

TRANSCRIPT

Internet Governance Review Group Telephone Conference 16 April 2014

Attendees:

Carolina Aguerre, LACTLD
Becky Burr, .us
Byron Holland, .ca
Don Hollender, APTLD
Roelof Meijer, .nl
Debbie Monahan, .nz
Barrack Otieno, AfTLD
Peter Van Roste, CENTR
Katrina Sasaki, .lv
Mathieu Weill, .fr

Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom

Apologies:

Jordan Carter, .nz
Keith Davidson, .nz

Byron Holland:

Okay, well, let's get started. We're a couple minutes after 3:30 so first off, let me apologize for on very short notice asking for a delay. I appreciate the flexibility has shown in accommodating that. Again, my apologies. So this group came together originally just as point people on the various threads of the internet governance dialogue flowing out of Buenos Aires and I think served that function relatively well, just to exchange information and make sure that we as a CCNSO community were sort of keeping up to speed on all the different threads.

Subsequent to Singapore and even probably just prior to that, I think this group is in the process of morphing into something different. And coming out of the Singapore meeting, there was a resolution to have Becky, and Keith, and I at least try to work as a very small group to help potentially shape or at least stick handle the formulation of a broader group or an ongoing group that was actually going to be tasked with dealing with the IANNA transition issues from a CCNSO perspective. And I think as we -- as there was conversation in Singapore, this group, this ad hoc group is probably the likely recipient of those responsibilities and of course, we will also I guess open up any potential working group that's formed here to others within the community.

And that's essentially where I see us heading at this juncture. Is that consistent with what people are thinking coming out of the Singapore meeting? And I will, as you formulate your thoughts on that, I will also update you on the fact that Keith, and Becky, and I have had a couple of calls as we try to at least take a couple of steps toward shaping the dialogue, or at least helping to provide some input to get it to a point where people can start actually having constructive discussion. In the interim, of course, ICANN has put out their initial proposal for process. Hopefully, you've all read it. If you haven't, I'd encourage you to do. And one of the things that we noted there is there's an interesting lack of participation by what we've been calling the sort of directly affected parties, and that's registries operators, in particular, both from the G and the CC space. And as such, given the May 8 deadline to have some input into the initial process consultation, Keith, and Becky, and I thought it would be very important for the CC community to be able to have some initial input there.

Given the timelines, it makes it very difficult to go through a standard CCNSO process to get the entire community involved in it. So our initial thinking is at least to begin with, because there will be another round of input available after the May 8 deadline, that if the CCNSO council could come to conclusion in short order on a statement or an input into that process based on the statement that we provided to the public forum, that that was something that was generally agreed to by the CCNSO and that we would build, in a sense, on that as we spoke to the process. We wouldn't frame it as a CCNSO statement. We would frame it as a council statement so people wouldn't feel that they'd been signed up to something that they didn't participate in. But it would then also give individual operators the ability to either pile onto the statement itself to take what worked for them and create their own submissions. And I know that Becky has taken an initial stab at drafting something that I think will put in front of the council in the coming call.

So I know that's probably a lot to digest right at the moment, but I just wanted to bring you up to speed given it's been -- there's been a fair amount of activity outside of our specific ecosystem that is definitely changing the landscape sort of under our feet. So that's a quick debrief on where I'm coming from, but I'd like your thoughts on if that's making sense, if there are any holes in that thinking, questions, concerns.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Byron. This is Bart. I just want to let you know I'm on the call as well.

Byron Holland: Hi, Bart. Welcome.

Debbie Monahan: Byron, Debbie here.

Byron Holland: Hi, Debbie.

Debbie Monahan: I think it makes perfect sense. I suppose one question is have the three of you given some thought to (inaudible) best get out to CC that aren't actually members of the CCNSO to try and capture their views on all this as well?

Byron Holland: We haven't particularly discussed that subject and Becky is on the call here, so she can chime in too anytime. Certainly, my expectation, having not really had that as subject matter in the conversations with Keith and Becky is that flowing from Singapore, we spoke pretty specifically to what we're doing is germane to the CCNSO. But certainly, the expectation is that that is more or less as a catalytic role that we hope and want the respective ROs to be engaged with us, as partners with us because they probably have better and more direct access to the folks -- to the operators who are not CCNSO members. And certainly, our hope is that our reach would be happening there at the RO level, but I don't have

a prescribed notion at this juncture of how outreach to non-CCNSO members should happen. I certainly welcome input from ROs and others on that.

