ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
October 8, 2015
12:00 am CT

Jordan Carter: The recordings have started. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. My name is Jordan Carter from (unintelligible) and the CCWG on enhancing ICANN accountability.

Welcome to Meeting Number 27 of this group, the 8th of October, 2015, 0500 hours. The agenda for our call tonight is in front of us. And the first item is the agenda review.

I have to give (better) so we're going to need to have the possible extra meeting that I described on the email (up to today's) call. And the reason for that is quite simply that the updated public comment analysis on the budget matters should have (unintelligible) today.

And on the inclusion of the affirmation of commitments and the bylaws are simply not going to be able to be done today because the documentation hasn't been completed.

I know that you all realize that we're working at a rapid mad pace, and one of the consequences of mad pace is that they don't quite get met. So we can submit our overall deadline, but we're going to need to have another call on Friday.

So I apologize to those of you who saw that is that it and I celebrate with those of you who find it good news. It doesn't mean that we won't be discussing the budget (power) on this call.

So Cherine, I know in particular you focused on that. If you were hoping to speak about it today only, if that was all you are going to plan to do, you've got a break and (unintelligible) two hour screen.

I'll start though with are there any other adjustments to the agenda? The plan is to move through the community forum comments summaries, led by (Matthew).

And then the community mechanism as single member comments from Avri and Robin. And I think both - I think a second of those would be a very long discussion if we let it. That that may also spill over into another call.

But we will hold over some time to look through the second draft of the individual director approval. I know that Mike has provided an excellent document on that.

And I'm uncertain whether Keith Drasek has given us updated documents if there were any on the (unintelligible) and regular bylaws, but we'll come to those. We can do those and then any other work.

So if anyone has noticed any gaps and comments that hadn't been analyzed but should have been, answered that by joining that agenda item Number 4 - it's 4.

So are people happy with that agenda as it is? Or is there anything missing? Please raise your hand now if something is missing. And if you remember during the call something is missing, we will do an any other business call in the last few minutes of the call. So you can raise it there and it can be and the agenda for the next meeting.

I see no hands up. So let's get straight to it. And I'd like to invite Matthew Shears to take us through a note on the community forum, that 3-page document that was circulated in the format of Google Docs.

Staff, I expect that we've got that on the screen. And if that's not the case, let me know and I can flick you a quick PDF through the Skype channel. There we go. Okay, so Matthew the floor is yours. Please go ahead. Please keep it really tight terms of timing of the introductory remarks so we had as much time to hustle through a discussion of your conclusions. Thanks.

Matthew Shears: Yes thanks Jordan. Can you hear me all right because I've got a relatively limited bandwidth here? Is that - can you hear me?

Jordan Carter: You're in low fi, but you're...

((Crosstalk))

Jordan Carter: Clearly.

Matthew Shears: Okay so the document that you see before you is not actually the document that I just circulated to the list, which is a PDF entitled Community Forum WP1, which is a PDF of the approval doc.

What you're seeing on the screen at the moment is actually the first cut out assessing the - or looking at the various elements that were in the public comment session - the tool.

So I'm not sure if staff has received that and can't put that up. But let me just make a couple of general comments and hopefully that will be available to put up.

So what we did in the suffix is we looked at (unintelligible) community forum PC tool. But we also looked at the Google Doc that we had the working parts had been working on the (insulets) from the transcripts and the (LEDT).

I went through the transcripts. I wasn't at the LA meeting, but we've incorporated those as much as possible. And also the input from the list on email.

I think that the most - the key points is that overall there is a substantial support for the purpose and function of the forum as it was described going into - in the public comment - consultation Version 2.

So basically encouraging discussion and sharing of information prior to exercising community power. And also its place in the petition discussion decision process that we've outlined therein.

But one of the props that, you know, one of the key comments that we've made also is that whether we needed to really highlight the open and

transparent multi-stakeholder (matrix) or the forum as the key elements in this community (meeting).

There was also general support for a forum that was open to broader participation. And that the processes should be open and transparent and the output should be documented.

