

**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 18 March 2014 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Tuesday 18 March 2014 at 14:00 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/gnsso/gnsso-gac-20140318-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnsso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/>

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail – co-chair - Egypt

Ana Neves - Portugal

Suzanne Radel - USA

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group

Mikey O'Connor – Internet Service Providers & Connectivity Providers Constituency

Amr Elsadr – Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

David Cake – GNSO vice chair

Apology: none

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: I just wanted to let all participants know that the conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect. For assistance press star zero.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Julie). Jonathan, this is Nathalie, would you like me to do a quick roll call?

Jonathan Robinson: May as well, please, Nathalie, just for the record.

Nathalie Peregrine: All right thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is the GAC GNSO Consultation Group call on the 18th of March, 2014.

On the call today we have Jonathan Robinson, Mikey O'Connor, Manal Ismail and Suzanne Radel. We have received no apology for today's call. From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Nathalie. And on behalf of Manal, my co chair, and myself, welcome to the call. So we have a small group today which is probably - makes things quite efficient and a relatively short agenda. And I suspect all of our plates are very full in the run-up to Singapore so let's see what we need to cover.

The agenda currently has three items on it, it's a discussion, if any is needed, on our slides for Singapore for which we gratefully acknowledge the underlying work particularly of Mikey but also of Manal. And then discussing whether we have - and the purpose of face to face meetings in Singapore and then any other business.

So let's move first onto the slides and just make sure - now we've had quite a good airing of these online. Welcome, Ana, I see you on the Chat. Are you on the audio as well? You're in the AC room. Great, well hopefully, Ana, you can hear us and we'll hear from you shortly.

Can I ask Suzanne, Manal, Mikey, if you've got any thoughts? I mean, my sense is that we've been through these fairly thoroughly. I don't know whether we need to do any kind of walk-through through these or quite how we manage this. It's really, I think, probably an opportunity to get comments or input. Any thoughts as to how we handle the slide deck? I suppose we should - yeah, any thoughts.

Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. And thanks, Manal, for being my partner on this. It was great. I think fun to do and I think a great result. I think - my main question right now is whether we know how these slides are going to be used in the GAC GNSO meeting, Jonathan. This is more aimed at you I think, maybe, and Heather.

And I guess the reason I'm asking is because I would - I would be happy to come up with sort of a really short version of this deck if it turns out that you think our time is going to be compressed. So that was the only question I had was whether this is too long.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...welcome input of any sort of Manal and Suzanne. And this - it frankly isn't completely settled. But my understanding is that this is really the substance of our interaction between the two groups in Singapore. I think we should make the policy briefing notes available to the GAC so that there is - and make sure that those are distributed.

I hope we haven't missed the deadline just for - in case you're unaware of this - and I am - Manal and Suzanne, ICANN Policy staff supporting the GNSO, that's really primarily Marika, has done a great job at the past couple of meetings and repeated that this time of producing a digest of the current policy work going on in the GNSO. And of course we've got the final slide.

But my sense of this, Mikey, my expectation is that we will work through this presentation. And it'll probably be, I mean, in the end it might be a double act between myself and Manal and we'll talk through this. That's where I'm expecting this to go.

And then we'll have the bulk of the hour slot to deal with this substantive piece of work. Manal, I see your hand is up, perhaps you have a comment.

Manal Ismail: Yes, Jonathan. Thank you. And thanks, Mikey, for the slides. I mean, they quite (express) the work of the whole group. Yes, I think we will have to go through the slides. We've already tried to reduce everything and deflect it in these slides.

And I don't think it's that long but I believe it's quite appropriate for the timing. And as Jonathan mentioned the time is mainly dedicated for the work of the Consultation Group so I think we could have the time to go through the slides you've prepared.

Because it gives the whole picture and spans all the work of both work tracks and all what we've done which is the main objective of the meeting is that we brief everyone on where we stand, get as much feedback as possible during the meeting and ultimately agree on some timeframe to receive further feedback online. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks Manal. Just noting before we move on to Suzanne that we have Amr and Ana - Amr and Ana both in the Adobe room. And I'm not sure yet if we have Ana on audio but I believe Amr, you're dialing - Amr is dialing in now as well.

