

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting  
Tuesday 06 January 2015 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 06 January 2015 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/gnso/gnso-gac-20150106-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jan>

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

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Ana Neves, Portugal

GNSO Council

Brian Winterfeldt, Councilor

Carlos Gutierrez, Councillor

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Jonathan Robinson, Chair

Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt

Suzanne Radell, US

Avri Doria, Councillor

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Olof Nordling

Glen de Saint Gery

Karine Perset

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon. Please go ahead. This call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Francesca), good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. And welcome to the GAC GNSO consultation group call on the 6th of January, 2015.

On the call today we have Carlos Gutierrez, Ana Neves and Mason Cole. We have apologies from Suzanne Radell, Manal Ismail, Jonathan Robinson and Avri Doria.

And from staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, Karine Perset, Glen de Saint Géry and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Mason.

Mason Cole: Thank you very much Nathalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on the call.

Mason Cole speaking, I'm chairing the meeting today. I know we have a fairly short agenda. And we have apologies from a number of participants.

So we may have a relatively short call today. But, Marika I see your note in the chat that the accountability call has just wrapped up. So we may very well have some folks joining the call late. But let's go ahead and proceed to the agenda nonetheless.

We have - looks like we have four items - the first being a discussion about GAC early engagement and new PDPs.

And I'll send out to the list some notes on the draft quick look mechanism along with her notes. Marika are you able to review those for us this morning and open up a discussion?

Marika Konings: Sure. So this is Marika. So as you may recall the document represents a kind of step by step approach of how a GAC quick look mechanism might look - could look - derived from the flow chart that we had initially developed.

So we basically outlined a couple of steps. And then highlighted in blue were the ones that represent new steps compared to what is currently down within the PDP.

Or formulizing some steps that, you know, may be done in the current way we develop an issue report, for example but is not specifically spelled out.

And then we discussed, I think, that at the last meeting that would be good. Or we already flagged, as well, that there were some specific questions that we had, at least from the staff perspective associated with each of these steps.

And we discussed with the group whether it would be helpful to actually try to define, you know, which specific questions we may want to put back to the GAC, as well as the GNSO, in order to get input on this proposed step by step approach.

So what Manal has done is started adding some of those questions to each of these steps. And I can just, you know, briefly run through those.

So this key is step one. It is a request...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: So step one is basically when a request for an issue request is submitted to ICANN staff and is highlighted in blue, you know, called out - that true - to specifically indicate whether there is standing GAC advice on the mentioned topic - if known to the requester.

And Manal has suggested that the questions to (unintelligible) to the GAC should be, you know, is this addition okay? Are there any further suggestions? And for the GSNO, is this addition okay?

And it was also - she also added that - in the comments - that, that would be attempted or there is already a template available and whether a request for an issue report is made.

And one option would be to add a specific field to that, you know, indicating the fact that if there is. Well if they request news that there's standing GAC advice on the topic, that that should be added to that request template.

And then second step proposed, is communicate to the GAC quick look mechanism committee that an issue report has been requested including information on the topic and that a preliminary issue report is expected to be published by X date.

And it's noted here that it's usually 45 days after the transmission of the request to ICANN staff.

And someone else suggest here that the questions to the GAC should be, is the idea of creating GAC quick look mechanism accepted? Should there be some sort of ongoing committee? And who should be on this committee?

GAC leadership, topic leads, GAC secretariat, dedicated GAC members or other. And in relation to the GNSO should suggest that the question could be

is the idea of sending an early alert by the GNSO liaison to the GAC accepted.

And I see that she also added in the comments that this mechanism could also look at other requests by the GAC. And I think that's something we discussed. That could work in a similar way. As CCNSO triage works.

Where it's a kind of mechanism to decide or determine how certain request are dealt with. So it doesn't necessarily need to be limited to GNSO PDP related request.

But, of course, our focus at the moment and my assumption is if there's a bar. Consideration of that, that's a GAC discussion to be held.

Then step three would be the publication of the preliminary issue report for public comment. And here we've highlighted in blue that should, of course. And include information on any outstanding GAC advice on the topic, if available.

And, again, I think as I mentioned last time, this is something we already do that is not called out as such in the procedures. So this might just be a, you know, making sure that it is specifically called out.

