I was. And for the record we have another apology there from David Roache-Turner.

Okay then so today we're - we're starting off as usual with roll call done and any updates to anybody's SOI? Going once, going twice, no, fine, perfect.

Okay then we were looking, last week, I believe, at the survey responses and conclusions from the survey. So how far had we got, Alan? Somebody?

Alan Greenberg: I think we finished actually.

Michele Neylon: Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. We - on last week's call I took everyone through the results that we received with regard to the registrar survey as well as the UDRP - or the UDRP provider survey. I think the question - because I basically, you know, just ran through the report and I drew up - so basically I think the homework problem was to have a look at that and see if whether there were any further points of discussion in there or any other findings people thought were worth sharing.

Also to note that we didn't really go into depth with regard to the open questions where we also asked input noting that it might be more helpful to actually take those comments once we start looking at the charter questions and then, you know, group those together in relation to each of the charter questions and review those in that context instead of ultimately going through those now.

So based on the discussion last week and having had another look at the two surveys what I did - and what you see up on the screen and which I also send around together with the agenda is my first attempt at trying to derive some general findings or conclusions based on the feedback received and on responses to the survey.

So I don't know if people already had a chance to look at that and I think the question is really do people feel that this adequately represents the data that was provided? Are there any other findings that we should be including here?

I would like to ask Berry, as well, and, you know, I don't mean to Berry on the spot but Berry had a look at cross referencing some of the data to see whether there were any other findings that might be worth including here based on comparing and contrasting some of the questions that are related.

And I think then the next question is basically where do we go from here? Because I think the discussion we had initially where one of the objectives or

one of the first requirements in the charter is for the working group to go out for and request public input.

I think the discussion then was like well let's first wait until we have the results of the survey and see if the survey inspires any kind of additional questions we might want to ask as part of a public comment forum or as part of our request to other GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as other ICANN SOs ACs for input.

So I think the question is, you know, based on what we've learned are there any particular issues you think we need to highlight as part of the public comment forum or requests for input or are we just going out with a more general kind of announcement saying look, this is where it has kicked off now. These are the charter questions we've been asked to look at.

You know, we did do a survey already asking registrars and UDRP providers for their views. This is the feedback we got, you know, these are the findings we - or conclusions we took from that survey and now we're actually asking you for, you know, any other additional input you might want to share that you think will help us answer these charter questions. So I think that's where we're basically at.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Sorry I just read - hands up - I have to say that I literally got off a plane last night and haven't had a chance to do much beyond that. Brian, go ahead.

Brian Beckham: Yeah, hi, this is Brian. I just wanted to say in terms of the summary that Marika's helpfully provided and going back to the questions of the survey themselves, Question 15, by way of clarification I suppose we have to have some mea culpa here because we helped draft the questions.

We answered less than 25% of cases involved a privacy or proxy shield. And just by way of clarification I thought it would be useful to note really I guess

this can be read as two questions. So out of those roughly 25% of cases where there is a privacy and proxy shield the sort of sub question there is which percentage of those cases involving a privacy or proxy registration is there an underlying registrant revealed? And for us that's about 75%.

So I don't know if it's useful to clarify that in terms of...

Michele Neylon: Sorry, just one second, Brian. Sorry, one second. Are you - so you're saying that - you're talking about two separate things here, one where there is a privacy proxy and the other one where is - where the privacy proxy is revealed, is that what you're saying?

Brian Beckham: Right. So in a quarter of WIPO cases there is a privacy or proxy service and then out of those cases 75% of those privacy proxy shields reveal the underlying registrant. The other 25% don't.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So I was just making sure I understood what you're saying. Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think what I may want to suggest on this is that we clarify that in the summary document saying additional feedback was received, you know, from one of the respondents indicating that, you know, what you just said that, you know, 25% of cases who have proxy privacy service and then 75% of those the underlying registrant is revealed at that time.

So - or if you prefer to suggest some wording otherwise I'll happily add something there because I think it is important, indeed, to clarify that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any thoughts on this? Don't all rush. Okay for those of you in Europe who it's in the afternoon you have no excuse; you should all be wide awake and full of energy. Have you any thoughts or other comments on this? No?

Berry, you're good at crunching data. Did you find anything else of interest?

Berry Cobb: Michele, this is Berry. Kind of. I've only worked on the registrar survey because it had the more responses than the UDRP one. And in that sense I don't know that there's anything glaringly different than the summary that Marika had provided.

