

David Archbold: Good morning and welcome to the most intimate room in Cartagena. Welcome to the Geographic Regions Working Group. The idea this morning is not so much for me to give a formal presentation, but rather to get a discussion on some of the issues that the Working Group will be addressing in the final report.

So far the working Group has issued two reports. The first one looked at how Geographic Regions were used throughout the ICANN organization and the second report, which was put out for public consultation in November looked more at the why - what were we seeking to achieve by the use of Geographic Regions.

And then the final approach, which is what we will start working on now, is do we need changes, what changes should there be. And it's for that reason we wanted to have this meeting this morning to try and get some feedback and thoughts from you all.

I see some very familiar faces in the audience who have seen many of my slides before, but there are some first-time attendees. So just to set the scene, I'm going to very quickly flip through some slides that have been on the go off and on for I'd guess about five years since I first started this.

If we can look at the initial purpose of ICANN regions, they were first defined way back in 1998 as an aid to insuring, and I quote from the bylaws, "broad international representation" on the ICANN Board. And the make-up of the ICANN Board should

“reflect the geographical and functional diversity of the internet.”  
And the procedures for appointing Board members were to be  
“sufficiently flexible to permit evolution to reflect the changes in  
the constituency of internet stakeholders.”

Now this was implemented by creating the current five regions.  
They were probably based in the existing and planned RIRs. The  
allocation of countries to regions used the UN Statistics Division  
tables but it was greatly modified, and I’ll quickly show you how it  
was modified. Now the Board said that they wished to adopt an  
independent list and that makes an awful lot of sense. But, in fact,  
the list that they adopted was very severely modified.

We look at the two regional structures. This was the breakdown  
according to ICANN, and it is essentially the current breakdown  
still. And the one in green underneath is the breakdown according  
to the U.N. Statistics Division and the two are supposed to be the  
same but are they?

We start with U.N. Statistics - you can see that it, too, has got five  
regions and the Americas can be split up by them in two different  
ways. One option is to split it into Latin America and Caribbean  
and Northern America; or the alternative is just to talk about the  
Americas, and then talk about South American and North America.

Now the first thing that ICANN did was they deleted Australia and  
New Zealand right from the onset, which seemed like a good idea

and they moved it into Asia and it became Asia/Pacific, where there's a completely different number of countries in it.

Next step was – let's get rid of the Americas as well, which only seems fair. And they took the Northern American section and moved that up to a region on its own. Then they took Latin American/Caribbean and moved that up. So we're back to five regions, but they're quite different regions from U.N. Statistics.

And then there are whole lot of countries that ICANN recognizes that U.N. Statistics doesn't recognize. Plus, ICANN decided that all overseas territories should be added to the region of their parent country. So, for example, and this is how I started in all this, Cayman Islands, which is my country, was allocated to the European region, which didn't seem to make a lot of sense to me.

However, if you do those changes, Latin America goes from 46 countries to 33; Africa goes to 54; Asia/Pacific to 73; Europe to 75 because it gains all its overseas territories; North America goes to eight because we bring in American Samoa and a couple of other places. And this, then, is the world according to ICANN.

Now remember, the world according to ICANN and the world according to U.N. Statistics is supposedly the same - doesn't look like it to me. And, in fact, if you include the uplifting of Latin America and North America, 40% of all the countries are in different regions than they're allocated to by the U.N. Statistics.

But even if you don't count those, 17% of the countries are in different regions. So one has got to ask the question – did ICANN go along with an independent list or did they create their own list? And I suppose you could also ask the question – and does it matter? And that's sort of where we are.

Looking at another issue, it said we need to be flexible. And this was a big point from the green paper and the white paper and indeed, discussions between ICANN and the U.S. Department of Commerce – that the Board composition should reflect the make-up of the internet and it should be flexible enough to change as the internet changed. Did this happen?

Well, have a look at some of the statistics here. You may not see them all that clearly on there but I've got some pie charts that will bring it out a bit better. And what I've done here is look at the number of internet users back in December, 2000, and then the most recent data that I've got which, in fact, now, because it's an old slide, is about a year old.

Easier to look at here in this pie chart. Back in 2000, roughly even split between North America which is sort of the mauve color; Europe which is the green; Asia/Pacific which is the “reddy” color.

