
MARRAKECH - CCWG IG Face-to-Face
Monday, June 24, 2019 - 15:15 to 16:30 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So there is not going to be a roll call. We'll have a sheet that will go around so we don't waste any time on this. And we'll turn immediately to Mr. Leon Sanchez, who is the chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance.

Welcome, Leon. Leon Sanchez hello, Olivier. Thank you very much. This is Leon Sanchez, and I would like to thank you for the very interesting turnout. We were just saying that there was a time at which there were only five or six people in the room, and I think this is a sign of the importance that this topic has, not only for the community but also for the organization and the Board. I can see many of my colleagues here to whom I thank for standing here with us and for attending the session.

I would like to update you on what the Board Internet Governance Working Group has been discussing and the Board at large has been discussing in regard to Internet governance and the challenges we see coming in the, say, near future is an understatement because it is the immediate future.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

LEON SANCHEZ:

...for attending the session. I would like to update on what the Board Internet governance has been discussing and the Board at large has been discussing in regard to Internet governance and the challenges we see coming in the say near future is an understatement because it is the immediate future.

And first of all if you have reviewed the strategic plan and the operational objectives and goals that we have set for the Board in our next strategic plan, you may have noticed that we have a goal in the operational priorities that has to do with Internet governance and how we address the different issues coming up in this arena by both the Board and the organization and the community.

So this goal has been adjusted because we saw the need to tweak the wording a little bit, and it now reads as follows: With ICANN org -- bless you -- with ICANN org, develop a mechanism or process to review emerging issues and geopolitical trends, including, of course, legislation, norms, principles, resolutions and litigation to evaluate whether they support or impact, number one, ICANN's strategic goals, ICANN's mission, or our community's ability to make policy using its multistakeholder model.

So as you can see, this strategic goal has three components to it and these components are the three layers in which we envision

or see divided our organization which is, of course, the community, the Board, and staff.

So the spirit or the underlying intent of this strategic goal is to have these three components working in coordination and doing this synergy which will appropriately let us face the challenges we see coming ahead.

This has also been included in the goals for the CEO for this upcoming fiscal year. So with this, we are trying to provide the community with a signal that, as I said at the opening, this is a top priority for the Board and the organization. And we cannot do this without the community.

So to that end, we would like to encourage everyone in our community to revitalize this CCWG-IG or the CCWG-EG or whatever name we come up with or whatever form we decide it needs to take, because we believe that the importance of this group is the function, not the form it gets; right?

So the importance is to have an open, diverse, and agile discussion group to coordinate and to form and to listen to the different views that the three layers in our organization may have in respect to the different issues that are popping up from here and there.

So we have also established some implementation steps for this Board priority, and we would like to combine the insights coming from the ongoing trends and legislative tracking initiatives and discussions within the Board Working Group on Internet Governance and this CCWG-IG to provide combined intelligence on emerging issues and stakeholders that may affect ICANN's ability to deliver its strategic goals and its community's ability to make policy using its multistakeholder model.

We also want to integrate this combined insight with the existing engagement model to determine how engagement on relevant issues and their stakeholders will be handled, and review with the Board's Governance Working Group on Internet Governance on a regular basis, as well with the CCWG-IG or the CWG-G, as I have just discussed.

So again, this is a top priority for the Board and for the organization, and we would like to encourage us and invite you to revitalize this group. We are aware that some supporting organizations have said that they are not chartering the group anymore.

So again, regardless of being a chartered group or not, we believe that the important mission for this group is to hold the discussions, to have the exchange of ideas.

And we recognize that we may not be able to have a single position because there will be, of course, different stakeholders and different interests that will be reflected in the discussions, but the important thing is to coordinate these efforts and to try to avoid surprises when we get to different Internet fora. And of course we want to expand the vision or the focus of this group to other subjects or topics that fall out of the traditional Internet governance arena. For instance, legislation. It is not something that is usually viewed on the traditional Internet governance arena but it does affect our ability to create policy and to operate the Domain Name System.

So we want to have a look at that. We want, of course, to get all the input our community is able to provide us and we want to work with the community and the organization in order to appropriately address the different challenges that this may have.

So at this point, Olivier would like to ask any of my board member colleagues to add anything to what I just said, and of course open the floor for any questions or comments you may have.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon. And so the floor is open for any other Board colleagues first.

Matthew Shears.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. Just to emphasize or reemphasize what Leon said. This is -- As he mentioned, this is both a Board priority and it will be a CEO priority for 2020.

We are very keen to ensure that this dialogue with all parts of the community occurs. And so it's important that we find ways forward for that to actually happen. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. So let's open the floor, then, for questions and comments. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. And, Leon, thank you so much for a really thorough and, at least from my point of view, I will say a very well received points of view from the Board.

I will just say that while I really welcome your Board call for revitalizing the group, I look around the room and think maybe we already did that. So now the question is how will our working methods continue to engage people in between the face-to-face meetings. Because I think that's when the attendance becomes

very challenging because there's so many other events and meetings and working groups, et cetera.

But -- So I think we will need to all think about how much can we actually do intersessionally. So I would say yet to be developed is how can we maintain the level of interest and synthesize the topics in a way that newcomers -- because I see many newcomers here, and synthesize the topics in a way that's relevant to them and easier for them to then explain why this set of activities is important to ICANN, is as important to whoever they are, whichever stakeholder group, whichever part of the community.

So the one comment I wanted to make, which I might slightly disagree with you on, is actually I think paragraph 72 in Tunis is broad enough to encompass the inclusion of legislative initiatives. And I don't think that, actually -- legislation -- a legislative initiative had been discussed at the Internet Governance Forum many, many times, which may be at a national level or even at a regional level. So I would just suggest that in thinking about that as an example. I wouldn't -- I wouldn't suggest that it has not traditionally been a part of the larger ecosystem of Internet governance issues.