I just kind of whipped together or compared two questions, for instance, when is the lock applied and the timeframe for applying the lock. And so you can see some correlation between there and how the pivot tables are shown out.

Some of the other questions were a little bit more difficult to compare together. But, you know, I still put them into a pivot table so that we could see percentages of response to respondents.

And like I said I haven't really started playing with the UDRP provider survey yet but it does look like there's a couple that could be compared together, for instance, is the domain name locked, when is it locked and when is it unlocked kind of analysis. But I won't have that until the next meeting.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Berry. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, just a couple of things that came up at the last meeting which you'll catch if you get around to listening to the MP3 and looking at the chat notes. But in the registrar survey there are at least some questions where the answers are inconsistent with each other; probably not in really onerous ways but nevertheless it's something to remember.

The other thing is because - again because of the way the questions were answered it would appear that at least some registrars do not consider changing the registrant's name in Whois to be a Whois change. So just along the way as we're formulating any recommendations we should keep this kind of thing in mind to be, you know, really explicit clear what we mean. That's about the only comments I had.

Michele Neylon: Okay so you're saying that the - okay what constitutes a registrant to change should be clearer?

Alan Greenberg: Well the issue came up because we asked, you know, the combination of questions of do you allow Whois changes, do you lock Whois, yes. But then a significant number of people said they - for domains that were subject to privacy services or proxy services they changed the registrant's name.

And the percentages were such that the two couldn't coexist if the change of a registrant's name was deemed to be a change in Whois.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: So, you know, again it just reinforces something that's already clear that we need to be really precise because an awful lot of the things that are there right now are using terms which are not defined and people interpret them differently.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Any other comments at this time from anybody?

Alan Greenberg: Marika has...

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Again I think the point that Alan made it's important as well to highlight in the summary document. And maybe that's an - we can do that in the form of a footnote just saying that based on the discussions it did become clear that, you know, some registrars do not consider when they reveal - when the registrant is revealed after listing of privacy or proxy service a change in Whois just to make a note of that so indeed it's already clear from there and then can be considered as well going forward.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. It's Alan. That may be a valid position to take but again we need to be precise in what we mean - what we want to allow people to do.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other comments from anybody? All right then, Marika, when did you send out this summary thing? Was it just yesterday I think? Did I see that come into my inbox?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think it was probably - because I'm in LA I think still it was your Tuesday but probably for most people it was Wednesday when you got it in your inbox. And it's also posted on the wiki.

Michele Neylon: Right, okay. So I would assume that some people have read it but other people may not have had a chance to.

Marika Konings: Right.

Michele Neylon: Okay so what I would suggest people do then is maybe have a look over it between now and the next meeting and if anybody has any feedback or suggestions for any changes to it that they make them.

Okay then any other things on this - on Item Number 2 on the agenda? Sorry, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. What I'll do is I'll push out an updated version sometime later today where I just incorporate those two points that we discussed today. And I think Berry just told me as well that he's looking at well for it on the registrar responses and trying to see if there's anything else based on that that we might want to include in the findings.

So you should see that as well on the mailing list sometime today or tomorrow probably so. Then hopefully indeed on next week's call our, you know, feedback for the comments on the mailing list we can actually finalize the findings as such.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. Now the other thing as well just looking at Agenda Items Number 3 and Number 4 at the moment the workgroup is meeting weekly but I'm also conscious of the fact that quite a few people will be taking holidays or are taking holidays or are about to take holidays between now and September.

So what I was going to suggest maybe is that instead of meeting weekly we move to meeting once every two weeks between now and September? Does anybody have any objections or any thoughts or any other input on this? Don't all rush.

Marika? Okay Luc likes the idea. Alan likes the idea. Marika has her hand up and I'll get to you in a second. Okay, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm also perfectly fine with that idea especially since I'm going on holiday myself too. But something the working group might want to consider - and I guess that's, you know, the discussion we're probably going to go back to now - is that this might then be a good time as well to move forward with opening the public comment forum and actually reaching out to the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies and SOs and ACs for their input.

So that will give them some time to gather that, for example, for the stakeholder group statements and constituency statements I think there's a requirement to give them a minimum of 35 days to prepare that. For the public comment forum there's the 21 plus 21 days minimum to let that run.

If indeed they're taking into account the holidays it might be a good moment to move all that out so people can start working on that. And hopefully some of you will be able as well to work with your stakeholder groups and constituencies to try to get further input to consider.

