

Round Table (Country) Reports: Day 3

Larry Caffrey

ICA Editor

Larry Caffrey, ICA. We all had a wonderful night last night. We saw many old traditions with, of course, a very young and new dynamic deputy mayor, which is very typical of Estonia as a new country with many old traditions. I was struck by the fact the wine offered last night was from Chile and you can draw many parallels with Chile as a country and Estonia. Again, they have come through the dark ages, they are a healthy nation, they are a new country and they are building a healthy and democratic country based upon old traditions. The wine has very similar traditions and was a good choice. The red wine for instance, is a wine that is only obtainable in Chile. It is not available at the moment anywhere else in the world. But, it comes from a grape with very old traditions. A vine that came many many years ago, centuries ago, to Chile, from Bordeaux in France, yet today that wine is only available in Chile. The interesting point that I was about to make is that Chile hope to have that type of wine recognised by the European Commission which will give it a new standing in Europe. Again, the parallel is very clear to Estonia.

It actually leads me to the first item that I wish to discuss with you this morning and that is Open Source. A new idea possibly, but it is a very old tradition. Is Open Source just another evolution of the old open system's idea. We've had open systems before. I remember many years ago, I had a team of people who went all around the country helping to advise and install what we called Open Systems. There was one branch of that team really looking at installing and helping people on Unix, they were mainly the academics; the military sites. But there were also the other sites where we were installing what we called OSI, Open Systems Standards and infrastructures, we developed things like, Gossips, Nossips, Sossips, and all sorts of other abbreviations. We had more flavours of them than books in the Bible. In fact I spent many years wandering around like a Bible thumper trying to sell Gossip and various other ideas, and then what happened? Well along came Mr Gates with an operating system. Or a version that worked like an operating system. Open systems went out of the window so to speak. So are we on the verge of a new evolution? Are we in fact ready to make a move away from propriety systems to open source, or will it find its place in a balanced economy. So who will start me off on open systems, or open source?

Barry West, USA. I'd say we are having great success with Open Source. As an example at my agency, I am with the National Weather Service, we have migrated our mission critical system, systems, across the US to open source, to Red Hat Linux. All of our weather forecasters now are using Linux, the hurricane that is hitting today on the East coast; all the weather forecasters that are putting out the alerts that forecast the warnings are using systems that have Linux. We have noticed savings up to 3:1 versus the HP/UX operating system that we were using. The performance has been great. The issue before was support and we are now getting the 24x7 support that we need. There was an interesting article on CIO Magazine this past year. Basically the article said that if you were not using open source by 2005, you will be left behind. So I think it is going to be a balance Larry, I don't think we are heading to total open source, but it is going to be a nice balance between open source and Microsoft.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you. I would like to move on and actually asked our friends in Switzerland if they could perhaps tell us about the experiments they have been doing.

Jean-Jacques DIDISHEIM, Switzerland. On open source we have had two or three Parliamentary interventions last year, because the politicians noticed that some countries published very bold statements, like in Germany and we have actually at this time no official strategy. So we started to make some surveys within the administration, within the different agencies. What we noticed is that of around 1,200 servers about 7% of them today operate on Linux. On the client side there is actually no Linux user to speak of, except for the Federal Supreme Courts. They work with Star Office. At the end of this year we will publish an official strategy about open source. It will be based partly on the survey where we asked people who use it, why, what was the reason and there were four things that were mentioned; one is cost reduction, the second is security aspect, and I think both of them are quite interesting because the discussion is open right now whether it is really a cost reduction to use open source, when you look at the total cost of ownership. Also on the security aspect, some people say it is better for security, others say it is less good. The other two reasons which were stated for using open source is independence from suppliers, it means Microsoft mainly, and the fourth is technological innovations. And so based on that we will develop our strategy until the end of this year.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. I think it will be interesting to see that. And you are keeping an open mind on open source.

Now, also then, I'll move across and ask Hugo if you can say a few words because you have gone the other way, haven't you?