Suzanne, go ahead.

Suzanne Radel: Thank you, Jonathan. And thank you to Mikey, Manal and you for all the work that's brought us to where we are. I agree completely with everything that's been said with a suggestion I'd like to throw out there. I do think this is, you know, I think we should all be quite proud of ourselves. I think we've accomplished a lot in a short time line and we have a lot of really good ideas to share with colleagues.

What I do think that we might want to consider is as we get to the questions, which are actually very good questions, that we make sure that we leave colleagues with a sense that we are intending to proceed sort of in a staged process. So if you like, as Mikey points out as we look at the pie chart and we're at the identify and launch, right? This is the best time obviously to get GAC input.

It strikes me that perhaps we want to permit people to focus on these stages and so that as we leave colleagues in Singapore it's very clear that we want to hone in on the identify launch time period. It just strikes me that we need to focus really direct people's attention to next steps. How do we go about this? Do we want to ask them to answer all of those very good questions that we have laid out in our longer document?

And I hope I'm making sense here. Because while the pictorials are very, very good, and we talk about what's in the queue and what are the triggers, I think we may need to explain that and then it just strikes me that it would help if we could focus people on very discrete parts of this package, not the whole because I think the whole might seem a little overwhelming. So it's just a suggestion. I would certainly welcome people's feedback. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah and I'm not seeing any other comments right now. I'll give you my sort of immediate - or 2 cents worth on this. I think I suppose a couple of things really. Just making absolutely sure we're on the same page.

As far as Slide 7 is concerned, which has the Identify and Launch segment, and here we're talking specifically about the PDP process in general rather than...

Suzanne Radel: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: ...the work of this group to make sure that that's clear. As far as, I mean, it's interesting, what are we specifically - and I think it's a really key thing to focus in on to give these both the groups a clear indication. What has happened as far as the GNSO is concerned is that we have put a motion to the Council to sign off - to formally sign off on the charter of this group.

That puts us in a very distinct place. We will hopefully exist Singapore with the Council - GNSO Council having signed off on the charter. So the group is, in that sense, from a GNSO perspective, and of course ideally from a GAC perspective, formally chartered. And ideally it would be formally jointly chartered. So that's a key takeaway that we'd like to have.

I think as far as the work is concerned, I mean, I think this is a good point you raise is what are our expectations? Now my expectation is that the group will do the work and we will continually circle back to our respective groups for input and feedback but really we're not expecting the GAC, as a whole, or the GNSO as a whole, to be doing the work.

We're expecting that these groups have been - are effectively tasked with making good and substantive progress whilst continually circling back for feedback. And this face to face meeting is one such example which is what Slide 10 is all about is saying, look, are we on the right track or should we - and what I hope is we'll get, you know, good endorsement from that.

But it's interesting because when you work within the GNSO - and one of the reasons I was personally reluctant to call this a working group, you end up in a very structured process. And the good news about that is you are in a very

structured process and you can tick all sorts of boxes as to where you are in the process.

The bad news is is you're potentially somewhat straight-jacketed by that. So we are in slightly uncharted territory and that does - that's always - it's always been a niggle in my mind. And the only way I think we can fix that is by this repeated circling back to our respective groups and making sure we can say, look, we have showed you our work. We are showing you our work. And we want your continuous feedback. So I guess that's my sense of it.

And I think one of the things that's probably incumbent on us is to set a side of a bit of time with perhaps Heather and some others. I mean, Heather's actually asked if we could spend some time talking with her anyway about this work and how we make sure the GAC isn't generally deluged with information. So there is an opportunity there.

So I hope that's not too rambling but those are some of my sort of thoughts on where we are and what we might want to achieve. Manal, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Actually I do agree to all what you have said. In fact I believe from a GAC perspective we don't even need some formal (unintelligible) to make sure that the Consultation Group is already chartered. I mean, this - we do it less formally, if I may, so - and this has been already, I believe, blessed by the GAC.