Becky Burr: The only thing I think that we could do, other than going after the regional organizations would be just to use the IANNA list for CCs who don't participate. But I don't know how good the lists are in terms of getting you to the people that you actually need to be in touch with.

Bart Boswinkel: Byron, this is Bart. During the Singapore meeting, I had, say, with Allen and others, we had a discussion around how to map all these CCs. And one of the things that is still on the to do list that probably is easy to involve the regional organizations as well is to map, say, you've got the basics is the IANNA list. We know who the members are of the CCNSO and we know who the members of the regional organizations are. So we create a kind of master list of the CCs and where they are a member of. And so you end up with a small group of CCs who are not involved in any of these regional organizations and/or the CCNSO, and probably, yes, we can do that in one or two weeks (inaudible) group.

Katrina Sataki: I'm sorry, it's Katrina here. Today, I just sent to Bart and Keith, you, Bart, Christina and Gabby, an Excel file. I compiled the list that was helpful for Gabby. We actually mapped everything, who our members of each CCNSO, which CC regional are members of which regional organization. And if they are on a CC CLD community mailing list, which is run by CCNSO.

So if you check your mailbox, there's email from me and there's Excel file. So you can see actually, which CC CLDs are not unreachable at the moment.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and it's more that you have a list of, say, CCs in the IANNA database and then map it against this list as well.

Katrina Sataki: Well, I went through the IANNA database so I have to admit, I didn't take IDN CC CLD. But all [indiscernible] CC CLDs should be on the list. Since I did it manually, perhaps I skipped some. But if you check the list, so.

Byron Holland: Okay. So that's a great start. Thank you very much. Pardon me?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, this is Mathieu speaking.

Byron Holland: Hi, Mathieu. Go ahead.

Mathieu Weill: Hi. I'm sorry if it steps a little bit back into the discussion, but I did not attend Singapore (inaudible) report. But I'm feeling a little bit lost in the process here between the group you're forming, Byron, Becky, and Keith, and the way you're seeing our restricted group here, and the rest of the community. Could you remind me exactly the scope of what the council asked you, Becky, and Keith to do and what kind of contribution you're expecting from us?

Byron Holland: Sure. So the Council approved that Becky, Keith, and I, because events were moving quickly, would simply take an initial role in trying to shape or organize a potential working group and just at least for the very -- for that moment or for this moment, at least try to shepherd the process until such time as a what I'm going to call a more fulsome, legitimate working group was able to take shape. And there was discussion at that point that this ad hoc group that's on the phone right now, which initially had simply been tasked with being point people on the various threads of the internet governance debate, would be an appropriate initial group to probably seed the working group. But of course, it would then -- there would be a call beyond that.

So the idea of -- pardon me?

Mathieu Weill: Sorry, Byron, the (inaudible) group then the mandate is about drafting a charter, right?

Byron Holland: That would -- pardon me. I'm sorry, you're cutting in and out for me, I'm sorry.

Mathieu Weill: I'm sorry, it must be my connection. If we are in a process to seed an upcoming group then we should be focusing on how we are chartering the scope and working methods of a future working group, right?

Byron Holland: Yes, I would expect that we would have to do or it would have to do a charter in short order. I'm only bringing people up to speed on where I see where we're at right now, but certainly in a very short amount of time, if this is to be the case then without a doubt, a charter would be one of the initial steps that would have to take place, absolutely. That, which you're absolutely right, I think is separate and distinct from being able to deliver a statement from the CCNSO council before the May 8 deadline. So the two, in a sense, two separate issues, though obviously there's some linkage between the two of them. Does that make sense, Mathieu?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, I think it's important to stress that it's two different things and regarding what you were saying (inaudible) this ad hoc group being -- helping out with the preparation of the working group and obviously there is (inaudible) today. But I think it's worthwhile that we keep this group as a way to liaise between the different initiatives and not forget this aspect of the working group right now, as it is now branded IGRG or something like this.

Because it's two different tracks.

Byron Holland: Yes, I agree.

Bart Boswinkel: Byron, do you mind. Mathieu, what you will see, and so I think we're seeing it both (inaudible) the small coordination group is just focusing on the IANNA transition. So there is a clear purpose of statements, which you can find under the -- say under the webpage of this group. You see some (inaudible) information there as well and say this ad hoc group, as we have right now on the call, is moving forward with all the other initiatives.