The (unintelligible) however, as you all know, significant number of comments of areas that needed refinement. I've kind of broken those down on the document that you don't see in front of you into better sub-headers. And I'll just go through those.

They're kind of in order of how the forum would be set up or work (unintelligible) triggers permanent (stay) period. This is a composition of representation, standing outcomes, what would happen with contradictory outputs, whether that moderation timescales cost relationship and decision making and relationships to the proposal for a public accountability forum.

So one of the questions that a couple of commenters asked for was what - how the community forum would be initiated and what the triggers were. We haven't really dealt with that or addressed that, although there was some discussion from LA on what that might be, particularly in one of the breakout sessions.

A number of comments question whether or not the forum should be a permanent or on an ad hoc basis. This is one of the most useful comments is whether that should be a standing panel that's called on an as necessary basis.

So the questions about periodicity, in other words, when would this occur? Should it occur alongside ICANN meetings? But a number of commenters

also suggested that still we need to ad hock new things. And there should be virtual sessions between physical face-to-face forum meetings.

And there were concerns about the complexity - given the complexity of some of the issues, they may have that document. You can go down to Number 3. There's where I am at the moment.

And so there were questions about how much - how long these sessions should take and how many of them would there be given that there are differences in complexity (unintelligible) exercised.

On composition and representation, many questions about whether or not the individuals who would be the forum would be chosen from a safe candidate elected by the FOs, ACs or both.

There are also issues about term limit, whether or not there would be a forum of NomComs. There were other questions that related to whether or not the forum would have access to legal counsel and whether nor not the CCWG?

And somebody probably writes (unintelligible) said that we shouldn't be talking about membership for forum. So there was a comment also about whether or not the forum should be on a kind of voluntary - used on a voluntary or mandatory basis.

If you go down - if you have scroll control, you can go to 5. A number of the commenters, and I think this is probably one of the most interesting questions was whether or not the forum should have any standing in terms of any outputs.

And whether or not the forum should be a mandatory part of exercising community output. And I'm not sure that we actually got to that point in the proposal itself, but it's certainly something that merits further discussion.

On the items with the outcomes, one of the questions was asked a number of times. And whether or not those outcomes would have to be taken into account or accounted for in some way when it came to exercising the decision making taking part of exercising the powers.

There were concerns about contradictory input. So - and how they would be taken into account. So if one - if there were a clear divergence used within the forum, (over the) invitations of those if the outcomes or outputs of the forum would have any kind of standing.

So the suggestion is that the forum would need to be moderated by a mutual panel or person and to make sure that views were heard and to ensure that the forum didn't become just a place for airing views and not necessarily finding a way, a point of common consensus or a point of the ability to move forward on a particular issue that was under discussion.

A couple of concerns also raised about the timescales. There was I think some general concerns raised about the overall question and decision. But the forum, I think the (thumbtack) for the issue is quite - of the issue that might be under discussion as to whether or not some of them have greater time to resolve or to address. And how many meetings it would take to air those concerns or challenges.

The commenters queried whether the forum would need funding and what the size of representation would be and what would be reasonably expected of ICANN if funding were to (to be) provided.

And again, the question is related to what's the relationship between the forum and the (NCM). (It can use) a mechanism decision making. In what way do findings, if we're having findings or outcomes from the forum, impact or contribute to that decision making. But there were no suggestions, explicit suggestions made as to how that might occur. But it certainly was a concern.

And then finally, a couple of questions - one or two raised as to what the relationship was with the other accountability forum, which was a proposal by (unintelligible) one of the advisors. And whether or not it did the same thing. Or whether or not they would be separate given the possible lengths and complexity of the issues being discussed in the community forum itself.

Jordan should I just keep going and then we can come to questions at the end? Is that fine?

Jordan Carter: Yes. That's the right approach (Matthew). Sorry, I was trying to get myself off of mute.

Matthew Shears: So I think it's fair to say that there was few areas of divergence. Probably the biggest one and the one that came up certainly from the discussion in LA was really what should - what kind of role should the forum have in the decisions or outcomes. And what role should it play if it's going to be more than just a discussion forum.