Hugo Agius-Muscat, Malta. Yes, if you read our Country Report that is what it would seem, because in January this year our Minister for IT signed a corporation agreement with Microsoft which is leaning the balance very much towards Bill Gates. However, there is an element of balance in Malta as well. You may remember from last year as reported, we were very active in the open source field. We are playing an active part in the IDA Megos study group; Migration towards open source software study which is now coming towards its end. We have been running pilots in our offices using Star Office, seeing what learning curve we'll be facing if we try to roll this out across our government. We've been looking at Linux at the back end as well and much of that activity is still going on. It is just getting less publicity because the agreement with Microsoft has snatched the headlines and it is quite a comprehensive agreement. It touches a lot on the educational sector side than on public side. There is no doubt that there is little public knowledge about open source at the front end and Microsoft Office software is ubiquitous in Malta, so you can imagine that when Bill Gates came along with an offer of giving Office and Windows at give away prices to students, prices like US \$12 for Office XP, well it was snatched up and made Bill Gates very popular. In a sense the government has had to pay its pound of flesh, because we are also on an enterprise agreement that does put obligations on governments to install XP across most of its PC user base. So we are actually paying as well, counter balancing by in a sense almost becoming a Microsoft shop in certain respects, so there is an element of lock-in taking place in various parts of government at the front end especially infrastructure wise as a result of this co-operation. But, it is too early to say which way in long term it is going, because the open source lobby hasn't lost its voice. They are still working on the elements that people know about. We heard security mentioned, there is cost of ownership, there are various good reasons for leaving it open. So we are still exploring those avenues. Thank you

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Yes, I often wonder in fact if open source isn't in fact a tool of Bill Gates to spread a little alarm and despondency and make sure that every separate country has to operate and negotiate with him separately. Or is open source something to get 2% off the price? John, in Australia two years ago, it was a really hot topic. Has it died down a bit?

John Grant, Australia. Thanks, Larry. I don't think it has died down. We still have the Open Source Reform Church and as always we've have the Microsoft Catholic Church. I think what has happen though, is that the government has actually made some decisions and

not unlike Barry's comment, open source is widely used anyway. It is used by a weather bureau, it is used by our Centre Link office, usually organisations with a significant IT, are using open source where it actually makes really good common sense. And in essence we had a look at what was happening around the world, where the open source Evangelism was lifting itself to new levels and said well what do we do here. In one of our States, South Australia, we actually have a Bill currently in the Parliament to mandate open source and the same party in that State Government is trying to do the same in the Federal Government. We expect both to fail. In the end I think open source is improving in terms of desktop, star offers and things are getting better all the time and we like it because it puts a little bit of pressure on to Microsoft and the other vendors. So obviously Open Source is becoming simply yet another mechanism to improve the way that we can actually use ICT to enable our services. I think giving people the choice and recognising that having the competition will in fact drive the market. The innovation and the price help significantly and that's about where the Australian Government is standing at present.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you. Finland please.

Arja Terho, Finland. I agree with John that it is worth having an open source project for us to be able to negotiate with Microsoft because I think this is, being a small country since we have had the open source project this is the first time Microsoft has actually come to us and asked if there is something they can do for the Finnish Government and what it would be but we have had an open source project for two years now and I think what is important is that you just can't talk about open source as one thing you have the service, about 18% of the service in Finland is run by Linux so that is coming to be the standard already and then there is office systems and we were testing them within thirteen agencies a year and a half ago and we found out that people were quite satisfied with them the only problem is the Microsoft file format is used in Word documents so widely so none of the agencies have really migrated to it yet but a lot of them are thinking about it when their Microsoft agreements expire and then there is the Government core applications and we have had a working group thinking about the open source with the Government applications and what we found out that the architecture in agencies is not so solid and the components are not even re-useable within one agency so we cannot really talk about pooling the components that are open source within the Finnish Government so we made some recommendations; the agencies should purchase the source code and they should develop a solid architecture so that they would in future have re-useable components and then we could think about maybe using the components more widely across Government.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you. I know I mentioned it last year but if ICA as an organisation went to Microsoft and said we need two billion or possibly even three billion packages would we be able to get it for ten dollars a shot? It's worth thinking about at times. So it looks as if from what you are saying that open source is here, it is to stay, it has a place but is not necessarily a replacement for Microsoft systems. In order though for it to find its proper place we need to make sure that open source develops and reaches that plateau where it can be considered as an alternative and I'd like to ask our friends from the European Union now perhaps to introduce their plans because I think they have something of real interest for us.