The one challenge that I am hearing from conversation with some from the business user community is just a list -- and I think I hear this in your report, just a list of the legislation that has been

introduced is not actually very helpful to the community. And in fact, in the United States alone, many bills are introduced to send a message or get attention or send their constituents back home that they are working. And never an intent to see that piece of legislation actually become a bill.

Different countries and regions are different in this, but I do think figuring out what the methodology is to understand when a piece of legislation is real -- that is, it's going somewhere -- and it does have implications for ICANN, I think that needs some further discussion as well.

And I would just caution against assuming that people who are not expert in legislative processes can take on effective analysis of legislation. That is a whole skill set and expertise that people work very, very hard to develop. And not only in the United States but in Europe as well.

So perhaps thinking together about, you know, how could we do an effective analysis, and then also have a little bit of an idea of how you track legislation.

But I would again say I don't think you should be asking the community without a deep amount of thought on asking them to take on tracking legislation, because it's extremely time consuming, and I know K Street law firms that make a lot of money doing it, for instance, in the United States.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Marilyn. I take many of your points and I agree with some of them, but I think that the spirit of having the group is to have it diverse and to have it open, because I truly believe that ICANN's community diversity is something that brings richness to the table and to the things we do in ICANN.

And I agree. I mean, I never intend to say that anyone would be asked to follow or track legislation, but we recognize that our resources are limited, and we are not able to have eyes everywhere we want to have eyes. And we recognize that in our community we have a valuable ally that could be able to signal loss to those pieces of legislation that might be emerging.

Also, I wouldn't rule out the analysis of any member of our community of any piece of legislation, because even if a piece of legislation might not have a solid future in terms of the process of becoming a final act in any case, it can may well signal us to a trend that we may not be seeing.

So if we see some piece of legislation that, however weak it may seem in it's legislative process and then we see another one popping up here, popping up there, et cetera, et cetera, that may well signal us a trend that is emerging and, and that could be telling us pay attention to this; right?

So that is the spirit of this working group. That is the intention to do the call for revitalizing, to take advantage of all the resources

that we can combine and, therefore, be able to carry our work and our mission in a better way.

So thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you, Leon. It's the pattern of weak signals that make up the -- or constitute, I guess, the key foundation stone of competitive intelligence.

I have just Young Eum Lee and then I'll turn over to the board members. We'll swap between. Young Eum Lee.

YOUNG EUM LEE: Thank you, Olivier. I'm also glad to see the issue of Internet governance has become much more focused, an issue that has been receiving much more focus within the ICANN community. And one of the communities that, unfortunately, had decided not to charter this group actually is the ccNSO. But I would like to point out that it is not because the ccNSO doesn't consider the Internet governance issues as not important. In fact, I think I reported this last time. There is a group called Internet Governance Liaison Committee within the ccNSO that has been formed. We've had a couple of calls. And along with the issues that this group is concerned with, many of the ccNSOs are actually concerned more with the actual day-to-day Internet

governance activities been the ccNSO. And that's the reason why that the ccNSO has not -- has decided not to charter it. Not because it didn't think that this group was not important. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Young Eum Lee. We'll speak about the charter in a moment, later on, or rather the lack of charter, perhaps.

Let's continue with Ron da Silva.

RON DA SILVA: Thank you. I wanted to complement the comments from Leon and from Marilyn, specifically in having experts in the legislative process complemented with experts in business, experts in technology. That coupling and that diversity we get by putting those together I think give us the greatest strength in doing analytics on what's happening in the legislative space.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Ron.

Next is Wolfgang Kleinwaechter.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you. My name is Wolfgang Kleinwaechter, just for the record.

I'm very happy that the pendulum is swinging now back. I think 15 years ago ICANN was seen as the leader in the global discussion on Internet governance, and then it peaked in the days of NETmundial, and then people understood that ICANN will not be furthermore the leader in a much more complex Internet governance ecosystem.

So -- But if you look into the big picture, then it would have been a big mistake if ICANN would become silent in the global discussion which has moved to us in places. And it's also a language problem. What we called in the WSIS days Internet governance is now called in discussions among governments either as cyber or as digital. So that means -- and they have intergovernmental negotiations dealing with issues which are in ICANN competences.

So in the first committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the cybersecurity issues discuss the Domain Name System and issues about how the functioning of the key elements of the Domain Name System, which is normally, you know, the issue of ICANN.

In the World Trade Organization where they started negotiations on digital trade, they are talking about domain names. And

insofar as ICANN should not take the lead in such discussions. But if ICANN would be silent and just watching what's going on there, then it has a high risk. So it has to raise their voice. Probably these governments will never come to ICANN and ask questions. That means ICANN has to go to these meetings and to say be careful what you are negotiating. This affects key issues which are already more or less organized in a way by an empowered community. So otherwise, really, you could face a lot of problems in the next five years.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolfgang.

And we'll take a few more comments from the floor, and then get to -- well, the floor; we're all on the floor, I guess -- and take then some answers and some comments from Leon.

Holly Raiche is next, then I've got Veni, and I've got Greg Shatan.

So Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, I really do not want to talk about legislation as Australia has three appalling pieces of legislation which are the subject of a Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and

Security, and they will hold high hearings on July 1st, and it will be a very long line of people saying how appalling they are. So I will move on.

My question is to what extent does the Christchurch call redefine what we think of as Internet governance and the ICANN role in it? Because I'm trying to struggle with that myself, but I'd be really interested to hear what you think.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly.

Shall we give you, Leon, a few more minutes to think about this one?