And there's an understanding that that would be included in any preliminary issue report. The questions that Manal has suggested to the GAC is, "Are you fine with the suggestion to include information on any standing GAC advice rather than to the topic on the discussion - any further suggestions?"

And to the GNSO, she hasn't added any specific questions there. So I think, again, that's one of items where if people have suggestions and hope to receive those.

On number four, submit notification publication and put in an issue report for public comments to the GAC.

And questions for the GAC, out to whom should this notification be sent -- GAC chair, GAC secretariat, GAC leadership, GAC topically or the quick look mechanism committee or other to the GNSO.

Who should send this notification from the GNSO side, the GNSO liaison to the GAC, GNSO secretariat or other? And these are just some of the logistics that will need to be worked out and make sure there's a clear understanding of who's doing what.

Then there's the new stuff on the convening of the quick look mechanism committee to review the preliminary issue report. One suggestion was here that that would be in the 45 to 60 day time frame.

So the question for the GAC is, you know, can the GAC quick look mechanism committee or any other agreed mechanism review the preliminary issue report intersessionally?

How will the review take place -- by email exchange, through conference calls or other? Is the 15 day window from day 45 to day 60 the process a reasonable default period?

And again, I think it's important to probably look at the staffing conjunction with step six to really make clear that this a, you know, standard response that is expected to be provided as part of the quick look mechanism.

It's not necessarily detailed input or guidance or it defies in any shape or form. So step six would be then when the quick look mechanism committee communicates its recommended response to the GAC.

And so Manal has suggested here that some of the questions to the GAC could be, "Is there any other possible initial response? Can this step take place intersessionally?"

If yes, how will the quick look mechanism committee communicate it's recommended response to the GAC over email, through a conference call or other? And to the GNSO, does the GNSO expect any other initial responses.

And then seven, the GAC reviews a quick look mechanism recommended response and decides whether to agree or disagree. This could include refer and issues back to the quick look mechanism committee or the GAC deciding as a whole on a response.

And, so the questions for the GAC are here. How will the review normally take place, by email exchange, by email or conference call? Does this require a face to face meeting?

It may require a face to face meeting in case of diverging views. Is the 20 day window from day 60 to day 80 of the process a reasonable default period?

Is that 80 would be to communicate the outcome of the quick look mechanism to the GNSO counsel.

And the questions here to the GAC are, "Is the five day window a reasonable default period which to communicate the agreed outcome of the quick look mechanism to the GNSO and the GAC secretariat, the GAC chair, topic lead and quick look mechanism committee other?"

And to the GNSO is the GNSO okay with receiving an initial GAC response within 40 days? Is the GNSO flexible - should the GAC request longer? And should its initial response be communicated to the GNSO counsel chair, the GNSO secretariat or submitted as part of the public common form or other.

And one observation I may make here is that I think the initial input of the quick look mechanism would go into the preliminary issue report. So maybe there's a communication that it would go to staff with copy to the council for example, as a FYI.

And that information would then be imbedded in the issue report that is submitted to the counsel at the end of the day.

Step nine, is an outcome of quick look mechanism is option A or B and the GAC would form a drafting team to dissolve input or consider what input needs to be provided. That can be provided to the PDP working group while it commends its iteration. Question to the GAC here would be, "Is the GAC okay with this approach? Is there any other preferred means to develop GAC input?"

And no specific questions at this stage to the team. So, and then there two more mini steps for which, you know, specific questions have been identified at this stage.

But just to know, that those are existing steps of the process. The first one being the closing of the public common form in the preliminary issue report and the submission of the final issue report - including the outcome of the GAC quick look mechanism to the GNSO counsel.

And that's all I have.

Woman: Mason are you still there?

Man: We lost him?

Woman: I don't know.



Marika Konings: Nathalie, can you see if he's still on the bridge, or was he connected via Adobe Connect?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Adobe - on Adobe Connect.

Marika Konings: Oh, he's here still. But we can you hear you Mason.

Nathalie Peregrine: Mason we can dial out to you if you're having mic issues. If you'd like to private message me which is Nathalie. Although we can't chat, I can get the operator to dial out to you quickly.

Woman: Perfect.