Jean-Pierre Weidert, European Commission. Thank You. My point was not so much an open source but I will also cover open source a little bit so the European Commission has already in its E-Europe programme put an action on open source to promote open source. The main reason at that time indicated was for security reasons because you can only guarantee security if you have an insight also to the code. Other reasons are also that it allows to develop shared components and it's perhaps the best way to ensure open standards, or the implementation of open standards. The point I have is more on standards because we have been asked by several member countries in the context of the IDA programme to see the feasibility of having an open document format. This story is not new. We had ODA in that

time but that failed but I think with XML there are new opportunities now so we have started a study to look at what are the elements required in such an XML open document format; to see also what existing elements could be already taken, for example in open office the whole storage is done in XML format, and to see with vendors of propriety software how open they would be to support such an initiative so we are at the beginning of that study. I think we will have a first version by the beginning of next year and if there is an interest in the ICA community I would circulate this study and see perhaps in the ICA conference next year what could be possible actions to pursue this in the future.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Yes but you are not confining your study or your work within the European area you are quite happy for someone as wide as ICA to assist.

Jean-Pierre Weidert, European Commission. Of course, yes I think the more support such an initiative would have the more power we would have persuading propriety software vendors at least to implement facilities like importing or exporting to an open document format so I think it starts now within the European Union. Perhaps there are reflections in other countries in the same way but I think if we share our efforts perhaps we can obtain more than if we stay alone.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Right, thank you. Now what we will do of course is we will publish this on our web site as an item of interest. I realise its all new to you this morning. Is there anyone who wants to ask the EU any questions at this time or take the opportunity later to speak to him? Yes Israel and then New Zealand.

Nachman Oron, Israel. Well Israel has a very special problem of language. As you know we have a very queer language that is written from right to left and with a different alphabet and this has been one of the obstacles in using open source. I can tell you that there are some computers put some effort in introducing Hebrew into the Star Office and are trying to do it. Are there any general plans to introduce different languages, I guess the Far East languages have a similar problem?

Jean-Pierre Weidert, European Commission. At the moment we are looking primarily at the languages of the expanded European Union that will be twenty five already and for the rest we have no plans for the moment.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Okay, New Zealand.

Edwin Bruce, New Zealand. Really just a message of support for the EU initiative. We are much less interested in open source and much more interested in portability and long term management of the information and documents and for anyone that hasn't read it obviously the correspondence between the Peruvian Government and Microsoft is really entertaining for those that haven't read it and I think most people probably have now. Secondly, we are quite interested in the relationship between the long term management information and where Microsoft is going with its paladin and trusted computing architecture initiatives and we are interested in that from a national policy perspective because there are implications also about long term access to Government information so we are quite keen on keeping up with what is going on

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you, now Singapore.

Choy Peng Wu, Singapore. I just think it is important to clarify in our minds that open source and open systems are actually quite different things and I think it is not very helpful to think of open source as just open source versus Microsoft because open source is just a software development paradigm and a software licensing paradigm besides Microsoft you have Oracle you have SDP you have lots and lots of others. In fact most enterprise class software today above the operating system is not open source. So I think it is important to

actually layer it up a little bit and we actually have decided that there is no policy to mandate open source as far as procurement is concerned. We think our current procurement principle of best value for money is the way to go and because we out-source at least 95% of all systems, in other words, we don't buy components; we buy solutions. If the solutions are built on open source components and that indeed work out to be the cheapest, the most cost effective solution that meet our requirements, we buy it, open source or otherwise. So I think we have decided that we will not go the route of "you must buy open source". What we are saying is that current value for money procurement philosophy is fine and if indeed open source delivers on its promise then the most cost effective and best value for money solution would be one that is built on open source components. We did a pilot on Star Office and Open Office. I think that just looking at even Word, have you seen how compatible it is with Presentation; PowerPoint? We have found that if you calculate productivity loss and the discontinuity between work and home environments, because a vast majority of public servants have home computers and they use Microsoft Office because they are kids use Microsoft Office in the university doing their homework environment, and so on. We have decided not to migrate the entire public sector to open office because the numbers actually don't look good for us by doing that. Recently with the enterprise agreement with Microsoft, I think you are aware that if the government has an enterprise agreement with Microsoft all employees can install a copy of Office at home at no additional cost. So that effectively was very good value for us. So I think at this point in time there is no intention to move entirely away from Office, at least on the desktop.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Okay, thank you. Yes, Taiwan.

