MARRAKECH – GAC Meeting on Two Character Codes Implementation
Wednesday, March 09, 2016 – 14:00 to 14:30 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you, everybody, for reconvening. We have a few items left on our agenda that we are trying to work through this afternoon. There's one substantive item before we probably will make a break to prepare the draft of the communique, and then reconvene at something like 3:00, or whatever, to go through it in a first reading.

So the issue that we are looking at now is -- I think it's slot number 22, if I'm correct. It's about the two-character codes on the second level, about the implementation of this. This is also an issue where we have had recurrent communication between the ICANN and the GAC with a number of pieces of advice.

You have a briefing in your -- in your papers, in your briefing papers, that is fairly comprehensive. So maybe I start with giving the floor to Gema to introduce this, and then have a discussion that hopefully leads us to a better understanding on some outstanding issues on this one.

Thank you.

Gema.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon.

If you remember our advice in Dublin, that was not the first time in which we addressed the use of two-character names under the new gTLDs. But just to set the scene, I will recall very briefly the advice that we gave in Dublin October last year.

We said that the actions of ICANN in the implementation of specification 5 of the Registry Agreement had not been consistent with previous GAC advice. And then we requested the Board to solve technical issues so that it could be easier for governments to find their objections. And we also recalled that all comments made by governments, regardless of the grounds, should be fully taken into account.

After Dublin, the novelties will this issue is that first we have a seminar or a Webinar -- I don't remember whether there were two, according to different zones, or just one -- by ICANN staff to inform GAC members about the Web form and the new processes they have to use in order to file their objections. And technical issues I think were more or less resolved, and now the work form is certainly easier to use. And this is one novelty. So the Webinar and the new Web form that has been streamlined.

EN

The second novelty is that you may have received, if you are the contact persons for notifications of new request being published on the GAC Web site, ICANN has initiated in the next phase in this process, and it has requested registry operators who manages labels or TLDs that have received comments by governments to present mitigation plans as to address and allay those concerns expressed by governments.

They are given a 60-day period to express the mitigation plans. So by the 25th of April, those mitigation plans should be put forward to ICANN.

Then they will take mitigation plans and governments' comments into account to formulate the criteria to assess governments' concerns, and they will put those criteria to public comment in order to make a final decision on how to deal with comments received. That will be further in the year.

On -- I don't remember quite well if it's in the same email notification or in a separate one, they let us know that there are eight labels, eight two characters, belonging, I guess, to eight countries that have already been -- whose comments have already been rejected because they didn't relate to the confusion, possible confusion with the country or territory name.

And the third novelty I wanted to share with you, it's that recently we received a communication by the Board addressing GAC advice issued in Dublin, and it includes response to our advice on this issue.

The Board states that governments' comments have been fully taken into account, but in the understanding that they relate to the confusion criteria. They very clearly state that they don't accept GAC advice to consider governments' comments when they do not relate to confusion, because this is the standard that is established on specification 5 of the Registry Agreement, and more concretely or more precisely on the second part or second procedure that has been followed in order to authorize the release of the two-character names.

So these are the three main issues after the Dublin communique: the Webinar on technical issues, the initiation of the next phase in the release of two-character names, the fact that eight -- comments pertaining to eight labels have already been rejected. We have a response on Dublin GAC communique stating that they don't accept GAC advice as regards the grounds or the basis for comments whenever they are not related to confusion, but on all other -- on all other situations, they fully consider governments' comments.

So now -- This is the situation we have now. This is up for debate, I warn you. And I go over back to our chair to continue the conversation.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

As we have Namibia, which is one of the cases where that was not followed, as they have not indicated, if I am rightly informed, not made a (indiscernible) reference to the string confusion. Maybe, Henri, you could just quickly report on your situation so we understand the concrete case of where this happened.

So if you could quickly report about your situation in Namibia with regard to this issue.

Thank you.

NAMIBIA: Thank you, Thomas. Yeah, I just raised the -- I just wanted to raise, you know, the concern that we now have after the rejection of our objections.