But, again, what's from a GAC perspective? What I believe we need to make sure of is that what's in the charter itself reflects the problem accurately, reflects old objectives, an exhaustive list of the objectives that we, representing the GAC, has conveyed the GAC view accurately.

So coming back to what we need from the GAC side, as Suzanne mentioned, I don't believe we should be burdening them with the questions to answer but

rather the questions represent the approach we followed to reach whatever we are going to reach.

So they have to, at some point in time, it doesn't mean during this meeting, but, I mean, we have to share the questions to let them know the approach we are following. If someone provides input well and good. It's not then this is how we are going to tackle the problem.

And then ultimately we are going to share our answers with our groups and take their blessings on the answers we worked on. So we're not necessarily asking them to go through the questions and answer them one by one but rather make sure that they agree to the approach; they don't have further questions to ask. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. So it sounds to me like we are pretty much on the same page. And I'm noting the helpful comment from Marika in the Chat and Suzanne as well, agreeing with Manal. So I think we're on the same page. Marika has highlighted, of course, the openness of this work.

And I think that's something which whilst it may not be - I don't recall if it's explicitly covered on the slides; it's certainly something Manal, we should remind both our groups of is that we have collectively elected to make this an open process.

Which means that should anyone have an interest in the detailed questions, which we are not necessarily expecting them to do because that is the work of the group, but should they have an interest in any aspect of the work of the group it's transparent and available to see.

So I think I feel pretty confident about the approach we're taking and the fact that we've amalgamated and are amalgamating two different methods of working here. So, you know, providing there's no concerns I think we sound like we're in comfortable agreement on this.

Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. These are now - I'm down to nits because I'm going to push out another final version of this set of slides. I'm on Slide Number 5 which is the one that's charter and it's got the little URL that now works; thank you Marika. I just tested it and it works without a login. That's terrific.

On the bottom of that slide we have something that says, "Target Date for GAC GNSO Approval." And given our conversation just a minute ago I left question marks in there because I didn't know where we were going to wind up.

I could change that to say, "End of Singapore meeting," which would work with the GNSO or we could leave it off all together. It may be sort of a red herring and may be distracting given what Manal said, might be easier just to leave that bullet off. And I was just curious, you know, we have this whole series of status items, charter is approved by the group, and then we have sort of a bunch of in progress stuff.

I'm just wondering one approach to this would be to just delete the last three bullets all together and just say that our current status is that the charter is approved by the group and that we anticipate moving forward. So just questions about that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. I think we might polish this up a little more over the next couple of days as we see fit. Personally I'm not unduly worried about that slide and the bullet points on there. I would certainly say that having a target date for GAC GNSO approval to the extent that that bullet stays there as ICANN Singapore. I mean, I think that's clear. We want to walk away from the meeting not feeling our charter is in any way in question.

From a kind of GNSO perspective, as you know, the way in which we work is whilst the Council could have a reservation with the charter and send it back to the group, the likelihood is that the Council will approve the charter as defined by the group, I think, and I'm speculating here.

But the Council certainly wouldn't tinker in detail with the charter. So I don't know. My temptation is just to, at the very least, fill in that date which is ICANN Singapore. And I think we do - we've got to stick to what we say. If we say we're having feedback at every stage let's leave the feedback and approval in there. So I would say target date for approval - I've sort of talked myself into ICANN Singapore there.

And that's - as Amr points out in the Chat - there's a motion to approve the charter on the - within the GNSO - on the GNSO side. So we have a reasonable confidence that that will happen. Of course the motion could be deferred or other things could happen. But I think there's reasonable confident it will - reason for confidence that it will be approved.

All right well seeing no other hands or comments at this stage - well I see Suzanne may be coming up with something in the Chat. I suspect, and Ana, we closed this item off and then start to talk a little bit more about how we might interact in Singapore. Just give a moment to see what comes in the Chat.

Okay so Suzanne agrees with putting the target so let's - of Singapore meeting. So let's put that in for the moment, Mikey, and if we get any other changes. I think let's give it a day or two. Let's put that in certainly, let's see if there's any other comments or if any of us spends time on an airplane or in an airport or something thinking about further detail and we'll go from there. I don't see that we can't make minor refinements between now and Sunday.

