

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
Meeting Strategy Update  
Saturday 07 February 2015**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: Welcome (Nick) and Tanzanica. Let me hand straight over to you to talk about that new meeting strategy and new implementation plans.

(Nick Tommaso): Thank you very much Jonathan. I'm (Nick Tommaso), Vice President for meetings for ICANN.

Good afternoon to everyone, good day to everyone on the telephone or participating remotely.

We want to thank you for giving us some time on your very busy schedule to take you through some of the concepts of the new ICANN meeting strategy which we're going to implement beginning with the March 2016 meeting.

As I'm sure you know this is a community driven strategy. There were 21 members on the Meeting Strategy Working Group representing all of the SOs and ACs.

For GNSO we had (unintelligible) (Dilija), Paul Diaz and Donna Austin. I believe Donna is the only one of those three who's here with us today. There you are Donna. How are you?

And Donna and Tanzanica King who is with the Meetings department are going to take you through the strategy. So with that I am going to turn it over to Tanzanica and excuse me.

Tanzanica King: We're going to run a short presentation for you I believe. I'm actually going to just let you know that we'll take questions throughout instead of waiting till the end. So we'll give you some time to see if there's any questions between slides.

And Donna is going to start by letting us know some more about the guiding principles that were used to develop the Meeting Strategy Recommendations. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks (Tanzi), Donna Austin. So it's been a while since I've looked at these so you'll have to excuse me if I forget what they're all about.

So when we did this work we went round in circles for quite a bit of time trying to work out what are these we were trying to achieve. And about I don't know, three or four months and we decided that some guiding principles would be useful.

And these largely came out of a lot of the discussion that we've been having along the way so that the guiding principles ensures sufficient face to face time for SO AC policy development. And we understand that primarily this is the reason for ICANN meetings so we thought it was important that we maintain that develop the next level of equal footed cross constituency interaction that facilitates sufficient delegate networking possibilities.

What this speaks to is the fact that the reality of many of these meetings is that we all sit in different rooms and we don't get the opportunity to get together to discuss issues on a more frequent basis.

So we felt that this was a pretty important principle to get everybody out of their silos or, you know, rooms with no windows than have more opportunities for interaction.

But efficient use of community in ICANN time with reduced session conflicts. I'm not sure how many sessions are on the agenda for this meeting but I expect there's probably 200 plus.

So and we understand that that is to a large extent is not sustainable. And we also recognize that there are a number of sessions that are conducted over and over again.

And just to use SSAC as an example SSAC has, you know, they'll go and talk to the GAC, they'll come and talk to the council here, they'll speak to the registries. Generally it's the same presentation. So we're looking for ways to eliminate that duplication so that we felt that was important.

Maximize qualitative participation, so I'll just run through these quickly. Insure capabilities to remote participation, provide sufficient language services interpretation translation, balanced geographic rotations versus sub location.

This was an important discussion that we had along the way. I think (Nick) had put a proposal out that led to the meeting Strategy Working Group that proposed a hub location, the use of hub locations.

We had a lot of discussion around this and stepped away from that idea more based on the importance of geographic rotation.

Outreach with local communities, educate new and existing participants on the issues being addressed by ICANN, minimize conflicts with other Internet community events such as the ICF and IGF. So ICANN doesn't want to meet at the same time that those other meetings are happening and the user availability.

This is a big issue for a number of the colleagues on the working group that, you know, ease of ability for people to travel to different locations is important.

Develop a design that allows for growth, increasing number of topics constituency groups and attendees.

One of the challenges for (Nick) and his team is that, you know, within - the meetings are so large now that the - to find venues in a number of locations around the world is really challenging. So this is an important consideration.

So to increase the credibility of ICANN with the broader global community I - it sounds good so (unintelligible). Thanks.

Tanzanica King: Okay we can go to the next slide. So I'm going to run through the three different types of meetings that we are currently referring to as meeting A, B and C.

I hope that eventually we will come up with a different way to name these meetings. Meeting A is very similar to how we're running meetings now. It's a total duration of six days.

The big difference here that you'll notice is the public performance is split into two.