I have been -- I am now asked to justify why this happened based on the promises that was made, although it now appears that in the fine print of the agreement, the Registry Agreement and then other processes followed, there seem to be a

justification from the -- from the ICANN side to now reject on the basis of the confusion criteria.

I find now it very difficult to explain and to motivate further what we need to do since we still hold strong views that our advice or our objection based on the Registry Agreement and the general understanding should have been -- should have provided for a process where the registries or applicants could have engaged and the government through the GAC representative on the issues, on the objections, so there can be clarifications, perhaps, and to avoid further misunderstanding. But that has not now been -- it has not been provided.

We are now at a point where we're asking whether there are any possibilities there now, after this rejection, whether there's possibilities to perhaps look at the objections and maybe enter into a discussion to amplify the same, because we are of the view that objections have impliedly sort of -- have impliedly indicated some confuse, but not expressly. And apparently that is what is needed. It needs to be expressly stated that there is this confusion from the countries in terms of the objections.

So we would want to get more information on the way forward what can be done now, in terms of maybe further clarification, further consultations, or then any process of appeal because this

is one government that we are dealing with now, but I suppose there may be many others.

Of course we are eight specifically that is referred to and that is mentioned, so perhaps this decision and the colleagues can give us more background and more clarification in terms of what the way forward now would be.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.

And as you have noted, we have Cyrus, who graciously had the time to come here and to look into this with us.

So maybe, if you may, I could give you the floor so that you can explain from the ICANN side how you proceeded and maybe also see whether there will be a solution for those cases where apparently there seem to have been some misunderstandings about the proceedings or about the rationale for an objection of the government to the release and then maybe help us find a solution for these cases that seem to be problematic.

So thank you for sharing your thoughts and working methods with us, Cyrus. Thank you very much.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Distinguished GAC members, my name is Cyrus Namazi. I'm a member of ICANN's global domains division. Part of my responsibility has to do with the handling of this process for release of two-character codes. I appreciate the opportunity to be here to help address any questions, any comments, and to better understand some of the issues and concerns that have been raised along the way.

To give you a bit of a background on this whole process, there are two facts to keep in mind. One is, barring any specific direction from the board, the language in the Registry Agreement is the prevailing sort of guideline for the staff to proceed. In particular, the release of two-character labels are addressed in specification five of the Registry Agreement.

We have been in frequent communications with representatives from the GAC, Gema and others, in regards to what our understanding and what our approach was going to be. And to that end, in August of last year, we published a process that we intended to follow toward the processing of the requests by the registries to release the particular two-character codes that they wanted to have released.

Since they be there has been communique from the responses from the board, none of which has resulted into a major alteration of the course of action that we set out to do.

As Gema mentioned, we also, in addition to the emails and updates that we provided on our website, we provided two webinars to accommodate the different time zones for various government representatives.

We had fairly reasonable participation in them, explaining the process that needed to be followed.

We also intentionally set the bar fairly low for governments to object to the immediate release of the corresponding country code in two-letter codes, which really had to do with confusion with their specific country code.

And we did that so that there will be a meaningful and substantive dialogue taking place between the registries who actually wish to use those two-letter codes, ICANN, the community, as well as, of course, the corresponding country toward a meaningful resolution.

To that end, the first phase of that process closed o 5 December, if I recall correctly, in 2015, after which we collected and processed all the comments that we received. A total of 48, I

believe, or some -- about that. I don't remember the exact number, but about 50 of them.

And after processing and analyzing all the comments that we received, as was mentioned earlier by Gema, a substantial number of those met that lower bar of criteria for confusability against the corresponding country code. And I underline "corresponding" because, again, that's driven by the language from the Registry Agreement, specification five. And eight of which did not meet that criteria.

Now, I want to highlight that by not having met the confusability criteria, that does not mean this we did not take them into consideration. We actually pointed those eight two-character labels to appropriate courses of action, namely being perhaps if there was issues and concerns with spamming and things like that to the registries' point of -- use point of contact and so on.

So we are, as indicated again earlier, now in the phase that the registry operators have 60 days from -- I don't know the exact start date, but until 24th of April to essentially come back and propose measures to mitigate confusion.