Nathalie Peregrine: Mason this is Nathalie. The operator is just setting up the dial up, it will be a couple of minutes.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As we're getting Mason on the line maybe you know, people can in the meantime start thinking about what all the questions and (unintelligible) or maybe could be added both to the GAC and the GNSO, as I believe the objective is that those would be some of the questions that will be used for the joined session in Singapore to try to get an idea of what the support for this approach and, you know, following that potential pilot to see how it would work in practice.

Olof Nordling: Marika, Olof here - if I - in the meantime, also what can be considered is whether we have any preferences from the working group. Because there are multiple alternatives in some of the questions that Manal has put forward.

And in some cases, well it should be open questions. But there may be preference for one or the other solution from the group. And that could be an enhancement since there are quite a few questions.

Well we were timed but perhaps not as much time in Singapore that we would like to have.

Man: Yes, Marika may I?

Marika Konings: Yes, sure, go ahead.

Man: Yes I think it's a very good issue, scoping and paper. What I take out of there are two things. One, that you have considered an early engagement. That's very important.

Second, that you have considered like a parallel crack for specifically, for the GAC - so it's very useful to look at it like that. But the main issue for me is the first question - the idea of the quick looking mechanism or committee.

And I think that's one thing that we should discuss, I think. It's, for me, this working group -- the GNSO GAC counsel group -- is kind of the place to start testing this idea of this committee.

Because I guess it's not going to be a committee only by GAC members. It's a committee that is going to help GAC members or the GAC group that is going to analyze that - take quicker decisions.

So kind of a, I don't know, tutorial, Mason Cole gives them a tutorial early on and then developing from there. So I think it sounds interesting. But we have to be very careful in defining this committee responsibility.

Right now we have committees for everything, you know, and very difficult ones. We are facing one in the geographic names that I - we have a CCNSO/GNSO committee.

And we want to involve the GAC. But we don't know how to do it, et cetera, et cetera. So this is my comment. Let's focus on this first question that Manal is placing there, the idea of this new committee.

Marika Konings: Yes and this is Marika - if I may just maybe respond to your question, because I think at least from my perspective and also, for example, looking at the CCNSO model that we've been kind of looking at, as well.

The committee itself would really be staffed by the GAC. And I think probably up to the GAC to decide whether that's indeed. I think as Manal outlined the option there.

It's a GAC leadership. Topically from the GAC and the GAC secretariat, dedicated GAC member, other and I don't think we've discussed - or at least we're seeing at this stage.

That would include others outside of the GAC in that committee. We're still, of course, not preclude the committee reaching out to, you know, people like Mason for example, you know, if they need further input.

But I think, you know, I think it's important, as well, to see this as a, you know, this is really an initial step. Whereby, what the quick look committee receives is basically, you know, it's probably kind of a one page of the surgeon - a request for an issue report.

For example, on the intellectual - our transfer policy has been submitted. And, you know, an issue report is being prepared. Do we believe the issue of inter-register transfer policy has public policy considerations?

Do we already have, you know, do we already have advice on it? Yes/no. So that is the kind of, I think, information that at that stage is available.

As the process proceeds, of course, you go into the depth of, you know, what is the exact scope? What are the questions the PDP will look at? What are some of the recommendations that maybe developed?

So I think that the quick look mechanism is really at that right initial stage. Whereby, the basic question is, you know, is there something for the GAC to pay attention to.

And, you know, equally for the GNSO to make sure that it understands that, you know, the GAC has specific interest in the topic and, you know, should be kept in the loop.

And, you know, though, for example, the liaison or, you know, through other mechanisms kept up to date on a regular basis. Mason, do we already have you back on the line?

Mason Cole: I am now. I'm just now back on the line.

Marika Konings: Right, thanks.

Mason Cole: Sorry about that folks.

Man: No problem.

Mason Cole: Okay, I heard a little bit of the discussion there while I was working on this - thank you Nathalie for the help on the call out.

So I'm sorry, Marika. Could you help me with where we left off on the discussion?

Marika Konings: It is Marika. So where we've started a bit on seeing what other questions may need to be added and, you know, how are Manal's questions.

And all of us suggested, you know, in Manal's questions there are in certain cases a number of options. And, you know, continuing to these to help forward may be to input from the GAC and the GNSO.