Michael Lin, Taiwan. Thank you. I would like to share one current case in Taiwan. We are going to procure 20,000 PC's for our government agencies, and distribute them to over twenty counties. With this kind amount of procurement we had negotiations with Microsoft and tried to lower the price for the procurement and to earn more from such procurement. Also, we had pressure from the private sector, especially from IBM, so we planned to set up four key testing centres for usage, for using Star Office and desktop environment. Since the user environment for desktop Linux and Star Office has not matured we still have to wait and see. Our point for building up this kind of testing usage centre is to encourage the movement in the private sector to keep some kind of momentum in the advancement for the development of Linux and Star Office. That is part of it. In addition, since June of last year, we have organised Linux seminars and in different cities, and our objectives are to try to encourage our private sector to get more effort into Linux applications and development. We know, Microsoft is so big, so strong for the computer environment so we really think that if we encourage a good Linux development it would be better for our e-Government because we can get our services; get our computer with more reasonable software. On the procurement of over twenty thousand PCs, we have to spend almost half of the price on the Microsoft windows operating system and for the Microsoft Office software, so that is really quite a problem. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you. Now I am going to move on because I think we have given this a good bashing and for the last two sessions of the Round Table we've been discussing the items that I myself have thought were of interest to the whole audience. I did promise you that we would make time available for you to pick what you wish to talk about from the country reports. I am going first to Ireland because, Keiran, you have something to tell us.

Keiran Coyle, Ireland. Yes that is right. I suppose it really is a case of technology enabling change. As you know, in revenue in Ireland we are probably unique around Europe in that both Customs & Excise and Inland Revenue and VAT are all under the one roof, under the one organisation. But up till recently, there are three separate streams within Revenue dealing with that, and there were in some cases maybe as distinct and as separate as three separate organisations. You will also know from looking at the country reports down the past number of years that we have invested a lot in IT. We had what is known, probably four or five years

ago, a consolidated tax pay process then it became our integrated systems. This was changing the focus from collecting tax on a taxing basis to one of a customer or a citizen or a client basis. You will probably also note at the same time that over the past couple of years we have invested a fair bit of money in our Revenue online service where we allow the customer to deal with Revenue through the internet. And again that has been across tax basis. All this investment has really showed a huge benefit to the organisation over the past year or two where we have re-organised Revenue fairly radically. Our Chairman called it the most radical re-organisation in its eighty years history. We regionalised the office, and every office now becomes a one-stop shop where a customer can go in and deal with tax, customs, vehicle registration, etc. This was greatly facilitated by the IT infrastructure and the developments that we have made over the past five, six, seven years. We anticipated that this change was coming a number of years ago and we put the systems in place so that unlike some organisations where re-structure, re-organisation is hindered by IT, we would claim that we facilitated greatly, and over the past year it has come about very very smoothly.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you. I am going to now move to Switzerland, because when a country such as Switzerland a methodology for implementing e-gov I am sure it is going to run like clockwork! So I wonder if you could tell us what you are doing along those lines, especially with NovIT?

Jean Jacques Didisheim, Switzerland. Thank you. The Federal Government in Switzerland has embarked on a very ambitious programme called NOVE-IT. When this was decided, in '98 formally - we started thinking about it in '97 - I think back then nobody used the word e-gov. NOVE-IT is actually a re-organisation programme of IT within the administration, quite ambitious in terms of scope of the objectives, which I am going to tell you about, and in terms of the timeframe. It has been formally decided in '98 and it will be terminated at the end of 2003, so it will have been a programme of over five years, and in terms of cost of investments, the total investment is about 230 million Swiss francs, which is roughly 150 million Euros. This is for consultancy services and infrastructure, software and hardware only. This is not counting the thousands of hours of internal work. The objectives which have been given by the government were first to increase the efficiency of the overall IT. The objective was to decrease the costs by 23% annually. I will come back to what this means, and whether we have achieved it. Another objective was to increase the flexibility and the effectiveness, and the quality of the IT services. There are some reasons to ask whether these two objectives are not self-contradictory to have a high decrease in cost and to have an increase in effectiveness and quality at the same time. But these were the objectives.