And that's the process that we're in. We've had good feedback from some of the colleagues in the GAC, in terms of making the web-based tool that we have for this particular process, improve

it -- provide improvements for it. We thank you for that. But essentially that's where we are.

Those eight two-character labels that did not meet the confusability criteria are on track to be released at a near future date.

So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Cyrus, for explaining this to us. And it shows that you have undertaken a lot to try and find a suitable solution.

I think the floor is open now for questions or comments to Cyrus or to the GAC -- the members of the GAC.

Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, chairman. Thank you, Mr. Namazi. Thank you, Gema.

This is question we raised before. The answer was given was not convincing. From the moment that the request comes, if the government in question does not react, is the non-reaction means tacit agreement or we need explicit reply from that government?

This is the point that maybe some of the colleagues may not be concerned, but many developing countries may be concerned. That is the question we have raised and we would like to reaffirm again that this is very important, that whether we have a specific reply or non-reply or lack of reply or absence of reply means tacit agreement, that means no comment.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Cyrus, please.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you for that question. The short answer to that question is that, yes, you have to explicitly actually object to the release of the request for release of the two-character code that pertained to your country code. And of course the objection needs to meet the criteria for confusability with, for instance, in this case, Iran's country code.

IRAN: If you do not reply, what happens? That is my question. Cyrus Namazi Cyrus Namazi if you do not reply, the country code will be released.

IRAN: We have serious problem with that.   Nonreply means agreement? We have problem with this tacit agreement. Not only here. Many, many other areas, this issue has compromised the very interests of many countries who do not have manpower, resources, due to many other issues, element, changes in the organization, changes in the responsibility of the people, ministry to other ministry, one office to the other office. And missed point, and that seems something to be worked out, and we need either to use ICANN to intervene by source of the contact with the contact person, by the reminder contact person, so on, so forth. But this immediately no reply after deadline means agreement it is something that we are not comfortable.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. Well, it is true that the GAC has expressed earlier its disappointment, if I may say so, that the process has not been set up or had not been set up in a way that it's actually making life as easy as possible for governments. It has, rather, been set up in a way that is easier for the registries.

We've had -- we've had that discussion before, and there has been some exchange of views. And so this process has been set up the way it has been set up. We took note of this with some disappointment already some time ago.

However, I have to say that -- and there is something that sometimes there is a confusion that for a similar process with regard to the potential release of country names, not the country code but country names, which is also in specification 5 of the contract, there it was done the other way around, or at least the GAC clearly, after this experience with the country codes, expressed the expectation that it is done the other way around. And as you may recall, we have collected a list -- we have invited -- In order to facilitate this for ICANN and for the registries, we have invited all GAC members to express their views on releasing their names for all TLDs or, as an alternative, only for brand TLDs but not for other ones. And those that did not reply to that -- there was a fairly good rate of answers that we got from GAC members, and actually the list was -- the urge was sent not only to GAC members but to all the governments, including those who are not members of the GAC. And we then handed over that list to ICANN, made this list public, in order to do things better together with ICANN on the country names. There is the very clear expectation that if there's no answer, the default is no release. But the other process was before, and

there it happened already. There was no way for us to influence this anymore.

Cyrus, do you want to implement on this?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes. Just to come back to a question from the gentleman from Iran.

The process is set up to really not make it easier for the registry operator or for the ICANN staff. I mean, we can debate, perhaps, whether there could have been a better way to do it, but just to summarize the process that we expect to follow, the governments get up to 60 days to essentially communicate their objection to ICANN. There are various ways to stay informed. You can subscribe to an email so that if a request comes in, you are emailed and are kept notified. There is a Web site, of course, that all of these requests are summarized in it. And, quite frankly, like I was mentioning earlier, the bar for objection from our perspective is set very low. All a government needs to do is come back and say, "I object because it is confusing against my country code."

I don't think that is a huge burden that requires, you know, many staffs in the government to go back and -- I don't know -- to work on it. It's a fairly simple bar to get to. And if a country, in

general, has an issue with it, all you need to do is to subscribe to the email. You have up to 60 days to get back to us, and then you get into the right process presumably.