So there are a couple of I think options for the CCWG to consider and take into account possibly in a rewrite as the community forum part of the proposal.

One of the interesting things was the, again the first one related to the role of function. One of the interesting things that came out to the transcripts for LA was the model that was proposed during the breakout sessions on Day 2 where (unintelligible) break through - break out groups how the powers would work.

And there was a proposal about the community forum could actually be as a tool for achieving consensus amongst the SOs and ACs on the exercise of a particular (RFI) (unintelligible).

So what I've done in the paper there is extract that particular paragraph or two from the transcript explaining. And this was taken in the context of an objection to the bylaws change.

And it does describe the (census) of whether or not the forum could be used as a place to achieve consensus on a particular part on the user's particular power. And I think that's an interesting approach for the forum to probably - for the working group to consider.

It did not really come up much at all as a mechanism for finding this in the comments or elsewhere. So I think it's - it is the different forums than I've personally have anticipated.

And the only comment that I think that I made there in the (unintelligible) is that it seems that, you know, the original role of the forum is a discussion information sharing space has been (sponsored) by a tool for building consensus.

It probably somewhere there probably is still a need for discussion and information phase for building that kind of understanding and sharing

information between the SOs and the ACs and other parties in the forum itself and (unintelligible) consideration.

With regards to the annual ad hock, if the forum (unintelligible) also efficient in their support for a particular issue or challenge, they're probably going to have to recognize that these (talks) arise at any particular time.

And that kind of ad hock nature of the challenge does not suggest that some kind of standing committee forms. When it's called upon is probably a wise approach.

And this also led me to wondering whether or not we might face a situation where there might be multiple challenges or multiple processes ongoing. And hopefully not certainly, but it could arise that there could be some ongoing at the same time.

The composition representation issue is (unintelligible). Thank you. (Unintelligible) but considering some of the other questions around representation and composition and the world of the SOs and the ACs they're in and the number of representatives, et cetera, it might make sense for us to model the forum committee or whatever we're going to call it on, you know, you know well which is the working group model, a cross community working group model.

But I think that you'd probably have to consider that more. That would allow us to talk and review representation terms appointments and things like that to be taken care of in the charter for the CCWG if that's the way that we're able to go.

In terms of the forum, obviously one of the (unintelligible) consensus, which was modeled and explored in LA. Otherwise I think it's difficult to imagine how the outcomes of the forum could be weighted to have a role in the actual decision making processes for petition discussion prior to that.

So I think that we may have an option - we may have a choice, which would be to consider it a tool for reaching consensus or to consider it in the forum that it was originally considered, which was for it to be a discussion and information tool.

And then moderation outcomes, I think it is reasonable to think that we might need some kind of mutual moderation given the complexity of the issues and also the need to ensure the documentation.

And on timescales it may well be something that we might want to leave to the discussion of the forum committee or working group or whatever the structure might be given that different issues may take longer to resolve and address.

So I hope that came across relatively clearly. That will be all at the moment. Thank you.

Jordan Carter: Thanks. And (Mathieu), are you happy to serve as the moderator of this discussion and manage the queue?

Matthew Shears: Sure. Thanks Jordan. So I'm assuming (unintelligible) we have (Greg) and (Tujani) in the queue. So...

Jordan Carter: We've also got me in the queue.

((Crosstalk))

Jordan Carter: And so I was wondering if I could go first since I was the first with my hand up? Thank you for that summary (Mathieu). And I'm worried a little bit. I think that we've got a massive and amazing capacity in this very interesting community.

And to complicate things that don't need to be complicated at times. And to me it feels like this is one of those times. And the insight behind having a forum of this sort does not create a place that would become an institutionalized, bureaucratized, representationized group of people making decisions about stuff or having some kind of imprimatur to express their view at the community about a particular thing.

The original design, which I think was represented on K in the proposal, brief as it was, was to write an open forum for discussion of a proposed exercise of the community power before that consensus voting process happened within the SOs and ACs.