And this comes from a recommendation that we tried giving the (unintelligible) information, getting some community input early in the week so that we can see if any of those issues can be addressed by the time we get to Thursday at the end of the week.

We can go to the next slide. Meeting B, the meeting everybody is talking about is - has been reduced to four days. This does not have a welcome ceremony. It does not have a big public forum.

It really is intended to focus on the work. So three days will be focused on SOAC and board work. One day is focused on outreach.

So this is supposed to be the opportunity for you all to do outreach. We don't know exactly what that looks like yet but we know that's what we want to do there.

Does anyone have question so far? Yes?

(Phil): Since we're sitting here in the GNSO council meeting which additionally takes place on the weekend before the meeting is there a two day council meeting in conjunction with this and is it congruent with these four days or prior?

Tanzanica King: So at the moment we're looking at these meetings as if it's four days, it's four days. So unlike now where we attach so many days before and after the meeting so that people are actually traveling for two or three weeks at a time some of us no, it's all intended to fit within the four days.

That doesn't mean that you can't have a separate meeting that's not part of the ICANN meeting prior if that makes sense.

(Phil): I'm not sure I understand. Does this envision the council having a meeting? Would the meeting be one or two days and would it be during these four days or prior or is that for the council to decide?

(Nick Tommaso): Let me see if I can attempt to answer this and hopefully get some input from Donna as well as from (Glen).

The overarching reason for Meeting B which by the way is the middle meeting of that year was to dedicate time to the SOs and ACs to do the work that they need to do.

That is why there are three days dedicated to that in their entirety. How those - the three days are split up by the SOs and ACs are your decision. But that is the design of the meeting to have those three days dedicated to that work

both amongst your own organizations which we call intra-community as well as being able to collaborate with other SOs and ACs calling it inter-community. Does that help answer your question?

(Phil): Somewhat but I'll - I think others want to jump in on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so let's just see if we have a queue. I mean I think it is a really important point that you're raising (Phil).

The question is in general what is, from the council's point of view and possibly more broadly but certainly from a council's point of view well one, this has been agreed to. This is the new meeting - this is - we're talking about implementation now and the question is what's the impact on us?

So, you know, it's possible like (Nick) said that we may be able to or I think Tanzania said, you know, for example are we going to get - most councilors rely on travel funding and ICANN hotel funding.

So to that extent you would be travel funded to be here between Monday and Thursday. Now one option might be to apply for supplementary funding for hotel on the weekend and then we meet on the weekend or it may be that that's not - and that might get refused.

So we do need to think about what the impact for the council is with all of this and how we respond and react to that.

I'm conscious to the queue. I've certainly got (David) and Brett. Anyone else was hoping to speak? Donna? (David), Brett and then Donna and then Stephanie.

(David): Yes. I mean I applaud the idea of a meeting that is focused on SO, AC and board work. But the end result here seems to be that we have at least one

less day for SOA - at least one less full day for SO AC and board work then we would have.

So this will be a meeting in which we get less. The meeting that is supposed to enable SO AC and work will mean - will be the meeting where we have less time for SO work. That does not seem to be really achieving our - the goal here.

Brett?

Brett Faucett: Yes. My understand of meeting reevaluation process that we've come through that has resulted in these three kinds of meetings is that it was trying to fix a problem which is that these meetings that we're currently having had become a bit of a Frankenstein monster with, you know, extra days added on the front and extra days added on the end and things in the evening and to bring some structure to this.

And so I would hope that ICANN would resist in the request to have the four day meeting and then throw another, you know, head on the front of the two day GNSO meeting.

I mean that's what we're trying to get away from. So let's - I love the recommendations and I hope that they go through and that we build this in.

And I would like to see, you know, the GNSO fit inside this four days not, you know, on either side of it.

So I'd hope that ICANN could force the community to work within this structure because if you don't force it, if you don't require it then people are going to constantly, you know, be building on top of the structure and we're going to get back to the same problem that we were trying to correct with this process.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay I just before we go on with the queue and I know Donna's next, Donna either you might want to say something or the presenters want to say something. But these aren't as I understand it recommendations at this stage.