LEON SANCHEZ: No, I don't think it is for me to answer the question. I think it is for the effort of this group to actually discuss it and to try to figure out how this would play, if at all, within the ICANN environment; right? Because content is absolutely outside ICANN's remit. So as I said --

HOLLY RAICHE: Maybe content is, but are there things that are within ICANN's remit? I think that's my question.

LEON SANCHEZ: I think that's a discussion we should definitely have in this group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon. Thank you, Holly.

Let's keep the flow going. Let's get Veni, Greg Shatan, and then we'll continue around the table.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thanks, Olivier. I just wanted to confirm what Wolfgang was saying just a few minutes ago, that the U.N. is not only the first committee that is dealing with cybersecurity and created -- the General Assembly created two working groups to deal with cybersecurity, the so-called Governmental Group of Experts and the open-ended group. And they both will be dealing with cybersecurity and they both will be talking about critical Internet infrastructure, norms of behavior of states and other actors. So, indeed, we are watching, and we -- just to say that, because maybe not everybody knows, but we do regular educational outreach efforts at the U.N., and we have even people who are sitting in this room have been speaking there like Tripti from the University of multistakeholder which -- then she joined the Board but then she was a root server operator, and some people from ICANN.

So we do try to inform the diplomats when they are negotiating behind closed doors because just for the record, the GGE, the Governmental Group of Experts is working behind closed doors. The OEWG will have --

This meeting is being recorded.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Will have certain sessions which are open and other actors may participate to watch but not to go behind the closed door when there are negotiations in the so-called informal meetings.

So we want diplomats to know what ICANN does, we want them to know what other groups are doing, and we also want them to know that there are people in town who they can call to ask for experts' advice. So we're not there to lobby. We're there to provide experts and expertise when needed.

Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Veni. Next is Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN:

I'll reserve my remarks until we talk about the charter or non-charter issue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. We'll come back to you later. Lori Schulman.

LORI SCHULMAN: Hi, Lori Schulman, for the record. I want to support what Leon said about identifying trends in legislation. I think that's exactly right, but I also want to reinforce something Wolfgang said about speaking up. I think there is a middle ground where ICANN can speak up without necessarily having very pointed and directed community positions on anything. We know certain things about ICANN. We know that we support the multistakeholder model. We know that any legislation that looks like it may have an impact on how we do policy is going to affect us.

I mean, we can see these things without necessarily getting into yes or no, up and down on a particular piece of legislative action. And I'm going to assume that ICANN's government relations team understands how to respond to challenges with emerging legislation. And if they don't, then I think that's a different discussion to have where this group may be able to advise some of us, have our own government relations teams that have these issues all the time. Where coming from my own association, it's very difficult to monitor all of the legislation and all of the world that may or may not effect our subject matter, and we do engage our volunteers, but at the same time we have certain alert

systems built in, certain talking points ready so you can have a rapid response as things emerge.

So I don't think it's a binary thing talk/don't talk. I think we talk. We talk to the extent we can talk. And those of us who have expertise in this area I'm sure would be willing to share it with ICANN.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Lori.

Sarah Deutsch.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you. I think it would be helpful not just to share about legislation in trends generally but to get into some details because some of the legislation and regulation kind of takes a direct hit at ICANN-related functions and models. And others is I think more of a subtle chipping away at issues that diminishes the role of self-governance in the Internet space. So it would be important to understand kind of the nuances of everything out there unless someone already has that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're hearing a lot of different points of view around the table, a number of questions.

I was going to turn to Leon for one thing that I didn't quite understand, which was I think a few months ago at the last ICANN meeting there was a paper about ICANN's engagement strategy that would be purely focused on the technical aspects. And I'm not quite sure where that fits with the strategy of what you've just spoken to us about. Is that an evolution of to paper, or is this something that happens in parallel?

LEON SANCHEZ:

No, it's not an evolution. It's a complement. I think these are different pieces of the puzzle. And when you look at the charter, it's just a way of codifying what ICANN was already doing for a long time and it's just putting it in black and white in a paper and say, Okay, this is what ICANN does in regard to its engagement with governmental institutions and the role, et cetera, et cetera.

And I think, as I said, that this complements the goal that we have set to the CEO and the strategic goal that we have set in our operational priorities. And it's just a piece of the puzzle. I think the main outcome, the main objective will be well-served if we are successful in, as I said, revitalizing this working group and having these rich discussions as to how we are going to manage to keep it going intersessionally. Of course, this is something that needs to be discussed.

But I would caution us from -- us discussing process and instead encourage us to focus on substance because if we do that, then I believe that the topics that are subject for discussion will stand on their own merits and we'll have the discussion going. And this will actually keep the working group active intersessionally.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon. That actually segues very well with a question that we have in a chat from Jim Prendergast who says the following: I get on a high level what Leon talked about. But could he describe how this group is operationalized on a more regular basis? Are we sending emails to a central repository where we come across something, and are those reflected back to the community somehow?

You got distracted.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let's start again. I get on a high level what Leon talked about -- I delivered the question so well. Well, anyway... I will try again.

I get on a high level what Leon talked about, but could he describe from this group -- how this group is operationalized on a more

regular basis? Are we sending emails to a central repository when we come across something, and are those reflected back to the community somehow?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Olivier.

I think this is something that still needs to be discussed and fine-tuned. But my feeling is that there is already a mailing list that is going on, right? So if someone has a topic that considers to maybe fit in the purpose of this discussion group, they could well participate over the mailing list and maybe we can think of other tools that could help us either have a central repository or a different channel of communication in order to have this interactive and multiway communication channel, right?

So I mean, as a Board, we are happy to support and facilitate any effort that you consider that could feed the purpose. So let's have that conversation, too, and let's find which would be the best tools that could serve the purpose of the discussion group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Leon. Perhaps a curated list. Perhaps a noncurated list. The mailing list, indeed, has been in operation for quite some time. We've had, of course, regular updates from the G.E. team,

regular updates also from some of the community members that are active on there.