I hope that helps.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I don't -- Palestine and then Spain. Thank you.

PALESTINE: Please, I prefer to talk in Arabic.

At the beginning, I apologize. My questions might be late because I have just recently joined the GAC.

My question is to ICANN. I'd that the two-character domain is very confusing for the DNS industry because it is like a problem for the registries and registrants because of the huge number of the delegated domains in the last year.

Here we are discussing the domains of two characters, and this is a further burden on all top-level domains and also on the ccTLDs.

This is -- My questions might -- seems to be a late one, but I just came, and I would like to have an answer for that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you for that question. I think to clarify, the issue here that we're discussing is about the release of two-character codes at second level, whereas, of course, a country ccTLD operates at a top level. So I'm not sure if I understand your question. Does it relate to the top level or the second level? But at the second level, I'm not sure if it creates that level of burden on a particular country code operator. If I misunderstood your question, please let me know.

SPAIN: Thank you. I would like to ask several questions of diverse nature each.

On the eight labels that have been already dealt with, due to lack of reasoning about the relationship of the objection to the possible confusability with the name of the country, and given that they are on track for the release but they have not been released yet, could there be any option other than use and the abuse at that point or appeal mechanisms within ICANN for these countries to provide reasoning that makes that confusability, explicit? Because I think that in the end, all

grounds have linkage and are founded on the potential confusion with the name of the country. That is one question.

The second concerns a technical issue. I acknowledge that the Web form on the process have been considerably improved, so much that I dare to suggest that if it could be possible for a country to issue a one-off objection including the top-level domains that have not yet requested the release. But the number of them and the identity of each of them, it's known. I think it could be fairly easy from a technical point of view to include them in the list. So that's -- You can make the objection once and forget about the requests that are coming in on a continuous basis.

Third question is related to mitigation plans and the criteria that ICANN Board could draw up subsequently.

Several -- a great number, I could say, of objections requested ICANN or the registry operators to consult with the government before registering the name. I would very much like that ICANN takes that into account as a possible measure since the will of many governments is not to block or oppose to the use of two-character name but to kind of have the -- be reassured that it is not going to be used in a way that is harmful for the country or confusing for users.

And my last question relates to the possible use of this procedure that has been set up by ICANN for the release of country names under the second level. We know that requests for the release of their use have been -- have been coming in. As far as I know, there is still a hold. We issued that, delivered that table that the Chair referred to but there is no -- I'm not clear about the process that is going to be followed. And I wonder if this process that's been put in practice for two-character names is going to be used or have an influence on the subsequent procedure for country names for which specification 5 of the Registry Agreement is not exactly worded or is not -- has not the same content as the one for two-character names?

Thank you so much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think we'll collect a few more and then give you a chance to respond to this all at once.

I have the Netherlands, and please, try to be short because --

NETHERLANDS: Yes, I will be short.

Just following the remarks from Iran and Palestine, I would just remind that we had the long discussion before this in the GAC

and the plenary, and there are also many countries who were urging not to be overprotective on the second level.

I would just recall that we have probably 240 or -50 legacy ccTLDs, generic release, in which the use of the second level is completely to their own procedures, probably in hundreds of them the code of countries are being used.

I would ask the delegation who have a strong reservation about this whether they have encountered problems in the last 20 years with this practice.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

And then I have WIPO.

WIPO: Yes, thank you. And apologies if I mentioned this earlier, but, Cyrus, you mentioned there would be criteria by which the confusability would be judging. I wonder if you can go into that a little bit now or if you can confirm that the rationale for that decision would be provided when you put this out for public comment.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: And then I have -- I think you're ECOWAS. Is that right? Or the gentleman in the back?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Chair. I'm Andreas Diamini from Swaziland.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Swaziland, thank you.

SWAZILAND: Yes, sir.

I'm wondering why this should depend on a government objecting? Why can't we just have a conventions that this is a top level, this is second level. At top level, you've got this list of names that you can use as gTLDs or ccTLDs, where -- that gTLDs or ccTLDs are not allowed. Second level, names or two characters for countries, that represent countries, are not allowed. That's just a convention. So that whoever wants to apply for it will just know that this one is out-of-bounds. Why should we rely on a government objecting?