Becky Burr: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: And again, this group has its own, again, say as a base, it has -- as a base, one of its objectives is to inform the community of what's going on. And for that purpose, you see the webpage as well. And there is no time limit to this particular ad hoc group. It's just in order to keep people and facilitate the interaction between the CECs and these different internet governance initiatives.

Byron Holland: So just to be clear, there's no intent that this small ad hoc group is meant to substitute for a fully formed working group open to all CCNSO members with a specific charter. That's not the case at all. What I'm putting forward is, here's the lay of the land. We have some steps that we're going to need to take to get to this point and this group has its own purpose. Of course, it's very much related and partially overlapping to what a coming working group would do. And in a sense, that's all Becky, and Keith, and I were trying to do is to keep the process moving until such time as that happens, which is going to be part of the Council call tomorrow.

So that's all that's happening and I'm just trying to make sure that everybody is on the same page on that. To also get feedback as we move down this track. The people on this call are people who are interested and participating in various

ways, and to make sure that this is an appropriate trajectory that we're on, and also just to update folks on the fact that given the short timelines here, some of us are about to head to Brazil. We have a short amount of time after that and then any input that we as a CCNSO community want to make into the ICANN process is suddenly upon us May 8. And that's why I know Becky has gone away and taken a stab, an initial draft on a potential statement or at least done the heavy lifting on some content that can go to the CCNSO Council for consideration.

So that's where we're at. That's it.

Becky Burr: Yes, it was just a first cut based on the statement that the CCNSO made or the Council, it made in Singapore on the IANNA transition, plus some other positions that the CCNSO has taken publicly before, including in the IANNA functions contract context.

Byron Holland: Mathieu and then Carolina, right?

Carolina Aguerre: Yes.

Mathieu Weill: Sorry, Carolina. It's a bit difficult to comment on a document that's obviously still in the drafting (inaudible) that I haven't seen. But I have actually one question about the content of this potential comment from this CCNSO Council and this is related to the controversy about the scope of the consultation that has been launched by ICANN. As you know, a number of stakeholders are challenging the assumption that the (inaudible) has been taken by ICANN, would that be included?

Becky Burr: Yes, that's definitely right in there because CCNSO was very clear in terms of automation and service levels, and all of that stuff in the context of the IANNA functions' contract. So the draft comment said specifically that the role of the establishing the requirements and specifications under which the IANNA functions and (inaudible) and management functions are performed has to be in scope.

Byron Holland: And Mathieu, just before Carolina, you speak, I just want to also clarify we're not holding out on this document. It only -- Becky only put forward the rough draft Monday night and with respect to it being a CCNSO Council oriented first draft with respect to the CCNSO Council, we want to make sure that they get to see it first. Happy to share it as soon as that's happened. We're not holding out on a document, it's just I think we need to respect the Council and let them see a document that was intended for them first. And then we'll most definitely share it with this group and beyond. But it definitely does --

Mathieu Weill: Okay. Good point, and I wasn't implying anything (inaudible). It's just I understand there's so many things going at the same time.

Byron Holland: Right, and that is one of the reasons why Becky, and Keith, and I tried to do something here, which was, you know what, there are numerous concurrent requirements happening in very short order. So let's at least just get the ball rolling while we fill in the form of this in a more appropriate way also. And one of the first steps is around getting to the Council meeting tomorrow. Yes, tomorrow.

Carolina, please go ahead.

Carolina Aguerre: Yes, thank you. No, one of my comments was related to something that you just sort of answers. And so we have to wait until tomorrow's call and let the Council have a first look at the document. But we will -- and since you mentioned that (inaudible) organizations, I mean have this role in terms of regional conduits and

getting into spaces that is sometimes more difficult for the broader global CCNSO community. We are having our (inaudible) on the 6th and 7th in Mexico and I think that's, okay, very close to the deadline but I think it's a really, a very legitimate space for us in the LAC (ph) region and we would be using that opportunity to comment and provide input to the document.

So I'm just letting you know that we will be sort of working on that and I'll try to have my community as centered and focused as possible in the document. But the time will be short, but I can guarantee that we will be providing input in that respect, but with a very short timeframe.

Byron Holland: Right. Okay. Thank you.

Carolina Aguerre: And the other question maybe is a bit too broad at this stage, but I've been seeing some comments on particularly, I think it was yesterday, on the one (inaudible). And there was this idea of having a PDP from the CCNSO on this process. I mean are you -- is this group thinking about starting a PDP around this issue?