Ana asks if we might have some problems at the GNSO Council level. Ana, I don't anticipate any. I think what I was trying to say is I have no reason to

have - to believe there are problems. But it would be - it is subject to a vote at the Council level. There's a motion on there to approve the charter. And it would be presumptive of me to say, "It will be approved."

It has to be voted on to be approved. But I have no indication that there are any problems. So that's my sort of, if you like, a kind of politician's answer because it simply would be presumptuous, as I say, to just assume it will be approved. But - no one is giving me any indication that there's a problem at this stage.

Okay so let's close off Item Number 1 for the moment then. No, Ana, we have a meeting in Singapore on the Wednesday; the Council has a meeting, sorry, you asked a question in the Chat about discussion in Singapore. From a GNSO Council point of view we have the sort of formal motion to approve the charter. So I expect the GNSO Council to formally vote to approve it.

And it just is - it's - assuming that happens, it represents an appropriate tick in the box from an approval point of view so that's the - that's it, yeah. Thanks, Ana.

Okay so closing off then on the Item 1. We've now got this prospect of a face to face meeting in Singapore. And I wouldn't mind any comments or feedback on this. There's really three parameters I see it coming from. There's a prospective social element which is simply a kind of getting to know you side of things.

We talked about separately or adjacent to that in concept an informal meeting. What we mean by that is hard to say. It doesn't mean we - I think it's an opportunity to chat about the work of this group and how it's going on and so on without formally trying to decide things.

And then there's a third element which is the possibility of Heather fitting into that and coming to talk with the group and understanding, and possibly some

other members of the GAC leadership team, talking with us and understanding better about our work. That may or may not be part of the same thing.

So I think we should probably stick - confine our discussion at the moment to Point 1 which is really the opportunity to get together - I think this is the opportunity of our meeting. It's not really to have a formal meeting of the group but nor I think is it purely social. It's an opportunity to get together, get to know one another and just simply talk about and - the work in an informal way.

Yeah, Suzanne, I note your point in the Chat that you suggest an informal get together where we could potentially invite other interested members of our respective groups. And certainly that seems appropriate to me.

Mikey, your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I just need a refresher, Jonathan. Do you remember what time we set aside on Sunday afternoon for the constituency meetings after our working session? That's the only collision I have and I just couldn't remember.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, approximately two hours. It's typically two hours and it begins at either 4:00 or 4:30 to 6:00 or 6:30 which and so that is a good point.

Mikey O'Connor: Just wondering if we capped that out just a half an hour or maybe an hour to get out of that collision. I think it might be more fun to do it Sunday evening, you know, because...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: For that same reason, Mikey, I'm strongly in favor of Sunday evening. I think Monday is going to be a crush and so I agree with you. So the question you just made was answered by Marika in the Chat, 1630-1830.

So my suggestion is we sort of - is there anything else that anyone's aware of on Sunday evening? Obviously personal or private professional arrangements aside, is there anything on the formal agenda on Sunday evening that is going to clash with this? Waiting for a - David and Amr are coming in with - okay great. So, David, you confirm that Sunday - my sense is it's free.

So I suspect what we might want to do is do either 6:30 - 7:30 Sunday evening or 6:00 to 7:30 and that leaves those finishing off SG and, you know, with a half hour overlap. Any suggestions as to whether we start at 6:30? Maybe 6:30 to 7:30 Sunday evening. Tick from you Mikey.

I think that that - given the stated purpose, which is an informal get together, opportunity to potentially invite other interested colleagues along, I think it's just then - and we'll work with staff to try and help with a venue. And we'll either do it in a pre-determined location in the bar or otherwise set aside an informal gathering in a room if we can sort that out. So we'll work on something. And I think it sounds like 6:30 to 7:30.