It may be worth for a consultation group to actually make a suggestion in that regard. And they to say, "Well we recommend that it should look like this. Do you agree?"

Maybe to make conversations easier - and so I think that's another, you know, item where people may want to provide input.

And Carlos raised the question on the GAC quick look committee and especially, you know, how would that be formed.

Who is on it? Also one of the questions that was raised by Manal and I think he suggested. You can correct me if I'm wrong. But that should be may be one of the first points to focus on as that may to a large extent, as well, define how some of the other things may work.

And it is my own, you know, adding to that question - is, for example, if that would be a committee of the whole. You know, obviously you may need more - a longer time frame to get decisions compared to if it would be, you know, the GAC leadership, for example.

So I think. And that sounds - maybe that's, you know, worthwhile project to start there. And see if there's - at least amongst the people on the call - an agreement of common understanding of what that may look like.

Although, again, and I think we've spoken about that before, as well as this is a, you know, a GAC committee. You know, it's probably something, as well.

Of course the GAC may want to have its own say on. And we may have to be a little careful on how forceful we are in our recommendation. But I'll let GAC colleagues comment on that of what we can or should be specific.

Carlos: I just wrote down three words from what Marika said - if you allow me Mason - that this committee should be leadership driven. It should be represented in a way that allows for quick decisions. That's my last comment to that point.

Mason Cole: Okay, thank you Carlos, well put. Yes, excuse me. Any other comments on this while we have everyone on the phone? Okay, I see another hand.

Marika, this is my own input, Mason speaking again. But I'm inclined to go with your recommendation that this group will recommend to the GAC and the GNSO the process.

And then seek some mechanism to formularize the process going forward. I think - from my point of view - it looks like we still have some unanswered questions from the GAC about how they would organize themselves in order to receive the quick look mechanism.

And then turn it around within the timeframes outlined in Manal's document - or within your document with Manal's comments on it.

So I'm curious how we might go about helping the GAC come to their own conclusion about such a recommendation. I'm not sure how we'd do that. We're, you know, we're fairly along in the process now.

And we're not getting - we haven't received as much input from the GAC that I think we would like. Anyone have any thoughts on that topic?

It may be better when we get to Singapore and we have a chance to meet face to face and we're able to get some work done. Okay, well I'll take that as a - oh I'm sorry. (Anna), yes please.

(Anna): All right thank you. Well I was thinking that - I think that GAC had to discuss first of all, all these proposals on its own. And then to have these joint sessions.

I know that. When are we are going to have this joint sessions? We have already any day of the week. Because if they're - well, we need like an hour or one hour and half.

And I don't know what roll off might play. But I think that GAC needs discussions among ourselves. And then we'll have to have this joint session with the GNSO.

From what I can see from Manal's proposal, I think they will trigger some discussion there. And so I don't see it for the time being anything that I look at.

Because I think that doing the discussion of this further there will be something that will be included. And then you have to see what would be the outcome of this discussion among GAC members and then to prepare the transaction.

So that's my point for now. Thank you.

Mason Cole: All right, thank you very much, (Anna). I note in the chat that Marika has noted that yes it looks like a joint session you've scheduled for Sunday afternoon in Singapore from 3:00 pm local until 4:30 local.

I believe that's right Marika. Olof, I see your hand.

Olof Nordling: Oh sorry. I was on mute. Thank you. It's Olof here. And while just comparing with Marika, of course. That is the foreseeing timeslot. And while as to (Anna)

point that we would need to have a preliminary discussion about it within the GAC.

While currently there is no slot foreseen for that. But that's something to bring up perhaps of the leadership of the GAC.

But really, in the first instance, I would say that well the questions are the right ones to put to the GAC - whether we have any recommendations or not.

And the time to do that is really when they meet face to face. It's rarely something that can be addressed intersession to the whole of the GAC.

So from that perspective, I think this document as it's scoped right now is very, very useful. The question is whether those GAC members on the committee on the consultation group could have expressed some preference.

For example, I mean in order to start out somewhere, one idea could be to - since we haven't got chair advice/chair group called the GAC leadership.

That they - at least in the first instance - that could be the suggestion to start out with that and see if it works - rather than establishing a new committee.