The only thing that I could, I guess, deplore over time is that it doesn't appear as though that everyone on the list is taking advantage of this. So I do know that we have a lot of people on there. But a lot of people are in listening mode rather than sharing the information that they might have, which is fine. But I never know when you have silence whether it's consent or whether it's boredom or whether it's select-all-delete. We'll have to see.

I will give the floor to Chris Buckridge first and then Marilyn Cade.

So, Chris, you have the fridge -- not the fridge, the floor.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE:

I'll be very -- I wanted to just echo, Leon, I think your point before about focusing on content a little less than on procedure here because I think we have just over one hour to talk today and we have been talking about procedures for this working group when really just in the time since the last ICANN meeting, we've had the Digital Cooperation Panel drop. We had legislation go through the Russian Duma. We've had various things which would be really useful to talk about here today.

And I feel like this discussion is getting a little stalled in terms of the process of how we tell each other these things rather than actually sharing information.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this, Chris. We will move on.

Marilyn Cade and then maybe we can move on quickly with the charter discussions and then the updates.

MARILYN CADE:

Marilyn Cade speaking. I agree with Chris' comment, and I don't want to spend more time on the process here.

But I am going to make a suggestion that we not use the existing mailing list if we expect people to actually show up for the working session; that we think about coming up with a kind of space, a template, you know, fill in this information and submit it to this space and then reflect it back and forth, because, look, I spent 20 years dealing with legislation at a state level, a national level, a global level. And unless you want to send people an email with 355 pages, you know -- let's move past process now and then think about looking at how maybe the way INTA does it or how other global associations do tracking, just kind of take a glance at some of that and see if there's a way to come up with a space with an organized approach. And then people can visit it, so to speak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And we will close off this topic with Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Oh, yes. Thank you. Nigel Hickson, Government Engagement, ICANN. Just to confirm, of course, what we're talking about here doesn't supplant the work that our Global Stakeholder Engagement teams are doing in the regions or what our Government Engagement team does with IGOs and the different U.N. missions. There's often occasions where we have direct contact regionally or globally with institutions and governments on what they might be thinking on legislation or policies. This is more of an overall approach. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Nigel.

Now, that takes us to the charter, the update on the charter. And I'll try to make this as short as possible so we can move into substantive issues.

As you know -- and I think I must have repeated a number of times -- a number of the original chartering organizations withdrew their support, mainly due to the complexity of the various things that the charter might or might not allow the group to operate and so on.

The proposal that's now on the table and which we have discussed in our meeting was to just have an engagement group -- not quite sure what the name would be. But we could call it just engagement group -- ICANN Engagement Group on Internet governance and operate along the terms that Leon has spoken about and effectively be an engagement platform.

So the way forward would be just to take the current proposed charter of the cross-community engagement group, strip all the parts that talk about chartering, and just have this as sort of operational guidelines as to what the group should be doing and what the group shouldn't be doing. And mostly being just based on the whole communication of the information and sharing of the information among the ICANN community, like a discussion platform.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Olivier. I will have to leave now, but I leave my Board colleagues to bail me out. And Matthew will be in charge. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And thank you for joining us, Leon.

So I have now described the proposed new -- can't really call it vehicle but platform as such. And I would like to obtain any feedback, any objections actually from any of the members of the

community around -- this is based on discussions that have been had over the past few months with various parts of ICANN.

We're told by the G.E. team that there will still be staff support. We will still be able to get room in the conferences, the ICANN conferences. So it doesn't really change anything when it comes down to staff allocation or any of the allocation with regards to having microphones and things and recordings.

Wiki page, of course, still remains up. It's just the name is different, and it's not chartered per se. And it doesn't need to be chartered per se because it doesn't have any ability to take any decisions as such or propose any statements per se.

It looks like everyone is extremely excited but we're all very chilled.

Matthew Shears and then, oh, of course, Greg wanted to keep his long list.

So let's start with Matthew, please.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Olivier, thanks. I think this is a very logical way forward. And hopefully it will allow us to move pretty quickly into the discussions around substance. It doesn't require any greater commitments from kind of an organizational perspective. I think

it's -- it actually frees us up in many ways. And I'm sure my Board colleagues would agree this is a good step forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Greg Shatan. And I will revise the remarks I didn't make because I think this is -- changes the way to look at things.

I was thinking about the fact that, well, if nobody charters us, do we go away? And I think we have now solved that problem.

We got very caught up in who was chartering us and who wasn't chartering us and what they wanted out of us.

I hope we will still enjoy the same or greater support from the other ICANN structures and that they'll still communicate to us how we can best serve other parts of the community.

But I think that all the debates about chartering and what it meant and what was going on and rumors of luxury yachts being chartered for the -- for this group, another form of chartering, I think this is -- we can focus on the substance here because I think it's critically important that the different parts of the ICANN community engage with each other on issues of Internet

governance and that they engage with the Board and with staff, you know, Nigel and many others who are in there. And this is the natural space for it.

And I think the less time we spend preoccupied with the shape of our own table, the better off we all are. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Greg.

In the absence of our hands around the room, I guess we can move then to the next -- (No audio -- briefly.

First thing, I'm not sure if everyone in the room has received a copy of the overall report from the G.E. team that speaks about all the CCWG IG activities and so on. If you haven't, you can come afterwards and ask us for a copy. We can forward one to you.

I did send it to all the SO/AC chairs. And, hopefully, it has been transmitted through the community.

Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thanks very much, Olivier.

Nigel Hickson.

Yes, the report is in sort of three areas. It looks at the activities that have taken place since the Kobe meeting, which for the cross-community working group was a session at WSIS Forum and also the calls that have taken place and the discussions on particular pieces of either sort of policy, legislation, et cetera.