We now move on to the percentage in 2009. And you will see that North America and Europe - much, much, much smaller percentage than it was back in 2000, and, of course, Asia/Pacific

growing tremendously; Africa now making a good presence. But even more interesting is if we look at this chart where the red color down the bottom shows the actual number of internet users at the moment; whereas the green column shows the actual population. In other words, the potential number of internet users.

What you can see from this is that North America, in particular, is just about reaching its maximum capacity; it's not going to grow that much more. Even Europe is about half-way there. But even if everybody in Europe went online, it's still not going to reach the present number of users in Asia/Pacific. And look at the potential in Asia/Australia/Pacific – huge. Same in Africa – big change possible.

So the question here is did even the original Board actually represent the make-up of the internet? Does it now because, of course, we haven't changed anything in the regions, although we supposedly had that flexibility. Nothing, in fact, has changed between 2000 and 2009 or even 2010. Question – what should we do about it?

Just looking at this one slide there must be a good case for increasing the number of regions or splitting the Asia/Pacific/Australia. Now, I'm not suggesting for a moment that number of internet users is the only measure. You could look at servers; you could look at all sorts of things, but the trend is there

and that's all I'm getting at. I don't want to argue about decimal points or whatever.

Quick word about the original goals – geographic diversity, which reflects the geographical diversity of the internet which is flexible enough to continue to reflect the make-up of the internet. And my comments would be, okay, happy with the geographic diversity bit; don't think it really reflects the geographic make-up of the internet now. We haven't seen any flexibility at all. We froze the situation back in 2000.

The structure is, I would say, ICANN-specific. While it was an authoritative list that was sought, GAC came up with this phrase of we recommend we should use international norms – and I'm going to look at international norms in a moment – but I don't think it complies with international norms because however you look at it, the regions don't correspond to anybody else's definition of regions or continents or anything. And just out of interest and it's just a small legal point - the deviations were never actually approved by the Board in any resolution.

Looking at this international norms, we tried to find some of those that could be used. UNDP uses Africa, the Arab states, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, Latin American/Caribbean. So that's one option.

U.N. Economic and Social Council uses – and I’m not going to read them, but you can see they’re different. The ITU uses, or at least a part of the ITU does; a different bit of the ITU uses a different grouping, and another and another. That’s just within one organization.

Some questions, then, and then we can start chatting about some of these. “Are ICANN’s geographic regions consistent with international norms?” I don’t think they are, particularly. I mean, another thought, and this is where we can start talking about it – in many organizations, like the U.N., you have groupings that are dynamic. Some lost for some time, for example, commonwealth countries, U.K. ex-commonwealth countries, are a grouping that exist and lobby as an entity. You have others like the small island states that tend to exist for some time.

On the other hand you get groupings that come together to deal with a particular shared interest, and once that has been dealt with, it disappears. And that is more the international norm than fixed regions.

Do the present ICANN geographic regions enhance or detract from ICANN’s goal of reflecting functional, geographical and cultural diversity? Remember cultural got added in when ICANN set out its core values. It said that cultural diversity was important, as well as geographic diversity. But nothing was done to implement that.

The regions weren't changed; there was no new mechanism brought in.

So how were we achieving that cultural diversity? In fact, some of the things that happen at the moment actually work against cultural diversity because where you have dependent territories aligned with the region of their home country, you end up with a silly situation where you could have a member on council from Jamaica because that would be from Latin American/Caribbean and you could also have one from the Cayman Islands which is right next door; same basic culture, but the Cayman Islands is from Europe, so you're actually not helping your cultural diversity the way it's set up at the moment.

I'm not going to go through these particularly. These are the sort of questions that we are looking at. The thing in brackets are the organization that raised the question. So I will leave these up and I will now try and throw this open a little bit more. One of the things I touched on – and here I've got to put down my caveat.

We are wanting to talk about things that will be in the final report – the recommendations. We're at the beginning of that work so anything that I say is probably just being a straw man, putting things up for the sake of discussion. They're not conclusions that the Working Group has reached. But let's take one which is perhaps simple and straightforward on the face of it.



Increasing the number of regions – I mentioned that the Asia/Australia/Pacific region is geographically huge; it is numerically huge. On the face of it, it would seem logical to split that into two regions, two or more regions.

The consequences of creating additional regions within ICANN are not just its change; it would also have significant financial impact, both on ICANN core and particularly in ALAC. Any thoughts, any feedback from... I see there's Australia/New Zealand wishing to make a comment. We've got a mic at the front.