I could speak an hour about it, of course, but I will limit myself to five minutes. To what we have achieved, what we have not really achieved and maybe two interesting points about the way we went about managing this programme. So what have we achieved? What we used to have when we started, each agency had its own IT service, it was sometimes just two or three persons, sometimes it was fifty or a hundred persons, so we concentrated the IT service provider to a maximum of one per Ministry - there are seven Ministries in Switzerland, so they have been put together so the IT people have been taken out of the agency, so it is an out-sourcing but within the administration. This step has been achieved and going with this is a large harmonisation of the infrastructure, the technical infrastructure. Because there was, of course, a very diverse infrastructure in terms of hardware and software, actually about half of this cost of 150 million Euros went into this spot, this is really the big chunk. Another thing which has been achieved was to define the processes, common processes, IT processes but not only for software development and IT operations but also for IT management. We developed a set of common processes that all agencies are supposed to use, they are on a rather generic level, and each agency can develop it further. We have a very comprehensive intranet site where people can go and take these processes. Another step on which our government will decide by the beginning of next week is to go one step further in outsourcing. Up till now as an agency you have to procure your IT services within the administration so the next step is to allow outsourcing with external providers. Software development had been done a long time

ago with external providers, of course, but I am now speaking here of operations, IT operations outsourced. Beginning next year we will be allowed to do it.

We have a central programme management which will be terminated this year, but there are some things which will go on because they are not finished. One essential thing is the introduction of the cost control, cost performance, so that the internal IT service providers must be able to tell how much it costs, what they are doing. This has proved difficult. Actually, thinking about it, all the points which are associated with transparency are difficult to implement. What an agency or a Ministry has to show to the outside world - by the outside world I mean the other Ministries - to show how they work, how efficient, or not efficient, they are. This has proven quite difficult up till now. We are also trying to implement IT controls at the federal level. It is extremely difficult to collect information and to consolidate it at the federal level. So we are still working on this.

Now, what may be interesting is how this implementation happens, and how we measure the success. The 150 million Euros are centrally managed, and the Ministries can call on this money to finance their own implementation project and everybody in central management of the programme expected a rush on this money but this did not happen at first. Why did it not happen? Because in order to obtain this money the Ministries had to show how the projects they wanted to finance with this money would advance the objectives of the programme and, more importantly, how they would compensate investment, that is how this investment would contribute to this objective of reducing on the long-term costs to 23%. We realised this was a very difficult thing to do and only when the central programme management started to develop internal consultancy to help the Ministries to do this exercise, then the people understood what it meant and then it started to work. During the last two years, the Ministry has called upon this money and it will have been almost completely called upon to implement the project.

This was quite an interesting experience, and the central programme management will have to go back to Parliament and tell them, how we have spent the money and whether we have achieved the objective. This is also a very difficult exercise. The point is that the objective was to decrease the cost by 23% in regard to the IT services as they were provided at the start of the programme. The total IT budget is still increasing because there is always more and more which is done with IT. We have actually to take those services which were procured four, five years ago and address those, and show that today we do this with 23% less cost. Probably we will be able to show that this has been achieved but I expect that there will also be some questions whether the measurement is correct or not. So as a conclusion, overall this has been a very difficult exercise. The culture change that has to go with such a programme was not taken seriously enough at the beginning and we realised that if all the energy that many people spent fighting the programme, if this energy had gone into the programme itself it would have been much more of a success. But on the other hand, when we look back where we were five years ago, and where we are today there has been a significant progress and we actually considered this programme as a part of our e-Government strategy. I was very interested by what was said yesterday from the gentleman from Sweden who is not here now (Knut Rexed) when he said you don't have necessarily to be prepared to be the best in e-Government. Actually, we thought that the opposite is true, and we considered that to make our own internal IT to be more efficient and flexible is an essential part of the e-Government strategy!.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Would anyone else here like to have a budget of 23% per annum increase for their IT? Israel.