In terms of the -- in terms of the discussions that have taken place, these have included at the last call a brief dialogue on the status of the ITU-D sector member application, which ICANN made and which we discussed in Kobe. And we also discussed briefly the status of the U.N. High-level Panel which as Chris Buckridge said is now reported and is being looked at and perhaps might be the subject of a future call or dialogue depending on what the membership -- what membership thinks.

On the ITU, just to give the factual position, so as I think most of you know, ICANN made an application to be a sector member of the ITU-D on a fee-exemption basis. This means -- because of the reciprocity that exists between the ITU and ICANN in terms of sort of cooperation and attendance at each other's meetings, et cetera. This is the status that many NGOs apply for membership at the ITU on.

That application came before the ITU Council. The ITU Council meets once a year. It met over the last two weeks in Geneva. And our paper -- or our application along with application of other

applicants came before the council in a paper and was approved. And that was ratified by the plenary of the council on last Thursday morning. And we will now be expecting a formal letter from the ITU secretary-general to our CEO and President confirming such.

On some of the other activities -- and how you want to pick these up, Mr. Chairman, is entirely up to you. But just to -- just to confirm because I think one or two points were made, which were very important, earlier.

ICANN is engaged in looking at the developments that Wolfgang had mentioned are taking place in such fora as the WTO and WIPO. Particularly in the WTO, the relevance of the various discussions, the plurilateral discussions that are taking place on electronic commerce which do mention the DNS, although mainly -- I'm not saying this is not relevant -- in the context of the country code top-level domains and the sovereignty of the country code top-level domains which is reflected in the WSIS language. It's not easy to track this because they're plurilateral discussions. So we rely on our relationships with missions in Geneva and elsewhere.

On WIPO, there's a particular committee that's looking at the domain name system. This has been ongoing and is in particularly looking at geographical names. It's having very

similar discussions to the discussions that will take place here -- or have taken place in Work Track 5 of the subsequent procedures PDP.

Also, in the context of the U.N. CSTD -- this is the body that looks at the outcome of the WSIS actions -- we have also been engaged there on discussions on eCommerce and other related issues for ICANN. Of course, these are reflected in our report and will be discussed on calls depending on the agendas and things. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel.

So the floor is open for any comments or questions regarding the activities as you will see mostly led by the Government Engagement team. But I think on many of those topics, a number of members of the CCWG, of the group, being in attendance as well.

We have Veni Markovski, first.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Just to add a couple of lines about the U.N. engagement because we covered the Geneva engagement, and I already spoke about the two groups.

The open-ended working group and the -- (no audio) -- going to monitor, it was between the ICANN Kobe meeting, which I think is 64, not 65 as it says in the agenda.

And today there was the organizational meeting of the open-ended working group. And a conference organized by U.N. IDIR, UNIDIR, an institute which was taking place in New York. We had a joke at the panel. The Global Stakeholder Engagement team was there because I was at the MAG meeting and that's another forum.

We have now so many competing meetings happening at the same time, which is difficult to attend especially when one has a function in one or another of those meetings.

But it was a conference dedicated to cybersecurity norms. We had also representatives from stakeholders and other I-Star organizations.

The actual meetings will start in September. So by the next meeting in the fall -- in early November, we will have more information about more substantive work at these two groups. And we will know also who are the chairs and how the overall negotiations are going.

It's going to be very challenging, so that you guys know because the GG is 25 members but the open-ended group are 193 so

everyone is there. And they have to work in a consensus mode. And we are already getting some calls and questions about, you know, expertise.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You mention consensus in the U.N.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is that full consensus?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yes, in the U.N. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Marilyn Cade, and then we will go over to Pablo.

Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. I apologize, I didn't have a chance to verify whether the template is already up. But in the last IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Committee meeting, the IGF secretariat is going to post a formatted approach to take further

consultation on the U.N. High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation recommendations so that anyone interested, individual, entity, anyone from here, from the IGF community, can go in. Anonymous comments are not accepted in these formats. But your comments can come from you as an individual or you on behalf of your employer.

And there's a very strong interest on the part of the secretariat and the members of the panel to now take this round of consultation on what the three major recommendations are. And there are implications for ICANN in the three recommendations - - in the three recommendation areas.

So, you know, one thing perhaps that we could think about is how we publicize the information about that consultation, not owning it, not dictating to people what they submit but, you know, really broadly circulating the fact that template will be up.

It will be analyzed -- and that's the reason for the structured approach. It will be analyzed and then comments brought back, again, to go to the U.N. Secretary-General.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Next is Pablo Hinjosa.

PABLO HINOJOSA: Hello. How are you doing?

Just following up on Veni's cyber norms development process, the last three years starting at the IGF in Guadalajara, we have tried to build bridges between the cautions of the First Committee which have been mostly very closed with the Internet governance discussions in the social and economic part of the U.N.

And, obviously, in APNIC it is our interest to build a triangle with the technical community in how these decisions at a very high-level diplomatic environment may affect the operations of the Internet.

So we have a successful workshop proposal for the upcoming IGF in Berlin about the -- questioning the sovereign norm-making boundaries and processes and trying to understand what works well and what hasn't worked well for, particularly towards implementation of these norms.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Pablo.

The gentleman next to Wolfgang, and then we'll have Wolfgang.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. My name is Philippe Fouquart. I'm with the ISPCP.

Thanks, Nigel, for the update on the D sector membership. I just want to on behalf of the ISPs, that wouldn't be surprising to you, reiterate our concerns relative to the D-sector membership being a slippery slope to the T-sector membership.

We have expressed concerns relative to the fact that that would put ICANN in an awkward position given some examples, past examples, of the T-sector developing gTLD-related policies, documents. So just for the record, I would like to capture that.