So, you know, it might be a good use of time even though we might be scaling back on some of the working group meetings themselves.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Marika. You've managed to say exactly what I was going to suggest. So if we were to - if we scale back the frequency of the meetings between now and September and also at this time go looking for the public input and the input from the SOs and ACs then this would make a lot of sense to me.

In terms of the SOs and the ACs and the various stakeholder groups and everything else - who is the GNSO liaison here?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: It's Joy Liddicoat.

Michele Neylon: Oh okay but Alan is also on the GNSO aren't you, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Not technically. I'm a liaison which means I'm not technically a member and I certainly can't be a - I can...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I can pass messages back and forth however.

Michele Neylon: Well that was more - it was more to do with the practical communication aspect of it more than...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. The way we typically do it - and I think I'll need to look back because I think I did prepare a request for input, you know, at the beginning of this working group so I might just revisit that and see if that's still

up to date or, you know, based on the survey as well we want to include some other information.

And I can push it out again to the working group to see if people are happy with, you know, the way that asks for input. But the way we typically do it is basically work through the GNSO Secretariat and have them send it out to the different stakeholder groups and constituencies and ask for their input.

And they are normally then as well the ones that collect the information and then feed that back to the working group, you know, through me or directly to the mailing list. So - and the same thing for the outreach to the different SOs, ACs. Normally Glen then gets that out because she's, you know, has access to I think it's the liaison mailing list where the different chairs are all.

And I think we now also have a new joint mailing list where the different SOs and ACs are on so that we could use that channel as well with a kind of general statement, you know, based on the input request for the SOs ACs or possibly, as well, point them to the public comment forum that is open and encouraging them to either, you know, participate there or, you know, send in a separate statement. So again I'm happy to draft something for that that the working group can have a look at, you know, between now and next week possibly.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks, Marika.

Alan Greenberg: Michele, that translates to staff is far more competent than us volunteers.

Michele Neylon: Well I don't think we should ever say that just - we wouldn't want to encourage...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: We wouldn't want to encourage them.

Alan Greenberg: I say it all the time.

Michele Neylon: Yes their heads will swell, though, man, I mean, you just don't want to do that, that's really not a good idea.

Okay then so, Marika, how long do you think it will take you to get an updated version of these various things?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think I would be able to put something together either, you know, between today and tomorrow and get that out to all of you. I need to look back because I don't know if we already did something similar for the public comment forum.

Because the way that works we need to fill in the template that basically, you know, outlines what is the input we're looking for, you know, by when do we need it, where can people find additional information.

So I can prepare, as well, a draft of that and then maybe send those three separate things out to the mailing list for people to review and depending on, you know, how much time you want to give people, you know, if we don't get any comments then we just start, you know, pushing it out and publishing that. So I don't know what you'd think - how much time people will need.

Michele Neylon: Okay well the only thing I was just going to say is if we're also changing the frequency of the meetings then, you know, what we probably want to do is try and get this moving on the mailing list rather than waiting for the next meeting.

Marika Konings: Right, right.

Michele Neylon: Because otherwise - otherwise we end up where the two concepts suddenly end up completely out of sync, if you know what I mean, as in the idea that

we were going to achieve lots of things while we weren't meeting regularly but if we don't actually put the ball or the game or the - oh I'm looking for a metaphor - I'm looking for a metaphor that won't get me in trouble. But anyway if we don't put that in motion then we're going to have problems.

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I can make another comment. I think, you know, it partly depends on the question do people feel that based on the feedback we received from the survey there are any specific questions we need to ask. Or are we...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...you know, comfortable with just going out with the more general questions of saying look, you know, these are the charter questions we've been given, these are the issues we're looking at, you know, here is some feedback we've already got from registrars and UDRP providers and if you have any views on that you can also share those.

But basically the...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...the broader question is, you know, just provide with anything you think is helpful for us when we study these charter questions and start our deliberations.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Marika Konings: So I don't know if there are any specific views on that. If people feel we do need to ask there are specific questions we can ask or whether, you know, at

this stage we're more in a position to ask more than general question like, you know, tell us anything you think might be useful in this context.

Michele Neylon: Okay I'm seeing people typing away there but they're not - nothing's coming through yet. Okay - all right - I'm - we're not going to say anything about what Luc has been putting into the chat; we're going to ignore that. I assume that was to do with the background noise.

Does anybody have any comments - oh okay, sorry. Matt has a question. Do we want to go back to the registrars informally and add a de minimus option to the questions that they answered as less than 25%? Any thoughts on that? No?