Keith Davidson:

Dave, thanks for that outline. My name's Keith Davidson and I'm the Chair of the Asia/Pacific Top Level Domain Association which has 36 of the 72 Asia/Pacific located countries as members currently.

Just some reflections. Firstly, I think, some of the influences on the way that the geographic regions were established initially were due to the fact that there were two regional TLD organizations in existence, and their boundaries warranted respect for some reason and I think that's diminished a little.

One of the issues about dividing the massive Asia/Pacific region is that when you start to look at methodologies of division, you can get into culture and language issues where you could upset other apple carts. For example, the Middle East scene is quite a distinct region, but the North African states that share the language

probably feel that they would belong more together with that smaller sub-region, so you may be creating more problems than it's worth.

So, to me the issues are what are we seeking to do? One is the issue of representation and the methodology by which the regions appoint or are appropriately represented in the hierarchy of ICANN. And the other is that there's a whole lot of issues that affect the world differently.

For example, New Zealand is part of Asia/Pacific region, but our law is largely based on English law, and so we have far more commonality with Europe in the legal and regulatory sense than we do with, say, Communist China, which is part of our region. So, our ability to share resources sometimes is in Europe, but quite often is also in Asia/Pacific.

So there's two separate issues. One's the representation methodology within ICANN and the second is how to not even think about regions but think about issues and where you have commonality of issues.

David Archbold:

Yeah, I'm strictly agreed. I think the only place where you have a formal requirement is in the representational issues and it's difficult to get away from that. I was trying to get the concept of perhaps having two organizational structures—one formal, which is necessary for the representational things, and a less formal one that

allows, for example, the Arab states to have a special interest group that can lobby for things of common interest without it being necessarily a formal regional structure.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you. What are the international norms? I don't know there is not. You have said that the UNDP regional division is different from the ITU one, different from the U.N. one. I remember when we were into our Summit on the Information Society, the Civil Society had another regional division. They put, for example, not America with Europe, so there is not norms.

What we need, I think what is the interest of making more regions in ICANN? I don't think that that is a real interest, but we have to think about the regional division; we have to think about this creation of internet in those regions. Geographic division, but with this creation of the internet, the internet users, the industry of TLDs, etc. So if we can, if we try to do that, perhaps we will have another division, which is not very far from the division, the actual division, but which will be, perhaps, more useful for ICANN.  
Tijani Ben Jemaa from ALAC.

Eric Brunner-Williams:

Thank you, Dave. Eric Brunner-Williams, also from ALAC, from the North American region. I had some questions as I saw the first slides. One is that the slides about market penetration offer us guidance on how we should spent outreach money. I would say that we really don't need to spend outreach money in North

America, my region; we do need to spend outreach money in Asia/Pacific.

So if we're trying to reach users who have not yet gotten the internet, not yet gotten into the system, the spending in North America wouldn't really have much return on our investment. Spending the same money doing outreach in Asia/Pacific and Africa would have a tremendously different return on investment.

So, there is guidance to ICANN marketing or to generally our message expense from this information. Also from those slides, I'd be curious to know what choices are available and what their outcomes are for the divisions of Asia/Pacific.

So, for instance, if the Australia/New Zealand, when split off, does their penetration resemble more like that of North America and Europe – in which case we have the same information about spending money doing outreach into those markets that it wouldn't be a good return on investment, at least not as good as spending the same dollars in Africa and the rest of Asia and the Pacific. So those were sort of technical questions arising from the presentation of data that I have.

Now let me make a personal observation. I've been used to this for the last 10 years. There never will be a North American/Indian in any position which is appointed to the ICANN structure through ICANN's procedural mechanisms. These will always be taken by

persons associated with European expansion into the Americas. The same is true for Latin America as well - there will never be an Indian appointed to the ICANN structure from any part of the Americas, and probably the same applies to Aborigines and to Maoris and from Australia/Pacific and this is a fact of life.

However we pursue diversity, we're not going to have those outcomes with the regime that we have. I'm not saying that they're necessarily good outcomes; we just should be clear about what can't happen.

Now, about how we split up the world – we have several choices, as you pointed out; two that you haven't pointed out. One was referred to by the head of the Asia/Pacific TLD Organization, which is the legal culture, that is similarity of legal cultures being an organizing principle.