Like Iran said earlier, the country might not be in a position to make the objection because they are not aware or they don't have the resources or whatever.

And, also, that's the -- the confusion, actually, I don't think it relates only to people of that particular country. I guess it does, even if you are in a -- in a third country, if you are not so much knowledgeable about the technicalities of the Internet. If you know that U.K. is for the United Kingdom and then you see .UK and dot some other country or some other ccTLD, can that cause confusion to the -- to the recipient that probably this is related to the U.K. government, when in actual effect it's just a domain name used -- a two-character used by some other person somewhere?

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

And the last one, Italy. Thank you.

ITALY: Thank you, chair. Thank you, Gema, for your recap and, Cyrus, for the explanation you provided.

Italy does not object to the delegation of our country code, the second domain, but would like to exercise the right to evaluate the delegation of IT as a second-level domain on a case-by-case basis. We are developing an international evaluation process

that takes into account not only the confusion risks, but also the national/international legal framework, GIPL and the opportunity consideration, for example, IT.sucks. Everyone here remembers the .wine issue. We would like the right to protect our geographical indication under IT.wine. For that reason, we think that ICANN and the registry should respect our position, respect our Italian country code second-level domain. For Italy, it is a very sensitive issue.

Furthermore, we would like to underline that this position has been agreed with the IT registry.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

So I know time is short, but maybe you can try to give some answers at least now on what we've heard. Thank you very much, Cyrus.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank everyone for all your good questions.

I will try to address as many of them as I can. And of course if we don't get to it, do feel free to reach out to us at any time and we'll be happy to engage with you off-line.

I'd like to begin my responses to you with two sort of fundamental thoughts perhaps for you to keep in mind as we progress in this conversation.

I'd like to echo what the Netherlands highlighted as a comment, in terms of the concerns that have been raised at least in the world of the new gTLD in using these two-letter codes at the second level. This is really not something new with all the what we call legacy TLDs, of which we have many, many. The two-letter codes have no restrictions on them. They are being used, and perhaps you should go look into the fact whether there is an insurmountable number of abuse cases that would lead to this level of concern by your respective governments in treating this issue at sort of the level that you're treating it.

And, number 2, this is a more difficult thing for me to perhaps communicate to you. We are not aware of any particular rights, international treaties, or such that actually sort of gives a government to object to the use of a -- two letters of the Latin alphabet at the second level. If you see something like that that we're not aware of, let us know, do let us know. But this is not

something that at least I'm aware of or at least on the ICANN side we've been made aware of.

So now let me quickly go back to the questions that you raised and see if I can answer as many of them as we can considering the short time line that we have.

So to answer Gema's questions about eight labels that have been notified that -- not to meet the objection criteria, there is no recourse, I'm afraid, to go back and be reinserted into the process. The deadline has passed, and I have no mechanism. We have no mechanism for reopening it for comments that did not meet the criteria.

Thank you for your compliment on the web form, Gema. The question that you asked was whether you can actually put one generic objection in for all future requests.

The answer is no, there's no so-called one size fits all for the requests having come in.

And the sort of logic behind that is because, well, we don't know what the requests are that are coming in. They actually may come in with a proposed mitigation measure already in the request, and we think they should be given due consideration as opposed to a blanket rejection.

You had asked whether ICANN will ask the registry operators to consult with the relevant government before they put the two-letter code into business.

We can certainly suggest that. I have no legal bounds by which I can make that request a legal request.

I do encourage the GAC members, government members, respective members here to participate in the public comment process that will follow the submission of the mitigation measures by registry operators. And, in fact, this is what we're trying to get to to answer the question that came from WIPO, in terms of the criteria that we used for assessing confusability.

There is some sort of basic understanding of what confusion means, but we want to engage with the community, with the respective governments, with the registry operators to come up with a common understanding and one approach that hopefully ultimately will fit this process.

There was a question from Gema not to use the same process hundred percent when we embark on the same process for country code.

Duly noted, Gema. Thank you.