The recommendations have been made. They've been accepted or they've been through the process. This is the implementation. So it's a done deal. It's how we work with that done deal that's the question.

I don't know if (Nick) or Tanzania would you like to comment on that or confirm that?

(Nick Tommaso): Yes. I can confirm it. This process has been a community driven process. IT's gone through many iterations. It's gone through much public consultation at many ICANN meetings over the last two years.

We had a public comment period which was open and closed with some input from the community.

The Meeting Strategy Working Group while they were working to develop this proposal to deliver to the board met with many of the SOs and ACs and have gone a very long way of saying yes, this we are now in implementation mode. We're out of planning and comment and we're at implementation. That's the design here.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Nick). Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan, Donna Austin. One thing I'd like to point out about this meeting B is that this is the opportunity to ensure that we have reached on rotation.

In theory this should be a smaller meeting in terms of attendance and it also should have met the requirements in terms of technical requirements, rooms



and those other things. So that was another reason why, you know, we felt that this was important as well.

(David) to your point about making sure that we have adequate time I suppose to get the work done what you need to think about is that Monday is traditionally, you know, a lot of combination sessions that aren't necessarily that SO AC policy work so that will change.

Thursday is generally the public forum so that's your four. So there's an opportunity there to redesign what those - what Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday looks like because we won't have, you know, a Monday that has, you know, 40 or 50 sessions running in parallel with one another.

So there's opportunities to redesign. And I think that's point, (Nick)'s point, it's up to us to think about what we want out of these and how we can manage this a lot better. So I think hopefully that's helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna. I've got I think Stephanie. I couldn't read my writing and then Edmund.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I'll listen to Jonathan's caveat that this is a done deal. And I guess my question is I hear a lot not only do we have the example of a very complex process that is about to land on us in the form of the AWG PWPDP, we have the IANA transition that is eating people live at the moment.

I think it's heroic to try to do four day meetings in that context. But and we also have a risk assessment going on where we're asked for the principal risks for ICANN the first being in my view complexity.

So I just wonder how we manage the increasing complexity of how the things are interweaving with a four day meeting?

I understand your task to come up with a four day module, you know, heaven help you. What do we do with four and after that allows us to do the cross-fertilization, the cross community working?

I see two days thereof of intra-community. That means a whole lot of front and loading prior to the meeting to get all the community work done so that you're ready to just do intra-community work at the meeting? Is that the idea?

And the other question I have is I would say going with my principal risk of complexity is a failure to have the working knowledge that is necessary to understand the other issues.

I don't understand enough of the technology. I also don't understand enough of the intellectual property law. I need that. How do I get that?

I presume that also would be knowledge that I would have to get through Webinar prior to meetings? Is that a yes?

Jonathan Robinson: Did you want to respond (Nick)?

(Nick Tommaso): You bring up all valid points. This is an implement to be implemented in June of 2016 so a little bit more than a year from now.

The view of the working group was that day four would be the opportunity for the cross pollination, the interaction between the SOs and ACs, not just and days one, two and three would be focused on each SO and AC doing their work much like we do today.

So when you remove the complexities of an opening ceremony of high interest topics of a public forum, of a public board meeting these days become fully available to you to design any which way you need them to be for your needs.

The possibility of Webinars prior to is a very practical and relatively easy - easily implementable plan which we would certainly entertain if there's a need to do that.

But we have to think about these as complete days 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM or 7:00 PM and being able to focus our attention for those days in their entirety to the work you need to get done. That's the concept.

Does that help?

Stephanie Perrin: I would say forgive me I come from a telecom background. Stephanie Perrin for the record again. And, you know, I just - and I realize a decision has been made. But it strikes me that ICANN cannot product metrics that we're going to, you know, achieve things in a four day meeting that is not possible to achieve in a four day meeting.

If a trade negotiation takes two weeks it takes two weeks. If a world administrative radio conference takes four weeks it takes four weeks.

And pretending you can pull it off in four days only achieves the kind of, you know, superficiality that leads us to the policy problems that we're dealing with on so many fronts. That's all I'm saying. So I appreciate your challenge and, you know, good luck.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So thanks for that interchange. I've got Edmund, (Carlos), Avri and then (Phil). And I think in the interest of time we'll probably have to draw a line under it at that point.