Byron Holland: We -- so that has not been entertained one way or the other and certainly, Keith, and Becky, and I are not stepping down that track at all. Our only job was to try to keep this moving while we actually get a more robust process and group in place. That's it. And believe me, we were not talking about PDPs in any way, shape or form, one way or the other.

Carolina Aguerre: Okay. But maybe, since that's in the air I thought it was just like (inaudible) would be interesting for you to know that some people are commenting that.

Byron Holland: Right. I can also just share that -- and certainly for those of you who were in the joint CCNSO/GNSO Council meeting, which of course was opened -- was that Carolina?

Carolina Aguerre: No, I'm here.

Byron Holland: You're still there. Okay.

Becky Burr: We got a weird note from Roelof.

Carolina Aguerre: I think it was Bart.

Byron Holland: Okay. So anyway, as I was just about to say, out of that, you remember there was some discussion because the initial cross community working group seemed to be floundering, and didn't really have a charter, and was much challenged in where it was going. The joint GNSO/CCNSO Council meeting, it was raised that there probably needed to be a narrower, more specific cross community working group with a definitive, much more disciplined charter formed to input into the IANNA transition issue. And those of you who know -- might know Mikey. I forgot his last name. I'm just drawing a blank. Mikey O'Connor as a bit of a charter geek had circulated something, which I know that's also taking some root. And one of the things that Becky, and Keith, and I had certainly have had some discussions about -- no conclusions, not going anywhere, but one of the issues that we were talking about, prior to ICANN putting out its proposal, but certainly subsequent to that is the notion that there are folks, arguably everybody, in some sense, at the end of the day, is affected by the IANNA transition.

But then there are those of us who are directly affected parties because we are the customers of IANNA. And obviously, CC operators would fit into that group. G operators would fit into that group. Perhaps, root operators would fit into that group. It would be a much smaller subset of folks who potentially have a role in

coming together to speak directly and from a position of intimate knowledge about the -- about being a customer of IANNA.

So that is just in the spirit of sharing some of the thing that I'm hearing. That's another space that may need to be occupied at some point. So there's a lot of things happening concurrently. I think the first thing we need to do is come to grips with a statement that the CCNSO Council and then hopefully others can support, which may clear some of the issues that are concerning people, including scope, as Mathieu raised, but is certainly within the document that Becky has crafted, the draft document that Becky has crafted.

And I think before we think about too many pieces here, and try to boil the ocean, we need to just step back to what is -- what do we need to do in the immediate term, which is ideally create a statement that can make plain some of these concerns. Think about the working group structure and charter that the CCNSO is going to need to put in place will be, and I think this group is well positioned to at least think about what that looks like, and some of the concerns, and some of the scope of that, and then be aware of some of these other brewing entities that we may want to be a part of are.

Which leaves us at this moment, not with a crystal clear path forward, but at least I think a better sense of the different channels or threads through which this issue is progressing that we may need to be or definitely want to be an active contributor or participant in.

Roelof Meijer: Byron, this is Roelof. Good evening.

Byron Holland: Oh, you made it. We got a funny message from you, not funny ha, ha, but odd, funny.

Roelof Meijer: Yes, very funny and I tried several numbers, but in the end I made it. Byron, while we are making or doing a draft segment and discussing these matters, can we -- may I suggest that as a kind of an exception, because ICANN has started drawing on its website, can we actually call the thing the way it should be called and not talk about the IANNA transition, but talk about the oversight of the IANNA transition and the transition of the oversight of IANNA. Because those are two different things.

Byron Holland: Okay.

Roelof Meijer: The whole thing is about the transition of the NTIA's role.

Byron Holland: Yes.

Roelof Meijer: Not about the transition of IANNA.

Byron Holland: Yes, and that --

Roelof Meijer: Literally, everybody is talking about the IANNA transition.

Byron Holland: Yes, you make a good point. Duly noted and I'm sure we can make that -- make plain that sentiment within whatever statement we end up putting forward as a Council. Because I think, my sense is you're absolutely right on that.

Roelof Meijer: Okay. Would be good. Thank you.

Byron Holland: And like I say, we will share this broadly. We just -- we just want to respect that the Council should see it first since it was drafted for them initially. So that's the first step, draft step into the Council shared broadly. It will speak to some of

these very -- the issues that are being raised around scope and correct terminology, et cetera. And then the next part is -- the next step is creating a working group with an appropriate charter that can start to speak to this issue or start wrestling with the issue. And a little bit further down the road, although not very far, is where do we want to also participate. Because there are, I think, other streams brewing that we may want to make sure that we're a direct participant in.