In other words, before the SOs and ACs started making their decision. And that model is very valuable for (unintelligible). It doesn't incur any obligations. It doesn't require any complicated accountability backstop to the participation of the decisions that it makes or the reporting or the recording.

And so, you know, it - I think that Jordan's suggestion of describing our (unintelligible) as a process is part of the dialogue is important. My fear is that if we turn it into a month long set of meetings that have to be run through every time the community power considers, we're making all of the accountability powers (unintelligible) fundamentally irrelevant in (model).

And so from my perspective as a participant is that this has to stay light. The only reason to have any kind of representative at G&S is to make sure that the perspectives being aired out come from around and across the ICANN community.

And I'm sure we'll get that because of the requirement we've seen that there be an open forum. That anyone can watch (unintelligible) CCWG. So the only point of having any representatives is to make sure that voice of them are heard.

And the further we go down the idea of documenting or trying to have multiple discussions to come to consensus, I just strongly oppose that direction as relevant to this as a participant.

Don't change the fact that the consensus we come to are all (unintelligible) faithfully. But I just wanted to put my view out there. Thanks.

Matthew Shears: Yes thanks Jordan. I personally agree with you that that is what we should be of. So thanks for that. Next we have (Greg).

Jordan Carter: Greg you may be on mute or asleep. But we definitely can't hear you on the line.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I think I fat fingered the - my mute button. As I was saying to myself, I agree with a lot of the things that Jordan said, as long as it keeps decision making process the same as we have in the second draft.

I think the forum needs to be lightweight, convened through, you know, online and telephonic methodologies and not turned into some sort of traveling tent party. That would be, you know, far too cumbersome.

And I think however if we change to a consensus driven approach, which I assume requires some deliberation in order to come to consensus. Then I think the community forum either morphs into a consensus building place, which is really not the community forum anymore. It's really something different.

Or maybe it exists as a separate place, kind of like the public forum for - so the broadest views can be expressed. Or maybe it falls away entirely. That's probably not necessary to discuss under the community forum having a rather large discussion about the community will make its decisions, whatever package the community is in, members, designators, huddled masses (degree) is free.

But the comm - in our particular design of the community forum, you know, it forms a particular purpose, which I think we need to preserve. Thanks.

Matthew Shears: Thanks. Perhaps, you know, having not been in LA, perhaps I am giving too much comment into the discussion around the consensus and using that as a model.

And clearly we (map) that the references for the model SOs and ACs have outlined. That definitely is my preference as well. I was just trying to capture what the diversity of views that had been expressed. So thanks for that. Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you very much. Good morning everyone.

Jordan Carter: Tijani we've lost your audio. And just after you saying good morning.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Do you hear me now? Hello? Do you hear me?

Jordan Carter: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, so I said that I agree a lot of things - with a lot of things that Jordan said. I want to remind you that the forum is mandatory looked. It will be, as you said, as everyone said, it will be a place for discussion, for exchange of views.

But discussion and the exchange of views means helping out each other. So it will be not a consultant's place. It will be a preparation for perhaps something to come to closure if you want.

We all agree that it is not a decision making body. We want it to be simple, yes. Not complicated, yes, but all the complicated standards mean not to organized.

So why we spoke about appointing members? It is because we want it to exist at least, because if there is no members, perhaps nobody will come. And it would be a problem because we put it in our proposal that there is three phases in our process. First the petition, second the discussion and third the decision. So the discussion is mandatory and the forum is mandatory.

As Jordan said, no obligation. Yes, no obligation, but do we mean that no obligation if nobody comes to the forum? It is mandatory in our process, in our loop.

So in my point of view, we have to stress the fact that this is mandatory. And the forum has to meet virtually or face-to-face, it is rather an issue. But it would tend to meet before going to the decision making. Thank you.

Matthew Shears: Tijani thank you very much. I think one of the - that is one of the questions that was asked was whether or not the forum should be a mandatory part of the discussion - decision making process.