The other one that comes to me because I'm kind of a tech weenie, is the Network Operator Group Locality of Interest. So we have the North American Operators Group; we have RIPE; we have the Middle East Operators Group; we have the A/P Network Operators Group. These are localities of service providers who provide the access network and the transit network for ultimate users of the DNS, our users. So that's another possible dividing principle is basically through the nexus of wire bundling. Thank you very much.

David Archbold: I don't disagree with anything that you've said. Certainly we haven't done the in-depth analysis as yet about the consequences of splitting Asia/Pacific, if that's something that we wanted to follow, so I can't answer your question but I think you're right. Penetration, I'm sure, within Australia/New Zealand is pretty much on a par with North America, would be my guess but we haven't done the research.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, one second. My name is Olga Cavalli. I'm from GNSO and from Argentina. I'm curious about your idea that only European/Latin Americans can be part of ICANN or representing the region. I think we have showed some changes in the region recently. We have presidents that are not necessarily Europeans and this is changing. I know it's a challenge but I think it's changing, slowly but surely. Thank you.

Khaled Fouda: Thank you. My name is Khaled Fouda and I'm from the League of Arab States and actually I believe those couple of questions that you have made in your presentation are very valid and issues that need quite a lot of work to resolve. Recently the ICANN Board has added six regions to the Draft Application Guidebook for new gTLDs of which the Arab States is one of those regions. And I have maybe two questions here.

No. 1 – Unlike the U.N. list, those six regions do not have sort of a short term or abbreviation or “commonly known as”. So, Arab States is too long for us to use or to apply for a geographic gTLD

and I believe that goes also for Asia/Pacific or South America/Caribbean. They're all very long terms that cannot be used in the domain name. So is there any way that we can sort of try to find a mechanism where we can relate a short term or a "commonly known as" term for those six regions like the U.N. list?

And No. 2 – The Board resolution actually applies those regions only for the new gTLD applications, okay? But as you just said, the Arab region is sort of a defined region with 22 member states that share the same language, the same culture, the same models and many things, actually. So is there also a way where we can work on defining the Arab region as part of the ICANN region in general, and not only just for new gTLDs? Thank you.

David Archbold:

Certainly, I mean there has been actually there has been a formal request from – I'm afraid I can't remember the title – but the organization of Arab States to ICANN to question the creation of a region.

Keith Davidson:

Dave, just a couple of comments and then I have to run to another meeting. I think, looking at the existing regional structures that exist in ITU and U.N. and so on is probably list productive because I don't think you can find another model which will fit, so this is a bottom-out process of finding what suits within ICANN solely. So my suggestion in that instance is that you start again with ignoring any existing structure, including the existing ICANN structure.

David Archbold: You realize that means ignoring GAC.

Keith Davidson: You say that like that's a bad thing. Oh, and I should add for the record – my name's Keith Davidson and I'm the Chair of APTLD and I represent Dot NZ as well. The other thing is an interesting matrix that may put a different slant on things rather than looking at the number of country codes would be the number of registrants or domain names within the regions to give some sort of balance of representation in that regard as well. Not saying you should choose one or the other, but in terms of balance currently.

And just a final point that APTLD has struggled as the largest populated region and the largest geographic region. We've struggled within our membership regarding whether we should split our region into three for our own purposes or things like that.

And so far the voice of the membership in that region, which is almost exclusively CCTLDs, has been to retain the unified large region, and that we actually, because of our diversity and the challenges that our diversity has, adds richness and texture to what we do, so that's a clear message from our region that if other people are suggesting that it should be split. So 36 of the 72 CCTLDs who are members prefer APTLD to remain the unified CCTLD organization for the region, and that would logically flow through to those Asia/Pacific registries operating in the ICANN environment. Thanks, Dave.



David Archbold:                      Okay. Thanks.

Jon Lawrence:                      Thanks. Jon Lawrence is my name. I'm from AusRegistry International where a registry service is provided based in Australia. We are associate members of two regional organizations and soon to be three, so this is something that we have some visibility on from a kind of external perspective. I've got a concern that starting to split regions up is something of a can of worms and a very difficult thing to get right and I would suspect you'd probably end up with just as many problems as you have at the moment.

But one point I wanted to make is that I think there is definitely scope for informal groupings and I think this has sort of been touched on already. But an example of this is a conference that's now been going on for three years which is run by the Russian Registry which, for want of any better terms, essentially incorporates the former Soviet Union and the former Warsaw Pact countries, and has many of those particularly, I think, in central Asia are not particularly involved in either the APTLD or the ICANN structure, so I think that gives them an opportunity to get together and I think that's really important.