And should -- we understood that was not the plan. So we take good note on that. And should this change, we would expect a broad consultation on such an initiative. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Philippe.

And Nigel is taking notes. Do you wish to -- no. Okay. Taking notes and so on.

Thanks so much for reminding us on this. We did discuss this, of course, at the previous meeting in Kobe.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter is next.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Yes. I want also to continue what was just said about the norm-making.

I'm also a member of the Global Commission on Stability in Cyberspace, and we are working now on the final report. We had good consultations with ICANN constituencies in Kobe, in particular with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

And one of the eight norms we will propose in the final report which will be delivered at the Paris Peace Forum in November this year is protection of the public core of the Internet.

We have here a second round of consultations with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, and we have a presentation in the GAC on Thursday.

And the wording of this norm, which includes the protection of the DNS of the routing system, (indiscernible) cables and things which are belonging, in our understanding, to the public core is not yet final.

So what I got as a feedback from various ICANN constituencies is that we can improve the wording. So my invitation is please give us the right language so we can work here hand in hand and we -
- there are some proposals now to propose to governments to enhance this norm to a special multistakeholder package, which would be a high level of commitment, you know, just below the border of legally binding.

But this could be an important step forward to have, indeed, a multistakeholder pact on the protection of the public core of the Internet, which would be supported not only by the member states of the United Nations but also by nonstate actors. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Wolfgang. Can you just remind us, when is that session with the GAC?

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: The session with the GAC is on Thursday, 12-12:30. And the consultation with the SSAC is on Wednesday afternoon. I think these are open sessions. It's not closed, yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: They're open sessions. Thank you.

Any other comments?

I realize, by the way, listening to all the different updates that it's quite crazy. Used to be just one update of one track, and now there's a multiplication of the tracks.

Andrea Beccalli.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Thank you again. Andrea Beccalli. I just wanted to add another update. Last week -- was it last week? Yes, I think -- in The Hague, the EuroDIG, it was presented another initiative similarly to the one that Marilyn Cade mentioned for the U.N. about the High-Level Panel report.

So former GAC chair Thomas Schneider presented with former GAC representative from U.K., Mark Carvell, an intersessional project where Mark Carvell will compile comments, feedback on the report on behalf of the EuroDIG. And it will be something that the EuroDIG community would then present to the U.N. as the common European multistakeholder feedback to the panel report. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. Paul Rendek.

PAUL RENDEK: Hi. Thank you.

I have a question actually relating to what Marilyn brought up, on the three points of how the IGF will be moving forward. I suppose ICANN is not working in a vacuum. There are other Internet administration organizations out there.

Is there any energy being spent on what all the different groups that have a place in the Internet administration would be bringing forward to the U.N.? Is that something that ICANN plans on doing alone, or is it going to be working with maybe other Internet administration or organizations?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I'm not quite sure.

This is Olivier speaking.

It's not for me to answer, I guess.

Does anybody wish to step forward? Let's ask Matthew Shears who is hiding behind Wolfgang.

[Laughter]

When in doubt, ask the Board member.

MATTHEW SHEARS: I'm going to have to defer this to Veni or Nigel, I'm afraid to say. I'm trying not to hide, but I think --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel is running away.

MATTHEW SHEARS: They're in a better place to answer this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Mandy Carver.

MANDY CARVER: So this goes to of a sort three-category approach to issues and events that were developed and blessed by the Board. There are some instances or some issues, some events where ICANN, because of its role, is naturally the primary. We always try and be collaborative, but we would move forward on those issues. There are other issues where ICANN is very much part of the ecosystem, but somebody else is the primary. And we would be supported through the dialogue and the ISTARs and the other kind of cross-ecosystem events. And then there is the third category. And these are not, in some way, priorities. This is not we do the 1's before we do the 2's. This is a way of thinking about issues that arise. And then the third would be what we would call selective engagement because there is a thing that occurs, GDPR, that has an impact both on ICANN as an organization that operates in this space and then also on the technical remit that ICANN has, and then also the policy-making process that is convened that involves the community.

So this is also the same form of evaluation, if you will, that the trends assessment goes through. So part of what happens in the Board Working Group on Internet Governance is an evaluation and reporting on both activities, events, but also issues that are coming out of the trends assessment work that falls within that construct.

So the answer -- the short answer is it depends; right?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mandy.

Matthew Shears.

MATTHEW SHEARS: To answer Paul's question, I think it's a very good one. We should be. And I'm not just speaking, and I wouldn't want to speak, for ICANN in that sense, but I think we as a community and all our various interests should be working together because so many of these issues particularly in the and the GGE and OEWG span across a range of concerns. They're not narrowly focused on DNS issues, but certainly some of the security issues do affect the DNS.

So I think we have to look a little bit more expansively, and Leon referred to this in terms of how we're now looking at Internet governance in the broader context. So where we can find

common interests in addressing some of these issues, we should be working towards that.

I will note that there are a number of efforts under way to open up as much as is possible a GGE and OEWG processes to enable for there to be some kind of stakeholder engagement in those processes. And those -- I believe it's the OE -- the GGE has committed to having some stakeholder engagement at the regional level to engage in those processes.

But I think there's plenty of opportunity for the technical community, civil society, the business community to come together and work on these issues. And it has been done before and we should be encouraging it.

Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew.

And ICANN has produced these little cards which actually have a link to the ICANN acronyms and terms. I think we probably have to produce cards for our work as well because there's so many more acronyms out there as well.

Theresa, do you wish to intervene before? Yeah, go ahead, Theresa Swinehart.

THERESA SWINEHART: Just very quickly because I think this is a useful conversation given all the different moving parts around either governance or policy decisions currently under way.