Nachman Oron, Israel. I wanted to indicate some developments that Israel think are of interest and we should keep on tracking it for years to come. Last year, my friend, Itzik Cohen informed you all the ERP shared systems that are being developed in Israel, and we

elected SAP as the main tool to be doing it. Now, for some probably good reasons, SAP had decided during this year to take the Israeli Shared system and to produce it as a SAP based e-Government ERP shared system product. Now, what are the reasons behind it? First of all, Israel is a relatively small country and you can use it as a very good pilot for other larger countries. Secondly, Israel have a very strong central government; we sometimes call it dictatorial bureaucracy. One officer can take decisions and impose the systems on the other. The third parties of this strong officer is in the Ministry of Finance that means that budgets are allocated to the central systems, and the combination of this, together, I think, made SAP transfer their centre of research for e-Government to Israel. It is based on the SAP portal and also the Business One centre. So it was interesting to follow up and see what happens with this. So far, we can tell you that the first finance and HR and logistics systems have been already tried, they started at the beginning of last month in the Ministry of Science and the Ministry of Finance, and, and it will be interesting to look what is happening forward.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you, Nachman. Does anyone have anything at all to raise from their country reports? Yes, Sweden.

Olov Ostberg, Sweden. I just want to wave a flag on what we are doing. Most countries seem to be working towards having a national entry portal, the portal one-stop shop for everything, and we are actually moving in the opposite direction. Yesterday, Knut Rexed said that we are developing a national materMeta-portal. We do not know what that means but it will be a support to have a multitude of portals which will be co-ordinated. We do not want to have a signature portal but we shall have the same effect that citizens shall have a good service. We want it since we have very independent agencies so we want citizens and industry to be directed to where they can get the best service but not monetary to one portal.. So if you think you know what a Meta-portal is, please tell us!

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you. One more point, before we leave? U.S. please.

Martin Wagner, United States. I think we get a bit confused when we talk too much about technology. Technology is a means to an end, we are trying to re-organise the U.S. government that orientated around a citizen; around a business, rather than agency by agency, programme by programme. That means that you can use the internet to make something look like its one when its really many underneath; but it also means that we have to re-organise a lot of how we do our business processes to be around the end user, the citizen in this case. The technology fools us into thinking that a portal or a meta-portal or not a portal is what we are really trying to do. We are trying to organise service delivery in a very different way in using technology as a means to an end. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Quick point, Benny?

Benny Raab, Israel. I think we would like tell you about a new project where we are creating a file, a medical file for each citizen so that when he goes to one hospital, or when he goes to a clinic he has to, every time, repeat all the information about what happened. Every citizen will have one file; all hospitals and all clinics will be connected, provided that he will identify himself. I think now we have a way of saving a lot of resources; ten hospitals do not need to have the same records ten times. Within a year this, in our opinion, will save a great deal.. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Okay, and a final word, I think appropriately, from our chair, Canada.

John Riddle, Canada. I just want to follow up on Benny Raab. Canada too, is spending a considerable of money on an electronic health record. What I would like to flag is here is a wonderful example of inter-jurisdictional co-operation. There is no point in coming with a Canadian version, or an Israeli version, or a U.S. version. What people want is the portability of a health record anywhere in the world. I just wanted to flag that.

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you very much. We have had, over the last three days free and open discussion on items that have appeared within your country reports. Now, the next step will be that over the next few weeks the information in those country reports will be collated and published as a single report. This was done last year by our past chair, Frank McDonagh. It was very well received and we are hoping to do something fairly similar before Christmas. Meanwhile, of course, all the country reports will be published. They will all be on our website next week.

So, what next? Well, next year I will look forward to another interesting round table session. As to subjects, there are very clear indications that in many cases, the first phases of e-Government are coming to an end, and phase two in many countries is beginning to start. What are we going to have after that? Is it going to be e-Gov three? e-Gov 4? Son of e-Gov? In your country reports, you have already identified m-gov for mobile government. We heard from the U.K. about d-gov, through digital equipment. And we have also heard yesterday, in a keynote speech, about real-time gov and active gov. It worries me to some extent that what we may end up with is just plain e-mad (or mobile-active-digital). We have to wait and see, and perhaps we might get some ideas of which way we are going in our keynote speech this afternoon. I hope so. For now, thank you for all the work you have done in the country reports, thank you for being so willing to speak to them, thank you for all the information you have given us, and I look forward to seeing you all next year.