Edmund Chung: Edmund Chung here. So I guess into implementation do we need a GGP now or - joking aside.

So I generally I think this is a good initiative. I'm personally I'm pretty supportive of it.

I think the whole notion is to make it more I guess boring from - for some people and make it more interesting for some people. And that's the whole idea of this and try to get us to do a little bit more work.

I've heard a couple times now Tanzanica and I think (Nick) mentioned that he said for example and one of the examples being taking out the public forum.

I guess that's probably part of the discussion but I'm not sure whether we are there yet? I mean there is the intercommunity work part where it's - I would think a public forum like thing is often very useful for the community in terms of how we do our work.

So I don't think we need to presume how things are done at this point.

And that brings me to the actual question which is what next? The SO ACs now we have this kind of framework. We - I don't like the idea of cramming it into four days.

In fact I think, you know, the way I see it that we had originally we had three days and now we're expanding it to four days. We had the weekend session and the constituency session so usually three days. And we know actually have four days to do this work. Maybe the community needs to think about it that way.

But how does the GNSO or the ACs now talk about how we spend the four days? You know, how do you envision that being created?

Jonathan Robinson: Well that's a good question because that's essentially I mean that feels like the question in front of us if you assume as I was saying that this is now a done deal and not loose talk.

But so that's a good question. I don't know if that's something you'd like to respond to (Nick) or Tanzania.

(Nick Tommaso): I'm going to spend just a minute on that. The - so the strategy was decided upon by the community led Meeting Strategy Working Group.

I like you I'm in a position of now having to implement this strategy. That doesn't mean that we can't be very creative as to how we do it but there are the fundamental requirements that we have to meet as far as duration.

What we're doing here today is to make you aware if you hadn't already been of what is coming and to have you begin thinking about how you can fit the work that you need to get done into this strategy and model that the Meeting Strategy Working Group has given us.

So to your point Edmund and, you know, more clearly to your point Jonathan this is as you say a done deal. Now it's the onus is on us to figure out how to implement.

So this group and all of the other SOs and ACs are going to have to figure out how they are going to model their days to fit into this.

Edmund Chung: Just quickly, Edmund here. So is this kind of an open invitation that we need to convene a group to start talking about this?

Jonathan Robinson: I think that's effectively what's where we're going to go to have to be at yes.

So I am very mindful of time. There's - we should really wrap this up in the next few minutes. I've got (Carlos), Avri and (Phil) in the queue. I think you guys have got more slides is - you haven't got...

(Nick Tommaso): We do have a couple more slides, the Meeting B being the most controversial one. Let's just jump through to Meeting C Tanzania if you don't mind?

Jonathan Robinson: My only I've just got to deal with the queue. I'm just reminding everyone that just if you could be as brief as possible in the queue, make sure you announce yourselves and then we'll come to Meeting C and I think we need to get some kind of action coming out of this. So I've got (Carlos), Avri and (Phil) let each of you make your point.

(Carlos): Thank you very much (Carlos) for the recording (Nick).

In other discussions there is always a question where all the money goes. And thank you for the chairs for focusing us on the resources.

Do you have any clue what the cost of a six day versus a four day meeting is? Do you have a standardized cost for each day of the meeting?

And how much money would you have saved if you would have gone to this wonderful idea of the hot locations that seems to have died? Thank you very much.

(Nick Tommaso): Good question. I don't know if you to resurrect the hub location question. I'm happy to but the group, the Meeting Strategy Working Group thought that there was more value in bringing the meeting to geographies as opposed to bringing the people to a meeting which is why they have asked that we not implement the hub city strategy.

I think...

(Carlos): How much does it cost? Just give me the number?

(Nick Tommaso): I don't have a specific number. For instance if we used Singapore is a hub city it could be rather expensive than using another as a hub city.

So we would really have to be very thoughtful as to what city we picked, what negotiations we could have with a local travel and tourism board who might be able to provide us with subvention which is funding to bring a meeting to a location where we might be able to negotiate multiple year contracts with a convention center.