As you're aware, the Board recently adopted the strategic plan for moving forward, and thanks to the community input and the trends-related work to really capture the different buckets around that.

And as you know, part of what we, as ICANN organization, do with the community is look at what is within our mission and scope and where -- where is also the community interest and all of that.

So this forum here provides, I think, a very useful opportunity to look at how do we address issues in sort of the three broader categories that we've identified where we go immediate or work in partnership or follow. And then also ensure that we're staying within our remit, but also informing, factually, discussions that might be relevant or touch upon the remit of the organization.

So I think we have a good opportunity for collaboration around a range of areas.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Theresa.

Nigel, I think you had -- Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Just very briefly. Nigel Hickson. Obviously a good question.

Just give you two very brief examples. We have what we call Internet collaboration calls, which quite a few people around this room take part in these sort of calls broadly of the technical community where we discuss certain issues. So we would discuss perhaps what's going on in an ITU study group or what preparations are being made for certain sort of committee work. And that interaction is also played out in actual activities; for instance, at the -- prior ITU meetings we have collaboration with ISOC and with other bodies. And next week, for example, at the OECD, ISOC and ICANN represent the technical community in giving input on their Going Digital project and the work under way there.

So as Mandy has said, at these different levels, we work together with our partners.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel.

That actually takes us to the discussion on external Internet governance priorities. I think we have already touched on a number of them. Is there any other topic that we haven't touched on of what's coming up, I guess, for the next -- well, over the summer until our next meeting in Montreal?

I'm turning to you. Or, indeed, anyone else around the table, if there is any other things that we need to flag up.

I do realize we have touched on a number of threads that are currently taking place, and it probably is quite confusing for those people who are just stepping into the room and hearing about all the things that are taking place.

Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Just one thing which we didn't mention, which is that some of you know, if not all of you know, that there is this ITU Council working group on Internet public-policy related issues. So the ITU Council, which took place -- I'm already lost it when it finished, but last week maybe, the --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You missed it.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

The ITU Council -- No, I mean I was there, but I have been traveling for 25 days so I'm lost in terms of dates and days.

The ITU Council decided that -- There was a request by the Council working group on Internet to the Council on what topics should be discussed in public consultations. Some of you guys

know they have these public consultations and topics that they have to agree upon. Council didn't reach a conclusion but sent back the question to the Council working group. So the next session of the Council working group will have no public consultations but will have to figure out the topics. And there have been already -- I mean, governments provided a number of topics. Because there are so many, they couldn't reach agreement at the Council and they turned it back to the work group. Now we will see what happens at the group meeting, and it's before we meet in Montreal.

So we will let you know what happens there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Veni. That's helpful.

For those people that are not aware of the ITU processes, things do tend to go back and forth between the bigger group, the smaller group, the bigger group and eventually something comes out of the mechanism.

So anyone else? No?

Paul Rendek.

PAUL RENDEK:

Sorry; I just want to ask another question. I have been a little bit out of the fold, so forgive me if you have been discussing this on the list. I have been vacationing for 25 days and not traveling.

IGF, there are some changes coming up in that space, and I think it has repercussions not only for ICANN but for the rest of or other technical communities or Internet administrations or organizations that are involved in Internet administration. And I think there's been quite a lot of stuff floating around on what that will look like in the future. And I think it could potentially have quite a big impact on the -- maybe the multistakeholder arena as we know it. And is that -- I'm sure that was a topic here, but it will come to light very quickly after Montreal. And I don't know what your idea of discussions are from now until that point, or will it come on the agenda? And how are you working with the others?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much for this, Paul.

Now we have a number of people in the group that are MAG members as well, or at least were MAG members or are still following things very closely.

I'm not sure if anybody wishes to say a few words on this. I mean, the two things, of course, are unrelated. You can be a member of

the ICANN working group and be a MAG member. It doesn't mean that the...

We're not linking that.

Veni.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I'm sorry, really, but I am a MAG member.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you're apologizing for being a MAG member. Go ahead.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I'm apologizing for taking the floor because people may get bored with all this.

But we did have a MAG meeting also before the Council. So in the beginning of June in Berlin. I went to see the venue, and I strongly recommend you guys, whoever is planning to go to the IGF, to book hotel at the venue because it's far away from the city -- or Airbnb nearby. It is far away from the city but it's very well organized. As far as I understand, it's the biggest hotel in Germany. Like 1200 rooms or something like that.

The conference center is right in the hotel, so basically there will be you walk out of the -- by the reception, you make a left and the conference center starts there.

The German organizers have made amazingly good job. There will be plenty of rooms for anyone or everyone, you know, whatever you guys want to do.

The German government is putting a lot of money to support the people from countries in transition, developing world, et cetera, to participate. So there will be a lot of newcomers. So for those of us who have participated in the IGF for quite a while, it's good to reach out to these people and explain why is it important that they be there. I think they've allocated 280,000 euro for travel and stay for these people.

We also were told who is going to be the next host and the next host will be Poland. The dates and the place is still not clear because they have a couple of places, and also maybe the IGF will be pushed back to where it was, which is September-October and not end of November during Thanksgiving week for the Americans.

And the workshops I believe are already announced publicly. I'm not sure. I haven't looked at the website. But if they're not, they will be very shortly. We've cleared all the workshops and open forums and stuff like that.

Also, there is a call for new MAG chair. The deadline for providing names or self-nominating is end of June. And there is also a call for new MAG members. And this year the expectation is to have I think about seven members should be rotated -- replace, rather, because their three-year term comes to an end.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Veni. In typical ICANN fashion, it's last four minutes and everyone wants to speak.

So Avri, no thanks? Okay.

Then we'll have Chris, briefly, and then Paul, and then Marilyn also.