Matt Schneller: Hi, this is Matt. I apologize, I meant the - providers. In the last call we discussed briefly whether the answers that were just under 25% were specific enough or whether we needed to go back and ask the dispute service providers whether they were essentially seeing few to no cases of the types of answers where they had answered less than 25%.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Matt Schneller: ...five registrars - excuse me, service providers, answer. It may be easier to go back to them for that extra information rather than sending out a completely new survey or doing something like that.

Michele Neylon: So you're saying for the dispute providers not for the registrars, is that correct or am I...

Matt Schneller: Yeah, yeah.

Michele Neylon: Oh okay. Marika and then Alan.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think for some of the questions one of the UDRP providers did provide some data or indicating where indeed it was less than 25% I think they were able to provide specific information. So like on some that we might have it but, you know, for the others indeed it's for the group to decide if at this point it's, you know, would be helpful to have that further clarifications.

Michele Neylon: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, Michele, thank you. If - I was going to say what Marika said. I think one of the providers qualified it and said the number is really less than 5% or something like that. And that brought up the question of are the other ones really seeing substantive numbers like 20% or is it also just, you know, minimal outliers?

So it may be useful. I wouldn't really want to cause whoever didn't answer it like that to go over their whole data again. But sort of enough, you know, off the cuff gut feel of yes most of the 25% or lesses were really 5% of lesses or something like that would be useful, I think, in knowing that we're really dealing with outside outlying cases and not a significant fraction of the norm. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Alan. This is Michele. Marika, how many dispute providers responded to the survey? Three? Four?

Marika Konings: Four, we had all UDRP providers respond. And just, you know, actually we have two - two of those are members of the working group and I think both are on the call - I think Brian and Kristine are both from WIPO and (unintelligible) are on the call so I'm not sure if they are in a position to provide feedback at this stage or, you know, maybe on the mailing list they can come back to that.

Michele Neylon: Okay the question I just want to simply ask is this then is, you know, if it's just a simple clarification on these - on the lower end, I mean, how much effort is involved just to go back informally to the dispute providers and just ask for that?

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine from NAF. I'm sorry I stepped in kind of late. For us it's not a problem for us to go in and find a little bit more specific data and come up with some concrete numbers.

You know, the 5% that I gave was sort of - in a couple of the questions was sort of an estimate just based on, you know, just my day to day handling of the domain name dispute, you know, issues that crop up.

So I think it would take, you know, a week or two for us to actually go in and analyze the data. But we could, you know, we could easily do that; that would not be a problem at all.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks, Kristine. I mean, the thing I suppose is this is what the guys are saying is, okay, the questions we'd asked were in relation to brackets of 25% so the simple thing really is are we looking at an answer where you're going on the low end, you know, kind of 2%, 3%, 4%, 5% or is it on the high end up closer to the 25% mark?

It wouldn't be a question of having 100% accurate - maybe accurate isn't the word I'm looking for - it's not a question of 100% precise it's more to do with kind of in broad scopes whether it's at the higher end or at the lower end.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And maybe an easier way to do that instead of having to go back to all the separate questions is actually look at - looking at the findings because I think at the end of the day the survey findings is what we're going to be including the report.

You know, of course linking as well to the full survey but I think there it is relatively easy to include something like, you know, on those questions where it's less than 25% noting that, you know, the two members of - the UDRP providers that are members of the working group indicated that the 25% is actually at the lower end or at the higher end or something like that so there's an indication that, you know, the 25% is either, you know, it's really a quarter or it's actually more to the 1%, 2% of cases.

So maybe that is an easier way to, you know, get that more accurate without maybe requiring a lot of work going back to each of the different questions if that will be acceptable to the working group and, you know, the UDRP providers on this call.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Any other thoughts on this? Brian, any thoughts?

Brian Beckham: Yeah, no nothing really to add other than what Kristine said earlier which is that we're happy to look at individual questions and provide more detail. We have done a sort of a sampling of our cases so, yeah, we can gladly provide more detail to help give some more precision to these answers.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Okay then so, Marika, would you rather proceed with that then?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. You know, if people want to go back to the specific questions that's fine and then we can still include that as, you know, part of the findings and, you know, again I think following this call I'll update the findings document with the two comments that we noted during the call today.