And whether or not participation should be mandatory. I think that the predominance of comments said that participation should not be mandatory. But thank you for that comment.

Is there anybody else on the Adobe or on the phone lines who would like to comment? Is there missing in this - and I would like to also just comment to Jorge who just put together the initial listing of the various comments on the community forum in the PC tool.

And what I had tried to do was to capture those comments and put those in the areas needing assignments. So thank you Jorge for that initial work. And again, apologies for not getting the document back to everyone earlier before the discussion.

What's come across - Alan, please go ahead. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm just getting mixed signals here. The concept of mandatory, but we're not actually saying who goes there and what happens if someone doesn't show up. I'm not quite sure how we're going to make this work. Thank you.

Matthew Shears: I completely understand. The issue was whether or not it should be a mandatory part of the process. As to whether or not people should turn up I think was a little bit different question.

You know, so far as we sit, there's a part of that process should be - it probably should be - it would be a necessary thing if it's a petition or triggering requires it.

But again I think that we to probably look at what the triggering mechanisms are for the community before we go back and look at the (unintelligible) again to see if that needs (unintelligible).

To the point of whether or not this is a body or, we still have to resolve the issue of how it calls and what the standing entity and, you know, how it's actually put into place and port into being. But I completely agree that it should not be complicated and it shouldn't (unintelligible) increase the complexity of the model.

Any other comments or thoughts?

Man 2:   It looks like Tijani is trying to talk.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: (Unintelligible).

Matthew Shears: Yes Tijani, yes -- sorry.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. I would like to say that if the forum is not mandatory -- if the discussion is not mandatory -- several things will change. For example, my community said we can live with and do (unintelligible) member a call proposed only if the forum is mandatory because the RSC who wants to recall

the (unintelligible) will not come to the forum and explain why. We will not accept it at all.

So the forum is mandatory to (unintelligible) power for us. Thank you.

Matthew Shears: Understood. Thank you Tijani.

Jordan, would you (unintelligible)?

Jordan Carter: Well thank you Matthew for taking us through that, and thank you to you and to Jorge for doing the preparations here.

Look, what I heard in the comments and in the discussion is an understanding that the dialogue process comes first here, that we'll not try to listen to the consensus-making body that would be required to make decisions for whatever model we end up choosing.

And I think though that the real key thing to get the CCWG to focus on in Dublin is whether we stick with that light model or whether we do something else.

And I haven't heard anyone suggest that we make that dialogue process as part of exercising any of the community (unintelligible) is optional. So I think we can take that (Lauri) off the table to (Yami). But I know what people mean by mandatory in different terms and I know that's not it.

And so I think we can probably - if people agree with me (unintelligible) that the key thing that needs to be sorted out, and then we can draw the CCWG's attention primarily to that and mention towards the others.

And another thing that I wonder whether might be useful is just in terms of - because we're going to have to reach after a report Dublin, right. So it may be helpful to start working on answering all these questions in a way that it's in line with keeping it wide ways (sic). That's something to have in our back pocket and after Dublin unless there's a sudden of events.

So thank you for that one and keep thinking about it folks. Look at it in the list and add any comments on the Google Doc, whatever, and we'll get there on this.

And the only other thing I was going to suggest - and this document didn't have that problem so I'll save it for the next one.

The next one is now. We're on to Item 2B in our agenda; the Community Mechanism SO Members out of the report.

There's a document that's been prepared to by a cast of characters, and I believe that Avri was instrumental in doing it.

Who is presenting that? (Unintelligible) and Robin, you guys certainly started playing this together. Have you agreed who's going to do that?

And while you let us know about that, Staff could you - oh, we're all on scroll control. You don't need to reread what's in the (unintelligible) so you can automatically skip the first two pages of that PBS. You might want to have it on the top of Page 3 and get PBS ready to go.

And Robin, I will hand the floor over to you for a quick tour. Just before I do, I know that I feel a bit of frustration myself about wanting to actually debate

the merits of this model and these (unintelligible). And I'm sure that others of you may feel to hash.