However, I see a couple of hands come up now from Manal and then followed by Ana so - Ana your hand's down. So, Manal, let's hear from you just a moment. Go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Actually I'm flexible both slots. I was just wondering what was the Doodle poll on this because we don't have everyone here on the call so...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point, Manal. In the end we sort of - we didn't do a Doodle poll because there were sort of various comments and potential clashes flying around. And it seemed to eliminate various options. And so we can - we could - I'm not quite sure whether a Doodle is appropriate given - and we could try that, I suppose, we could put the two normally proposed slots.

I worry about Monday, though, that everyone is going to be - it just doesn't have the same effect and everyone's going to be rushing around a little. Marika reminds me we did do a Doodle. I must say that's - I've missed - escaped my attention.

And actually we've got pretty much everyone can either make it or make it if need be who has answered, in fact, including me although I don't remember doing so. So apart from Mikey, as it turns out you've said no to 6:00 to 7:00 but I suspect then that has to do with a clash with the SG and Constituency thing.

So it looks like, Manal, we've got, I mean, frankly if you just took it technically it's more popular on the Monday in that there are 7 yeses and 2 if need-be's. But frankly if you look at the Sunday evening there 5 yeses and 3 if need-be's so we get to 8 and the only no is Mikey and we've got Mikey on the call now.

And as I say, given the stated purpose, which is make a little social, a little informal, my temptation is to go with the 6:00 or 6:30 to 7:30 slot. Any comment on that? Thanks, Mikey, I see you're fine with Sunday. I see a few ticks coming up. And I see Marika's hand up so let's hear from you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just noted in the Chat as well that I can check with Glen, who's already on the ground to see what is possible. I mean, one option is, as well, because I know there are typically sign-up rooms that we can sign up on on the spot.

The one challenge, I think, of probably doing it in a bar is that there will be many people around so it may be hard to limit it to, you know, our group's conversation. So for that reason you may want to consider having a more separate room. Unless, indeed, you really want to make it very open and just get together. So but I can check with Glen what the options are and we can get back to the group on that basis.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. That would be helpful. Suzanne.

Suzanne Radel: Thank you, all. And I don't mean to sound like a horrible stick here but just a very bureaucratic reaction, everybody will be fairly busy all day. We're all in meetings all day long. And so my guess is I don't know about everybody else but I'm not sure how inclined people are to have yet another meeting if it's just a meeting. Okay?

So by 6:30 my sense was if we made this informal and a little more sociable with liquid refreshments of whatever stripes, then that is a little more enticing and a little more attractive. And I will say I do have an ulterior motive and I see - thank you, ladies, Manal and Ana have agreed with me - my goal was to attract other GAC members so that they can actually sort of ask questions and ask us how things are going.

I think - my instinct tells me there's a great deal of interest in this work but the GAC is overwhelmed as everybody is, right? You know, we're all inundated with documentation, etcetera. Our time period is going to be very well spent in the meeting, you know, presenting our materials.

There are going to be people who will have just simply questions. So my strong preference is to not just find a room because I think we could lose people. You know, that's the time of day people are frankly worn out and they'd like a nice break and they'd probably like something cool to drink. So I vote for making this very casual and very sociable and if need be let's find a place that is attractive for that.

Otherwise I'm afraid, you know, it's lovely to all get together but I think our group would be fairly small if it's just going to seem like yet another meeting. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Suzanne. I'm not far off that thinking actually so my thought was that the room would be - if it was a room would be to facilitate that kind of interaction but I take your point, it may and I see, Mikey, your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: This is a tall order for Glen. I agree with all of that. You know, what would be really neat is if there was a room that had liquid refreshment available that we could, you know, then use that as bait just like Suzanne was saying. And if not then second favorite choice would be a small room at a bar; that's a very tall order given that none of us are local.

And then, you know, but I agree entirely that, you know, people are going to be really tired and it's important to make this an attractive spot. So I leave it up to the social committee to figure it out.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks Mikey. And thanks, Suzanne. And based on what's been said in the Chat I think we're on the same page. And I am quite confident that we will - or should I say moderately confident is what I mean by that given that, you know, it's a busy time and so on that we will try and find somewhere that's attractive and that fits into that time slot. So I think we're okay.