Not the least of which, of course, is ICANN's steering committee, which doesn't yet include us, which I think they are very remiss in. And as part of our statement, I'm sure we will --

Becky Burr: It does include it on sort of as (inaudible) from a SOAT but not in the directly affected parties category.

Byron Holland: Yes, and I -- so yes, and that's what I meant. And I think we also might want to be commenting on what directly affected parties. The ICANN proposal includes affected parties as a short list, which include like ISOC. And to my mind, I think they perhaps -- and ISOC should absolutely be very involved in whatever this process ends up looking like, but there's a directly affected parties piece, which are those of us who are actually customers and actually directly interfacing with IANNA. And that's not, I think, effectively contemplated in what ICANN is proposing right now.

Anyway, that's getting a little bit ahead of us. We need to take the steps that are immediately in front of us, while being aware of, I think, the shortly following steps and that's just what I wanted to try to communicate to this group, which still is formed to share information, which is what I'm trying to do.

Are there any -- respecting the fact that I delayed you all, and being sensitive to time, it's now seven or eight minutes past the hour. This was really to be an exchange of information. Are there any other comments or input that people want to make in particular as we head in, as some of us head into a Council meeting tomorrow?

Mathieu Weill: Byron, Mathieu speaking.

Byron Holland: Yes, Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: An exchange of information about (inaudible) have you all seen the outcome document, probably the WikiLeaks (ph) version and then the official version?

Byron Holland: Yes.

Mathieu Weill: I mean one difference that's been noted between those two versions was the fact that a sentence which was phrased about the functional preparation for IANNA between policy development and operations was in the first draft and not in the most recent version. So I expect maybe one of the discussions next week in Sao Paulo and I wanted to draw attention on it.

Byron Holland: Thank you. Is there any feedback or input that you think would be appropriate to put into the Council tomorrow?

Becky Burr: I think -- while Mathieu is thinking about it, I think it might be a good idea to point -- to bring the proposed outcomes document to the attention of the Council. I read the changes as sort of scaling back NETmundial's focus on the IANNA transition, the stewardship transition. There's just now one paragraph, which I think is sort of a good thing in the sense that it suggests that the process that's

underway will be the process by which the community thinks about this thing, rather than having a whole bunch of input in Brazil.

- Byron Holland: Okay. And I will make sure that the outcomes document is circulated to the Council.
- Don Hollender: Byron, it's Don.
- Byron Holland: Don, go ahead.
- Don Hollender: I'm just wondering if there's a plan for the CCs that are in Brazil to get together ahead of time, either virtually or physically and whether there's a plan to make an intervention during the meeting to just remind people of the special nature of CC TOVs.
- Byron Holland: At this juncture, there isn't a coordinated statement being prepared. I know that ICANN has -- is planning to make CC members aware of what's happening from their point of view, but from this point, there is no coordinated CC statement being contemplated.
- Don Hollender: So this is the same ICANN that did not include CCs as direct stakeholders in their group?
- Byron Holland: Yes, it would be the same one, yes.
- Mathieu Weill: This is a really good point, Don. I think we should definitely try and at least get some (inaudible) get together the day before people have arrived and probably try and see how we can promote the specific nature of the CC TOVs using the open mic sessions. I'm definitely open to contribute on that. I'll be on the (inaudible), but I can also do a few other things when we are there.
- Byron Holland: Is Gabby on this call?
- Kristina Nordstrom: No, Kristina is here.
- Byron Holland: Kristina, so I know Gabby was, or I think, thought it was Gabby, was collecting the list of CC participants. Do you know if that list has been created? I know she listed it just by country code. She provided a list just of the country codes. But does she have a list of the people and an email address?
- Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. As far as I know, she has one, but this is just to inform the community of which CC TLD is attending and we can send out a reminder (inaudible) yesterday. So we do have a list with email addresses.
- Byron Holland: Can we create a mail list of those who are going to be in attendance so that we can communicate with each other as a first step?
- Bart Boswinkel: We could try, but that's going to be -- that will probably take a lot of time. What we could do, what I suggest is just copy one (inaudible), say once we copy all the email addresses in one email and make the subject line NETmundial, they can use that one with reply, et cetera. It's easier than creating a separate email.
- Byron Holland: Okay. So can you ensure that that happens?
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I'll check tomorrow or Friday with Gabby when we got the latest data.
- Byron Holland: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Otherwise, we can ask people to submit their email list or email address so we can create this list in this manner.