I think we'll learn a lot of the learnings and the cores and the blocks of it that are applicable, but definitely make sure that it's

tailored to the specific process that the release of country and territory names requires.

I think you asked about why can't we have a convention for the release of these codes. I suppose we can. We looked at the communities to come up with these conventions, but at the moment the driving force behind you me and the staff side is empowered to do is the contract that we have in place, as well as any additional direction from the Board. And this is where we're at today.

I think I already addressed Italy's comment which was the right to evaluate. I'm not aware of that particular right to exist, with all due respect.

Back to you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think we have to include here just two words. First of all, thank you for engaging. I think as you see, there's still some issues that hopefully will be clarified soon.

With regard to the release of the -- which is another request that is coming with the release of the country names -- and let me start with the question of the right. I'm not sure -- Going to the question of whether there's a right or not. There's one thing that maybe we should also learn. At least in the perception of the

GAC, when we were discussing this program, there was -- the GAC felt that it was promised or it was ensured that the GAC would have a say in this, or could. That this was up to the governments to release or not to release their country codes. And then maybe we were not diligent enough to actually look into the way that was formulated in specification 5 and there was not enough communication, so we ended up with a procedure that was fairly cumbersome for governments; in particular, the ones that do not have the resources to spend too much attention on these issues. And I think we learned from that.

However, I would just note that with regard to the country names, there is -- there is a clear legal situation there that gives protection to these names.

There is a different text in the specification 5 that does not allow the release with either the government consenting or ICANN consenting. It says basically needs the consent of the government and of ICANN. So there's a clear, very clear expectation that the process will be different. And as I said, we've already tried to be constructive and helpful and put that list together. That should make it easier, I hope. And I will end with this. I hope that we will engage -- when you set up the process, that we will be engaged actively in seeing if this works for everybody before the process is basically -- goes live, is

launched, so that in case there are any problems, that we can sort them out before the launch of the process.

Thank you very much, Cyrus, for coming here, and looking forward to future cooperation.

Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think we should not rush into anything. This is a very delicate question. This is not a matter of overprotection. This is the matter of the rights. There is no need to have any constitution convention. This is international customary law, that is the right of the country. It is possible to have the built-in mechanism that unless otherwise specifically agreed, no reply means disagreement. Should we put in? Perhaps you in ICANN don't have that, but we know in the U.N. we have that. Many, many areas, that unless specifically agreed, lack of reply means disagreement. However, in order not to block the registry or the one who ask that could contact ICANN and ICANN could contact the country and asking that "We have not received a reply. Could you provide answer or reason?" That is possible. But we don't want that. And sorry, please put our comment in the amended and also somewhere in the result

of this discussion that we would like that this built-in mechanism be provided. We don't need to go to the constitution, convention, and so on. International customary law. This is very important. If you want to use the IRN and then you want to put second level, and you need to have the agreement of the country. If we miss because of the organizational changes, we would like that the advice be there.

It is not overprotection. It is respect to the right of the countries, and that is very important.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. We have to conclude here. We are already a little bit over time. Fortunately, we will probably not use the whole afternoon for the communique.

We will now....

We have another practical thing, actually. It's the door prize that we will now give. So I hand over to ACIG. Then we will make a short break in order to finalize the draft of the communique, and then reconvene a half an hour later to give us the time to look through that, print it, and distribute it to you.

EN

Just for your information, the cards that have been in the bag more than one time have been removed in order to reduce the incentive for this to happen the next time again. So to those who unawarely in put more than one card, we apologize deeply. For those who deliberately put in more than one card, that's what you get.

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: And now we're getting ready for the actual drawing. And suspense, suspense. And this is one of the moments where you do need a resident grandfather. And a little help.

I know who this is. Florence Lengoumbi, Gabon.

[Applause]

I would say I think that's a perfect match to the dress and the lady.

[Applause]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. I think we're all happy with the choice that Olof has made.

So now let's make a break and give us about a half an hour time to prepare the -- update the communique and have it printed.

EN

So let's convene around 3:30. Okay?

It's not going to be a very long communique, so we hope that we'll get through it rather quickly.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]