So, yeah, so it sounds like we've got a pretty clear plan there. The idea is to get together with the group to make it open to members of the GNSO and the GAC, should they want to come along, and ask questions.

And I think we could phrase it in such a way as to say the group is getting together informally and socially but not so informally and socially that we wouldn't welcome anyone from the GAC or the GNSO coming along to informally discuss with us the work and nature of the work of the group and

what's going on there. I think we can hit the right tone there and make that invitation during our Sunday meeting if not beforehand.

Great. Thanks, Manal. I think we're in shape with that. Is there anything else we should be covering then? Mikey, your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again, thanks Jonathan. This is a complete nit but I just - it's easier to talk this off. Marika, do you hold the pen on the charter or do I? Because Manal caught the fact that in our title - if you go to the title slide we left GNSO out of Policy Development Process in our charter as well as in our slide deck and I just need to insert it and I wasn't sure whether I'm the holder of the pen still or not. So just a trivia question...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I think you're still the holder but I'm happy to make changes but I think you still have actually the latest version. I think I have the PDF one but that's not necessarily the work one. So...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...if there are any changes and maybe then if you can share it on the list we can make sure as well to get that posted.

Mikey O'Connor: I can handle that. Thanks.

Marika Konings: So, I mean, that Glen usually posts these documents as well as drafts from the Council so we links in the agenda so not only on the wiki, I mean.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yes and that - hence the document deadline which I think we're well past so we'll have to skirt that somehow for both of these actually.

Marika Konings: Yeah but I think these are minor changes so I don't think - as we already submitted the charter I'm not sure that that's a big issue.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Okay thanks. That's it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay that sounds like - I note in the Chat, Suzanne, that the opportunity for more colleagues to become involved, I mean, just to check, I mean, think we have a defined working group. I assume there what you mean is - or define group - I assume you mean sort of engaged with the work - actively engaged with the work of this project so they track it and give, you know, feedback and so on, that's what I assume.

All right, go ahead, Suzanne. Thanks.

Suzanne Radel: Thank you, you put it extremely well, Jonathan. I want to make sure - and I think, Ana - I hope our colleagues will agree with me, Ana and Manal, I think we want to really sort of not get buy-in; I think people have bought in. They know this is a really practical important initiative that we've taken on. I just want more people to become engaged, not necessarily in our work in the working group but as Manal had sort of laid out, we are obviously going to do the work, right, we're going to tackle answering these questions. But we wish to bring our people along every step of the way.

So the more they're familiar with it, the more they can engage and see what our mindset is, how we've tackled this together, I think it's a plus for us. So, again, it may just be kind of - I'm tapping into a different bureaucratic culture, but it's exposure is what I'm trying to sort of work on.

Because we do tend to get buy-in - people do a lot of work online but I find that face to face time is literally invaluable. So that's where I'm coming from. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so this is, in effect, a sales and marketing function for the work of this group.

Suzanne Radel: Yeah, I mean, basically. Rah-rah. It's a PR thing with drinks because that works.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. Manal.

Manal Ismail: Yes, just to agree with Suzanne. I see where she's coming from so maybe we can look at this as a second chance for those who did not feel comfortable to provide feedback in a formal set that they may be more comfortable to discuss informally when we get to that.

Suzanne Radel: Yeah, exactly.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Well it sounds like we've come to a broad agreement on the topics we wanted to cover. Is there anything else we should cover under AOB? Has anyone else got any concerns or issues or practical points we need to cover up? Good, well I think that's a useful little session we've managed to have.

It's a shame we couldn't have more of our group on but I think it was probably always predictable to some extent given where we are in the process running up to Singapore. So I'll just pause for a moment if there's any other points to be made but I suspect we've said what we needed to.

Okay great. Well thanks, everyone. Obviously safe and hopefully not too challenging travels all that way. And we'll look forward to meeting formally on Sunday and informally on Sunday as well.

Suzanne Radel: Well said.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Thanks again, everyone. We'll look forward to seeing you later in the week.

Suzanne Radel: Thank you. Safe travels.

END