Byron Holland: Okay. So let's -- we will do that. So as an initial step, we will be able to communicate -- clearly communicate with each other at the very least.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Byron Holland: Any other comments or feedback at this point? I see that Katrina has sent us all an email on CC TLD reachability from the conversation we had earlier on this call, and Peter has sent something about Ellie Cruz's (ph) statement, which are always interesting. I'm sure they'll be interesting.

Peter Van Roste: Hey, Byron, this is Peter. The reason why I forwarded this is it's linked into the discussion that Mathieu and Becky just raised on the separation of (inaudible) should be functional, structural separation thing. She made some pretty strong statements and I'm convinced that that will set the tone for that part of the debate and NETmundial and that's why I forwarded. Sorry, I should have given some background because it's a rather long email.

Byron Holland: Okay. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: And you have on Peter (inaudible) email to the high level (inaudible) as well. And I have to say, it's not often that I say that but I tend to agree on (inaudible) of what she is saying. I feel very comfortable in that (inaudible).

Byron Holland: Okay.

Becky Burr: Are you talking about Nelly Cruz's letter?

Peter Van Roste: It's an opening piece that she wrote and it also includes a copy and paste from her most recent blog. The essence of the message is somewhere down where she talks about IANNA globalization, yet another wrong use of terminology, but I think it's about 75% down in that email, the fourth point in her blog post, actually. And it's the last paragraph where she takes a very clear position. So there should not be artificial limitations and scope of the discussions. And then with the globalization of ICANN, I think she will make this debate even more complex because that will weaken the political -- that will strengthen the political resistance in the U.S. And if people keep on insisting to have both discussions go hand in hand.

Becky Burr: If it were the sort of politicization of this in the U.S. is a problem, although I actually think the best way to deal with the sort of silly political stuff is to really think hard about the piece -- the provision that says that the U.S. won't accept an intergovernmental or multilateral governmental solution because that's really what people are focused on. And I think that's fine.

I'm a little worried, though, about Cruz's statements, because what she seems to be advocating is sort of the discussion of the transition of the NTIA role to all global forums (ph), and well -- and I agree there shouldn't be artificial constraints on what people can talk about. But the more it goes outside of the -- sort of the more it goes outside into all kinds of different organizations, the less direct the voice of directly affected parties like registry operators it's going to be.

Peter Van Roste: I agree.

Byron Holland: So before we dive further into that debate, I'm just going to say for this call, the idea -- I just wanted to make sure that we had an exchange of information about what's happening right now as we head into NETmundial, as we work toward the

May deadline, and as we see a number of potential working group, steering group entities starting to take shape in our community and broader, just to make sure everybody had a sense of what was happening. I think that we have done that on this call. The Council has a call tomorrow. I'll make sure that Becky's document goes out to everybody on this list subsequent to the call. And then we'll take it from there in terms of starting to finalize whatever that statement looks like and encourage all of you to participate in that.

So unless there's any other comments or information that people want to exchange, I would suggest that the essence of this call, which is for the information exchange, has been completed for now. And -- hello?

Kristina Nordstrom: Hi, this is Kristina. Sorry. I just wanted to quickly ask the group whether, for the future, you want an Adobe room for these calls or if you -- the Bridge is sufficient?

Byron Holland: I think an Adobe room would be very helpful certainly from just making sure that people get heard in a reasonable order. It would be very helpful if we could have that so we can have the hands up, assign, et cetera, and use the chat function.

Kristina Nordstrom: Yes, I'll set it up.

Byron Holland: Thank you very much.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Do we have dates already for the next call?

Byron Holland: I don't believe we do, but my sense is we should have one subsequent to the week after the NETmundial meeting. So basically in two weeks.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and then move onto London maybe every two weeks as (inaudible) moving so fast.

Byron Holland: That certainly makes sense to me if the group is amenable to that. So let's try to do it every other week, and if we don't need it, we'll cancel it, but we'll put it in our calendars. My sense is given what's happening, the pace and the parallel nature of a number of these discussions that it's probably worthwhile trying to make sure that we have this conversation every other week.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. We'll start preparing it.

Byron Holland: Okay. With that, I think we'll call this meeting to a close and just say thank you very much. See some of you in Brazil and safe travels to those who are going to be there.