And I think we would certainly encourage regions like the Arab States to start developing their own sort of informal conferences on an annual basis. And I think that potentially provides kind of a

bottom-up approach, and if these things are viable and start to make sense, then perhaps in time they can be looked at as potential sort of proto-regions or whatever they might become. Thanks.

David Archbold:

Thanks. I mean, very much a personal view and I'm not speaking for the Working Group at all here, as I think I've said before, the formal structure of regions is needed for particularly in some SO's for representational or election purposes.

Aside from that, my own view is, I'm not sure that there's any particular need for there to be formal regions, and it should be up to the members to group together as best suits them within their particular constituencies. But you just can't do that entirely because there are the few sort of official, formal structures that need to be there.

Mike Roberts:

Yes, I'm Mike Roberts and I just wanted to make a comment from the perspective of the NomCom which I'm on this year. The NomCom's responsible for selecting Directors for eight seats, and one of the great challenges that we face is when you take heart of the goal of being diverse and yet you have to deal with single digit numbers of seats, you have a very formidable task. And one of the things that we have to push back against is the notion that somehow or other that the current, as you point out, arbitrary division that ICANN has adopted creates a sense of entitlement.

And to give you a concrete example, this year we will select one individual from North American which, of course, is about somewhere between 4-5 hundred million people and a fairly, as you point out, a fairly deep penetration of the internet. And so the notion that one person could represent the diversity of that big chunk of geography and culture and language and economies just doesn't really compute.

And there are similar examples, I think, all around the globe, so I'm very pleased with the progress that you've made. I guess the notion is we ought to try to turn down the volume on the notion that the regions have representational value that borders on entitlement because that leads us to a place where we really don't want to be.

David Archbold:

I'm not sure that you will ever convince the world at large that there isn't an entitlement, no matter what you do. I think that's fact of life. Anymore questions, comments? I will throw in another issue. Is there any need for there to be a standardized set of regions throughout ICANN?

I mean, if you look already, we have various regional structures because the RIRs have one, which in fact, of course they are slightly outside ICANN anyway in some respects. The At Large has one; ICANN's own Regional Liaison Offices based on quite different functional breakdowns which make eminent sense. So is there a need for a standardized set of regions?

Mike Blade:

Mike Blade, just following up on some of the comments of Mike Roberts. I'm serving with Mike as well on the Nominating Committee this year, and one of the requirements hard-coded in the bylaws of ICANN is that there has to be at least one Director from each of the regions serving on the Board. And that's one of the reasons why the Nominating Committee does its selections after the SO's do their elections.

So one of the safeguards after the Evolution and Reform Process back in 2003 was to allow the SO's to do their election, and then the NomCom was designed to fill in gaps for those regions that would not have representations. So I'm just raising that as an issue as far as consistency.

Whenever you define it as a region recognized in the bylaws, that then has implications as far as representation on the Board which carries over to the NomCom, as well as obviously within the GNSO Council and CCNSO Councils regarding the number of representatives from each specific region.

David Archbold:

Yeah, but, in fact, the Board, by bringing in NomCom, that works quite well. It avoids the issue that CCNSO has, for example, where the actual electoral constituency is the region which is different from the Board, you fill in and get the regional diversity after everybody else has been appointed. You don't have the problem... CCNSO has the issue of the regions actually define

which region you vote for, if you see what I mean. So it's an electoral college, the region, which becomes far more important which region you are in when that region forms electoral college.

Mike Blade:

I'm not disagreeing with that statement and I think one of the issues that we had on NomCom was this year with the Director, Cherine Chalaby, who has dual citizenship, in that situation with both Egypt and the U.K. So for the NomCom, that was convenient because we were kind of able to increase diversity with sort of a unique, shall we say, qualification. But that was the first Director that has ever served on the ICANN Board from the Middle East.

So it's one of the challenges and, as I said, it's not easy and, as I said, Mike and myself and others and anyone else who has ever served on a NomCom, it is a very difficult task that we do in trying to insure that diversity and representation within the ICANN leadership structure, not only on the Board, but also on the SO and ALAC.

David Archbold:

Interestingly, of course, NomCom did change its bylaws fairly recently so that you could take into account – let me think now, it wasn't just citizenship but also residency. Similarly the GNSO, as part of its reorganization, actually subtly changed the diversity requirements and included words “as far as is possible,” which weren't there before.