So I can't give you a specific dollar amount. Anecdotally I think we could save some money if we were to do that.

Jonathan Robinson: So maybe the question is partly to the Meeting Strategy Working Group if anyone recalls how much if at all finances was a part of the decision-making process, you know, the cost of running?

Because that's your question isn't it, was this a more cost effective solution then an alternative or was it done for reasons other than cost?

Donna Austin: Jonathan I'll take that one. Donna Austin. So (Nick) I might get this wrong but I think we actually took cost off the table. I think once we developed the going principles cost actually came off the table.

But we did recognize early that there is a significant costs associated with every meeting that is done.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. I think that's probably the helpful answer. Avri and then (Phil).

Avri Doria: Hi. Thank you, Avri speaking. I have two questions and they both apply to B. One is that when it talks about the first day being outreach does that mean that the other work cannot happen?

And the other one was in the notion of the meeting being smaller at B. Is that an assumption? Because when I look around I sort of see there's a small number of people that are here doing the policy stuff and then there's a large

number of people that are here for the dogs and ponies and business dealings.

And is there an assumption with the B meeting but that doesn't - because it doesn't include dogs and ponies it doesn't include the rest of it? Okay.

Donna Austin: So yes Avri that assumption is basically where we're going.

Avri Doria: So and the first one also on the first day when it's outreach day nothing else goes on but outreach?

Donna Austin: So just to say a little bit about outreach, I think because Meeting B is smaller and that provides the opportunity for the meetings to go to locations that wouldn't be available with the bigger meetings that we felt it was important that there were opportunities for outreach.

So you could go to local universities or you could get people from the sector to actually come to the meeting.

But it doesn't have to be, outreach doesn't have to be the full day. So it is possible that you could take up some of that time with other work. Is that correct (Nick)? I think that's where we got to.

(Nick Tommaso): Yes I agree. We had to use placeholders. We had to define a day that we would do that. We had to engage with you to make sure that you are part of that outreach to the community. But yes it's not exclusively for outreach, you know, ten hours that day.

So there is an opportunity to use that for your meetings as well hopefully still making yourself available to embrace the community when we develop - when we collectively develop what that outreach program looks like.



Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So it's quite clear we're going to have to respond to this implementation. (Phil) you've been very patient. Let's hear from you and then (Nick) and Tanzania I think we have call this a wrap up.

(Phil): Yes. I'll try to be brief since I started this off. And I do accept that this is a done deal. I'm just trying to understand how it actually works.

And I did want to say that within the business constituency there has been concern about whether people depending on location will actually go to a location that's a long way away and expensive to get to for just a four day meeting. But it's a done deal.

Like Avri I'm trying to understand day one outreach is it exclusively outreach and outreach to who? If we're in Singapore is it to the city of Singapore, Southeast Asia, all of Asia? How are we involved?

Day two and three inter-community that means within the community so I guess that's when the council would do whatever it wants to do, and the stakeholder groups, and the constituencies and all of that interacting with each other.

And day four inter means not within but without but different from outreach. So I'm just trying to understand what these different labels mean and how we're supposed to organize in response to them.

And maybe we can't get an answer now but clearly we're going to have to think long and hard about how to make this a worthwhile meeting to get things done in a compressed timeframe.

Jonathan Robinson: So Steve what have you got from this?

(Steve): This is Steve. Thanks for putting me on the spot Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: It was intentional.

(Steve): Just at some point we're going to need to put together some kind of group to discuss the approach of - because it's essential I guess out to the communities themselves to determine how they're going to handle their time.

So at some point the GNSO's going to have to consider how they're going to use their four days.

Jonathan Robinson: I think that's right (Steve). I think the council, so the action really is on the council to determine its response to the new meeting strategy so we need to capture that.

But what I'm also sensitive to is kind of what (Phil) has touched on there a moment ago. The council doesn't operate in isolation from the rest of the GNSO so there's got to be a dialogue with the stakeholder groups and constituencies as to how they interpret this as well and therefore how we work with them.

So I think it's twofold and we've got to get both of those done. So (Nick) and Tanzania you probably need a couple minutes to deal with the last few slides. And I'm sorry we've compressed you but we've had a useful discussion on it.