CHRIS: Very briefly. Okay. Well, possibly I'll give a little -- to move away from what Veni was talking about, I think the German event looks like it will be a very good one and I think they have a lot of very good connections with the community there. And I think probably, and, maybe, Paul, you were referring to this, the bigger context is the report coming out of that Digital Cooperation panel and the fact that we may not have the IGF in its ongoing format after -- after this year. But who knows? But -- and I think that would be something -- that would be something, I think, this working group would be well positioned to discuss given that a

one of the possibilities coming out they raised is for what they are calling an IGF+ model. What would that mean for the IGF plus slash minus that currently exists? I wouldn't imagine those two things are going to exist at the same time so what do we feel about the IGF and its place in this ecosystem? Is it something that should be transitioned to a different format or is it something that we feel very committed to in its current form?

Yeah, I'll leave it at that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

I was going to take someone who hasn't spoken yet. The gentleman over in the back, please. It's you.

WISDOM DONKOR: Thank you. My name is Wisdom Donkor. I am a former MAG member. And I just want to find out from you what is the government of Germany doing to bring -- specifically looking into the developing world? Let me see Africa, bringing the ministers?

VENI MARKOVSKI: I think the question was -- oh, Andreea, do you want to answer this question? Sure.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Andrea Beccalli.

ANDREA BECCALLI: I'm not speaking on behalf of the German government, but I was at EuroDIG last week and a representative from the German government actually addressed this issue.

One initiative that I recall is that they are hosting a parliamentary meeting within the next IGF, and they are sponsoring and they are funding travels from members of parliaments from the Global South, and they are investing a lot of resources in that.

The representative from the German government, he addressed very openly the fact that it's not a good -- it's not good that the global IGF is having three meetings in a row in Europe, and Germany is committed to -- you know, to make as much as inclusive as possible this IGF.

So I suggest to reach out to the GAC representative here from Germany, and he may have more information, but I'm sure that there are -- there are initiatives, and the one of the parliaments is the one that I recall which is the most evident one.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And thank you for the question, Wisdom.

And I was going to give the floor to Danko Jevtovic.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: I --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And I need to close the queue otherwise we will be shouted upon and kicked out.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: A small comment on the Europe. Actually Poland is in different U.N. region. So this is (indiscernible) kind of important. So this is of course Europe, and we understand it is complicated travel, especially for the World South, and it is great guest by the German government to help the parliamentarians, but it is the fact that it is different U.N. regions, so it is important.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

Veni, two words.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Just to add to the parliamentary, and also, everyone reach out to your permanent missions in New York because the invitations for the ministers are being sent by the German Foreign Ministry

through the missions in New York. So I have reached out to the Bulgarian government, I mean the Telecom Ministry. Turns out they still haven't received it, but it's sent so it may be lost somewhere. And it's good to reach out and make sure that the invitations get to the right minister.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Veni. Matthew Shears.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Can we set ourselves an ambitious goal, Olivier? Can we say that by the time we meet -- I'm assuming we'll meet in Montreal, we will have explored, agreed and set up this discussion space so that we can already start to see the discussion prior to the meeting in Montreal? I think that will be a great goal for this group. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you for these marching orders. I think we are all understanding that this will require some work from all of us. So we need to put some structure to this because it's all coming out, and there's so many of them.

I was going to give the floor -- okay. Paul, two words as well.

PAUL RENDEK: Thank you very much, Matthew, and I will bring this to the list because I want to kick this up a little further. I'm not really quite getting the answer I'm looking for here.

We've put a lot of eggs into the basket of the IGF. I think the I-Star organizations have. There are some questions coming up there, and I'm wondering whether we're working in concert to answer some of these questions, and are we wanting to preserve this? What do we want this to look like? Not only as an ICANN community but I would say I-Stars in this basket. And I'm not quite seeing that addressed.

There are a lot of different areas where IGs are taking place now, not only in the IGF. I would never say that that's the only place we need to move, but are we even discussing that? We need to kick this up a little bit further to understand where we're going. So I hope we can do that on this list, Matthew. Thank you very much for bringing that up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And Marilyn Cade did you want to say a few words?

MARILYN CADE: Actually, I'm going to respond to Paul's question, first of all. Marilyn Cade speaking.

I think -- and for those of you who have been around a long time, you know that I, too, have been around a long time including being very heavily involved with the business sector in contributing to the language in the Tunis Agenda. And we have had an IGF, Internet Governance Forum, that was fit for purpose for a number of years; however, the world is changing. And it's my own personal view that it's better not to be an ostrich or a duck. And I say that because I think we have to critically examine some of the options of how do you deliver outputs that aren't necessarily negotiated agreements? And that happens all the time in a variety of other settings. And for some of the MAG members who are here, you know that, in fact, there is terrific -- there was a terrific call for action from both the president from France but also the U.N. Secretary General who asked us to seriously consider how to make multilateralism more multistakeholder.

And, you know, I think we have to all recognize that cybersecurity, cyber threat, cyber risk, digitization of work and of the future is really calling for some different thinking on our part, and I think we need to be very serious about it.

I personally think we can preserve the IGF with changes, not moving to negotiated text but doing some things much, much better and doing some things differently. But I also want to make a comment in response to the -- in the world of governments, east

Europe is a very different region. And I hope everybody in this room when they hear the words, "Well, it's Europe one more time," will be more informed when they make their comments. And I say that to my colleagues from business very strongly. Because we're going to have a very different experience in Poland.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Marilyn. And unfortunately, we have reached the end of this meeting, but thanks to everyone for having participated very vocally in this meeting. And as we have plenty of things to do until our next meeting, we can end this meeting now. And with thanks to the tech team for having supported us.

NIGEL HICKSON: And if anyone in any remote possibility is not on the CCWG-IG list and wants to be on the list, please let us know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]