So a number of constituencies have, I think quite sensibly, relaxed a little bit the diversity requirements in the light of practical experience. Other SO's have not done that yet, but perhaps that's the way to go so that you do relax it so that common sense comes into play.

Olga Cavalli:

This is Olga Cavalli. From the perspective of the GNSO it's quite challenging because as you know, we have two houses – contracted/non-contracted one and we have for the (inaudible 0:45:23) constituencies now we have stakeholder groups. But they are organized in relation with their function, not with regions.

Although they try to have representation from different regions, as you know, some regions of the world are more developed and have more registrars/registries, so it's easy to find those representatives from Europe or the United States, but it's very challenging to find them from Latin America and other regions of the world.

So what we are doing now is we have worked in one of our Working Teams of the GNSO Restructuring Process an outreach document that is in the revision process and the idea is to work with all the activities that ICANN is doing to reinforce the diversity of the GNSO. Thank you.

Rob Hogarth:

Hi, this is Rob Hogarth from ICANN staff. I'm in the Chat Room and I wanted to pass on a question/comment/statement by Roland. He wants to know – “I wonder what the population is for the 40%

of countries that differ from U.N. My feeling is that many islands are often uninhabited.”

David Archbold: I don’t think many... not many of them are uninhabited. Granted, in some cases the population is relatively small, but that 40% included the whole uplifting of Latin America and North America, so the population there is quite large.

Rob Hogarth: While I have the microphone, I just wanted to note that I still have a few memory sticks here that if anyone is interested, the Working Group has produced the stick with copies of their existing Interim Report, as well as Dave’s presentation, so I’d like to share that with folks here. Thank you.

Dave Archbold: Okay, the floor is still open. Any other helpful thoughts for us to take into account? No?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I’m sorry. This is Eric Brunner-Williams again from North American At Large Regional Organization. The question I should have asked – my very first and I guess it’s now my last – is how to assist the work of...

Dave Archbold: Well, obviously we would be delighted if you can give some response back to the second report, which is the one that is out for public consultation. It is open for consultation until the 31<sup>st</sup> of January. It was put out in November and there’s a link to it from ICANN site, obviously. Thereafter, we will be putting out...

Male: Dave, get a bit closer to the microphone please.

Dave Archbold: Thanks. We'll then be working on the final report which will have recommendations to the Board, and we will put that out as early as we can for public consultation and again, we would very much like, obviously, feedback from all the communities on that.

This is not something we are seeking to impose in any size, shape or form. We're wanting to get a conclusion that is better for ICANN and it will insure the flexibility that it was designed to be in the first instance but never happened - to help with outreach, to help with participation and that's the motivation behind it. No more, no less.

Okay, well if there are no further questions, I will draw the session to a close with... Ah...

Male: Perhaps you could share with the group what your timetable or thoughts are in terms of next steps and where things would go from here.

Dave Archbold: Well, you can because you've probably got it in front of you and I don't.

Male: Just from a very general sense, cause we know how challenging the timetable has been for this group, and I think I could certainly



echo some of the sentiments of the Working Group members to be delighted at the turnout of this event. It certainly greatly exceeded expectations, given the attendance at past Working Group events, and it may reflect the fact that the Working Group is beginning to narrow its focus. You know the initial report was much more research-oriented and now it's much more what do we do with that.

At the end of January we'll conclude the public comment forum, taking into account the comments here today, as well as the written comments. Then the Working Group is really going to embark on the major tough task of coming up with potential recommendations. And so I would expect that we'd have a similar session like this in San Francisco.

I don't know if the Working Group members feel like you'll have a draft document by that time period or not, but this is really an issue that's ramping up and I think it will be extremely important for all of you to encourage others to pay attention and participate.

Ultimately what will happen is any recommendations produced by this group, there will be subsequent public comment periods, discussions with the Board and the rest, but this is a community-wide Working Group. Representatives on the team are from all the different Advisory Committees and supporting organizations, so I think they hope they're going to have a very broad input into this process.

Dave Archbold:

Just to pick up on your point about timing of the next draft – I hope that we will have a very early draft out before San Francisco because I think that actually helps people formulate their ideas and to give feedback rather than doing something in the abstract. So even if it is a very early draft, I would like to get that out in time before the next meeting. And ask the Working Group about that now.

Alright, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for your participation. Very grateful for all your input. We will take it all under advisement and look forward to seeing your responses to public consultations and hopefully at a meeting next year. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]