(Nick Tommaso): The discussion has been extremely useful for us as well so thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Are you happy that you've covered everything then that you need to for the moment and (unintelligible)?

(Nick Tommaso): I think we need three more minutes...

Jonathan Robinson: Please go ahead. That's my expectation yes.

Tanzanica King: I know your lunch is behind you so if we can go I think to the next slide and be on Meeting C.

Meeting C is nothing too surprising. It's our longest meeting seven days so that we can include the annual general meeting at the end as we do now.

We have it worked out as two days dedicated to intra- community work, one day dedicated to inter-community work, a day dedicated to internal SO AC work, CC interaction or both.

Two days dedicated to the public forum. So we're again we're splitting it up in the beginning and the end of the week an annual general meeting and opening session and high interest topics. So there's nothing too shocking there.

We can go to the next slide.

(Nick Tommaso): One point. This meeting is an extra day in duration which hopefully will help to alleviate some of the issues that Meeting B may create.

It does provide more opportunity for meetings non-conflicted meetings which is a very important thing.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great.

(Nick Tommaso): Next slide please. Let me just run through this.

Tanzanica King: Yes it's okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry (Phil), we'll come to you.

(Nick Tommaso): Yes. I'm going to go through this briefly. This is the geographic rotation that we have come up which spreads the meetings equitably by region, by geographic region over the next five years or so.

The design and we touched on it very briefly, the design of the Meeting B is there are so many locations that want to host an ICANN meeting and have just not been able to Lima (unintelligible) Chile, places in Southeast Asia.

So the concept we - and Latin America specifically. So the concept is we take Meeting B and put it in Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia in those locations that have historically not had facilities large enough for a large meeting.

It makes us more global. It makes our outreach much better when we get to those communities.

And there you have the in front of you the geographic rotation as it exists today, the kind of meeting that's going to be in that geography.

And I think with that Tanzania are we ready to wrap up?

Tanzania King: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. It looks like - thank you very much. It looks like there's one question (Phil) you want to ask and then we'll...

(Phil): I hope I can get it (unintelligible) and can you please define the difference between an intra-community and inter-community because I'm not getting that point?

(Nick Tommaso): Yes. I'll - and perhaps Tanzania is the right one to answer this question. But basically when the board meets with an SO or AC is inter-community or when RSAC meets with another of the organizations that's inter-community.

Intra-community - think about intramural sports in high school. You know, you have your teams within the school playing one another and inter-community is the other organizations coming together and not outside of the ICANN community but GAC meeting with GNSO for instance would be inter-community.

And that's come from a request from some of the SOs and ACs that they need more opportunity to engage with other organizations and understand what they are working on as it affects their own work.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much (Nick) and Tanzanica. Thanks for a good discussion everyone. So let's call that session to a close.

And if you can just bear with me I want to make a couple of housekeeping notes about scheduling. So let's draw that session to a close. We can stop the recording there and thank you again for your involvement.

(Nick Tommaso): Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so we are about to go into the lunch break now. I think we probably need a little bit of a break. Time's moved ahead of us somewhat.

What I think we will do is break until a quarter to. And at a quarter to I know I've talked to (David) about the possibility of getting an update on the recent NCPH Intercessional Meeting and anything that might be relevant to the council or participants here in the room from the GNSO.

So (David) if that's okay with you we'll do that at quarter to as towards the end. So we'll call back into session. We'll take somewhat of a break and then come back into session a quarter to.

And then we'll work through the rest of the items between that 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock including coming back to discuss the perspective CWH, CWG on auctions later in the session around 3:15, 3:30 as we said this morning.

So I think that's it for now. If I could just remind everyone when you do contribute later just always state your name before you'd speak at the microphone. Is there anything else?

Volker Griemann: Yes just one quick reminder for the council lunch, please let the councilors get their lunch first so we can continue with the update that (David) is providing.

We have very cut - we had to cut short the lunch to be able to fit everything in time. So it's essential that the councilors get to eat first and can return to the table first.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Volker. But everyone's welcome to stay and please stick around for the afternoon session and for some lunch. You're welcome to stay and be part of that.

END