And then, you know, again anyone can, there, make additional suggestions as well on how to clarify some of the data or, you know, providing maybe a footnote saying, you know, based on additional review of our data we actually

see that it's, you know, closer to X, Y percent instead of, you know, 25%. So we can do it either way.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Right. Okay then the other - any other charter requirements that we have - that we need to address at this stage? Oh Matt is volunteering to send stuff through. So if you could do that, Matt, as soon as possible that would be helpful.

Are there any other charter issues that we need to address at this juncture, Marika? Putting you on the spot again even though I know it's early in the morning there.

Marika Konings: No, this is Marika. And I think that, you know, may be a question that I don't know if we want to go into right now because of course, you know, part of getting the input at some point we need to actually start looking at the charter question. So one of the questions will be, you know, do we already have - can we already start looking at the charter questions, for example, based on some of the comments that were provided by the registrars and the UDRP providers in response of the survey.

Or do working group members think it might be, you know, better to wait until all the information is received from different stakeholder groups and constituencies in the public comment forum and then start, you know, going through those all at the same time?

So that might be something more of an approach kind of question. And I think we still have, you know, the open issue of, you know, if I send out these documents or the call - the request for public comment and the stakeholder group statements how much time do people need to review that before we can actually launch those? So noting that I probably will be able to get that out either today or tomorrow.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. Thanks Marika. Okay then so moving forward then we agree that we will meet every two weeks so looking at my calendar - which I'm going to pull up here so I can actually see what the hell I'm talking about.

So today is - so the next call would be the 2nd of August. Is that okay for everybody? Does anybody have any issues with this?

Juan Manuel Rojas: This is Juan Manuel. Yeah.

Michele Neylon: Hi Juan Manuel.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Hi, I was hearing that you are proposing that every two weeks that we make our meeting instead of weekly? And I understand you well?

Michele Neylon: The next meeting would be on the 2nd of August.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Okay.

Michele Neylon: We are doing this because of a lot of people are going on holidays.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Okay. Okay for me is good. I don't know what - everything - someone else but for me is good.

Michele Neylon: Okay, I mean, I know that Volker, for example, is gone pretty much for the entire month of August. Volker, you're gone for most of August aren't you?

Volker Greimann: Yeah, I'll be back on the last week of August.

Michele Neylon: Yes, it's okay. We're just ignoring you.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yeah, I thought you might be. So, you know, that's fine. Anybody else have any questions, queries or issues with the new meeting schedule? So just for clarification we would be meeting on the 2nd of August, the 16th of August and the 30th of August. And then from September onwards we'll be back to a weekly schedule.

Okay perfect. Right then so Marika has a whole load of wonderful things that she's going to be doing for us. And then we're all going to be very good and do all our homework and read the document she sends us and get everything moving so we can get some public input on this.

So does anybody have any other issues they want to raise at this juncture?  
No?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I still would like to hear what deadline you want me to put on review of those documents, what will be a reasonable...

Michele Neylon: Oh sorry, sorry. I would ay if you can get the documents - these are the documents for the public input, yes?

Marika Konings: Yes, correct. So it would be the draft text for the public comment forum, the draft text to request input from stakeholder groups and constituencies and probably draft email to request input from other ICANN SOs and ACs.

Michele Neylon: Okay well they're all quite - they should all be quite short and quite similar.

Marika Konings: Right.

Michele Neylon: Unless you want to upset people and make them read lots and lots of text. So would it be unreasonable to say that we would expect people to provide input on them by next Wednesday? Does anybody have any issues with that? And these are - they're not very long text and all of them should be very, very similar anyway.

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine from NAF.

Michele Neylon: Does everybody...

Kristine Dorrain: That sounds reasonable.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Okay Kristine says it sounds reasonable. Does anybody disagree with Kristine? And please disagree with the point not with the person. Sorry, because everybody disagrees with me just for the fun of it. Okay going once. Okay so you all agree so by next Wednesday - and you're not going to turn around Wednesday afternoon and ask for an extension. Perfect.

Working on the basis that your silence equals assent. So, Marika, if you can get that out to us as soon as possible and then we can get input back from people as quickly as possible and then we can all move forward.

Any other issues? Okay then how about I give you back 20 minutes of your day?

Alan Greenberg: Sold.

Michele Neylon: And for those of you who are disappearing on holidays and who won't be around for the next couple of weeks enjoy yourselves and get a nice tan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Speak to you all in a couple of weeks.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: And via email in the interim. Thanks, bye-bye.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Bye, bye, thank you to all.

Nathalie Peregrine: (Ricardo), can you please stop the recording? Thank you very much.

END