Well since we do have - well that is - well would be. I was a GAC member I would suggest that, for a start. But well there may be other views from the real GAC members.

But at least we have got a committee already existing within the GAC that could potentially take on this kind of task. My little thought - thank you very much.

Mason Cole: Thank you very much Olof. Marika your hand is up.



Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. In response to (Anna)'s question - and maybe also already looking at the, you know, the second little point on this item.

And, you know, if it will be helpful I could maybe try to, you know, combine some of the documents that we've used to get here - like for example the flow chart is related document the question.

To maybe turn it into a kind of, you know, short briefing paper including - of lining some of the recommendations you are making and some of the specific questions.

Maybe that will help, as well. You know the group to provide feedback on whether that it is a need - a helpful format - to put you to GAC. So they have a chance to review it prior to the meeting.

And, you know, if your agenda allows, of course, to even talk around it. And it I think somebody for the GNSO. And that may then form partners around the basis for discussions on Sunday afternoon.

And that could potentially be used as well to the updated and to kind of, you know, form recommendations once we've received the feedback. And, you know, determined if and where changes they need to be made.

I don't know if that will be helpful. And I'm happy to try and at least attempt to do that - if you think that would help the process forward.

Mason Cole: Well this is Mason speaking. I think as much hand holding as you can do for this group - the more that you can do, the better.

I see (Anna)'s point that that's what she thinks the GAC needs to better prepare the joint session and make it productive. Well said (Anna). I think that's probably the case.

So Marika if that's doable, then I would suggest that we move forward in that manner.

Marika Konings: Okay, I'll do something.

Mason Cole: Okay, and mindful of the time here. It's now 35 past the hour. Unless there's any other discussion on this agenda item, perhaps we can move forward.

Okay, I see no other hands. So moving on to the second item - the second issue under item one. Any other documents or updates that need to be made before the Singapore meeting.

I'm not aware of any. But, of course, we can entertain a discussion on that right now quickly if anyone has any suggestions. Okay, I see no other hands on that, as well.

Okay let's move forward to item two then. GAC and GNSO dialogue on ongoing topic, the first matter is any updates or requirements regarding the IGO/IMGO ongoing coordination.

The lead is on - being me. I have no further update on that. Does staff have any further update on anything that's moved forward? I'm unaware of any subtenant work that's taken place over the holidays.

But Marika or any other staff is there an update there.

Marika Konings: This is Marika - nothing from my side.

Mason Cole: Okay, Olof.

Olof Nordling: None from me either.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Discussions ongoing but no further steps.

Mason Cole: Okay. Okay, moving on then an update on preparation of the general proposal for the work track. I'm sorry. Marika can you - can you take that agenda item.

I'm not. Are you talking about the discussion on just the work track between the GAC and the GNSO or is there something more specific you had in mind there.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think that's something - an action item that came out of the last meeting where we'd look at whether, you know, it would be helpful or necessary to prepare more concrete kind of proposal or framework on how, you know, GAC GNSO dialogue on ongoing topics might work.

And so my apologies here to the group because I picked that up relatively late. And I put something together yesterday that I actually sent to you Mason for some review.

Which basically is the kind of first outline of your different steps in, you know, how ongoing conversations could work between the GAC and the GNSO.

It's a little bit similar to, you know, what's so up on this screen - is really trying to say, okay, this first happens. What's in the next step? What is another step after that?

And also highlighting some of their questions that we may want to get input from, you know, from the GAC and the GNSO. So I think at this stage - and I'm not really sure.

I'm happy to put up what I put together. But, at least personally, I think it would be more comfortable if you Mason as the liaison would maybe first have a look at that.

And, as from your perspective, what you think, you know, makes sense or what you've already experienced, as well from, you know, your role so far.

And maybe that's something Dan - once you have had a chance to do so - that we can maybe share with the list so people can comment on and provide input.

Mason Cole: Sure I'm happy to do that. Okay, then that kind of belongs to me. Is there any other discussion on this topic?

Okay, all right. Thank you very much Marika. Item number three, planning for the Singapore meeting - again, Marika, I think I would have to defer to you on the discussion on this.

I mean, I'm aware that we have a time - at least tentatively scheduled for our Singapore face to face. What else at this stage can we discuss that would be helpful for staff in planning that session.

Marika Konings: Hey yes this is Marika. So I think we currently are looking at Monday lunch time. So I think it's 12:30 to 2:00 - if I'm not mistaken. And I see Lynn is on the call.

I'm sure she'll correct me if I'm wrong. And so I think as Manal has suggested, you know, everyone should just, you know, grab some food unless someone is willing to sponsor lunch.

But from the ICANN side, unfortunately we don't have any budget to provide lunch for the group.

But we'll reserve a room and are able to set it up and I think and (unintelligible) on Jonathan on that note and maybe some discussion in the group. But, of course, there are two ways in which we may approach the meeting.

You know, one could be it's just a working session of the consultation group - in which we'll have an opportunity to, you know, discuss and review the feedback received during the weekend session and hopefully make further progress on some of the proposals that we'll have prepared.

But secondly, it could also be a more kind of engagement outreach kind of session. But probably that is already covered, you know, during the weekend. And our target audience is really, you know, the GAC and the GNSO in that respect.

And I think Jonathan wasn't sure either how much value there will be in doing the meeting in that way.

Although, of course, if you have it as a working session it's still open to, you know, anyone interested to come along and listen and, you know, as questions.

So I think the question here is really from the group, you know, is there specific view on how you think we should be running that meeting.

Should it really be a working session for the CG where we just take whatever was discussed or raised during the Sunday meeting?

And continue our work, basically and, you know, determine our work plan from here to maybe the next meeting.

Or if we believe we can conclude before that time. Or should this meeting have a more of a kind of, you know, outreach our work facing objective.

Mason Cole: Okay, thank you Marika. Brian I see your hand up.

Brian Winterfeldt: I this is Brian Winterfeldt for the transcripts. I'm glad that we have set aside a time on Monday. I wanted to also offer to sponsor the lunch for our group - since I know that apparently we right now have no funding for food.

I think it's probably important that folks can eat and focus on the work that we're doing and as far as substantively on whether or not we open up that session on Monday to other folks.

I think if there are, you know, GAC or GNSO people who want to be engaged and continue to dial up on Sunday and join us on Monday I think that actually would be a really good thing and that we should be open to that.

Mason Cole: Very good, Brian, thank you very much for that. That's generous of you. Thank you for your sponsorship.

Any other input on structure or content of the meeting. Okay, I see no other hands up in the Adobe. Okay, moving on then on the agenda. We've pretty much taken care of everything.

Is there any other business to be discussed in this meeting? All right, in that case, we have the luxury of giving - oh I see Marika. I'm sorry Marika - you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) sorry it won't take long. It just - I think to confirm next meeting and probably looking at Nathalie, because I think we did agree during the last meeting that I think we'll meet in two weeks' time. Nathalie, can you confirm if I have that right.

Nathalie Peregrine: I do believe that's correct, yes.

Marika Konings: So just to confirm that next meeting is in two weeks' time. And we'll send out, as well, a notice to the list. And hopefully we'll get more people to join.

Mason Cole: Okay, I hope so. So that'll be Tuesday, January 20.

((Crosstalk))

Man: That is correct.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mason Cole: Okay.

Marika Konings: Just to know that actually will conflict with the face to face meeting of the accountability working curve that just looking at the list. I think some people may be involved are affected by that.

But I can have a look and compare membership of those groups to see. I know, for example, I think (Suzanne) is one of the people that is a member of the group and presumably will be attending in person.

So it may affect some of our participation. But we can have a look at that.

Mason Cole: Sounds like it might. So yes, if I might ask you, Marika, to take a look at that and see if there might need to be an adjustment made in the schedule. I know that we try to stay true to every two weeks.

But if we have the opportunity for better participation on this call - particularly from the GAC member - I think that'd be great - if we could do that.

I don't want to disrupt the schedule too much. But that'll be our last meeting before - I assume - before we all arrive in Singapore. So if there's an

opportunity to increase the participation then maybe that's a good thing to take a look at.

Okay, any other business or any other comments before we adjourn? All right ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for your time. The call is now adjourned. Enjoy your Tuesday, thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you very much (Francesca). You may now stop the recording.

END