And I think it's really important that this call is not the time to do that. That the task we have to do is to make sure that we've analyzed the public comments that came in and join out (sic) where the (unintelligible) style, what needs clarifying and what (unintelligible), and get people focused on what we need to discuss in Dublin. So that's the job here.

If we turn it into a debate about the merits otherwise, and they will come up. But if that's just the primary focus we'll get there. If we turn the primary focus of this conversation into an argument about which one is better, we're going to be here all night.

So that's my plea at the start to consider your interventions in this light and making sure the comments have been registered and taken (unintelligible) and the analysis which we've (unintelligible) is correct.

Robin, over to you.

Robin Gross: Thanks. This is Robin Gross. Can you hear me okay?

Jordan Carter: Quite quietly. If you're able to move a mic closer to your mouth that would be great, but we can hear you; the audio is working.

Robin Gross: Okay, it's kind of late here. (Unintelligible).

Okay, so let me go through this -- some of the highlights here. So the analysis of the public comment on the model is that the selected in the second draft

proposal -- the member model -- that we would choose (sic) back on that including the conversations in LA and subsequent to that.

So we had about 51 public comments that was this issue. Forty-eight percent of the commenters were concerned with the model. And that's about half; that's noteworthy.

Thirty-eight percent of the commenters said they agreed with the model, roughly 19% of the commenters said they disagreed with the model. And 66 of those in divergen were concerned with the voting structure we had set out earlier.

The received (unintelligible) comments were neutral, 10% of our commenters discussed the preference of the designator model, another 13% expressed a preference for (unintelligible).

Jordan Carter: Robin, Robin, someone - sorry to interrupt you. But first of all, either there's a clicking or clanging noise on your line or someone else has an open line. (Unintelligible), there are a number of people commenting in the Chat that they can't hear you.

So my first request is for everyone else to really solidly make sure that you're muted. The second thing is Robin, if you can do anything to hold that mic up to your mouth that would be great.

Robin Gross: Well I'm going into the computer now, so maybe I should call back on a phone line. That's the only thing I can think of to get a better audio connection. It might take me a couple of seconds to get back into the call, right; calling on a landline.

Man 4:   You're fine right now.

Robin Gross: Okay, well let me keep going then and I'll just - hopefully my neighbors will
                  forgive me.

                  Okay, so there were some areas of consensus. There was support and
                  appreciation for the enforceability of the community powers. There was
                  agreement that the sole-member model was an improvement from the first
                  draft reference model -- the SOAC membership model.

                  The CWG Stewardship group had confirmed that the powers were in
                  conformance with their requirements. There was significant support for the
                  principle of the community mechanism we used to enforce the community
                  powers. There was consensus that we should be as restrained as possible in the
                  degree or the structure or the organizational changes that are required to create
                  these powers.

                  There was consensus to organize the mechanism along the same lines as the
                  community basically in lines with the compatible SOAC structures.

                  And there was consensus about the importance of having an open community
                  forum for the deliberation of the community powers.

                  So that's where we were in widespread agreement. Now there are areas where
                  there were calls for further clarification and refinement.

                  So first would be the first retail needed surrounding the community forum,
                  and we just went over a lot of that in that view.

And a number of commenters said they couldn't support or in many cases even determine a position until more detail has been fleshed out since we haven't provided enough information with what is in the second draft for many commenters to even be able to make the decision for or against.

You know, there were more calls for simplicity in the model in its explanation, and there was some concern about meeting the minimum number of SOs and ACs to participate in the model for it to even work.

Okay, and then there were a number of areas where there was concern and divergence (sic). So there was lack of consensus on whether the community should take decisions to formal voting or if we should move to establish a consensus process or (unintelligible).

There was also a lack of consensus on the voting allocations between the SOs and the ACs. A number of comments expressed concern about the leasing (sic) of authority and influence of the SO community for example. Most commenters on this issue were expressing a concern - or excuse me - expressing support for voting allocations along the lines of ICANN's existing Board structure.

There was also a lack of consensus on the composition of the community within the model -- I mean the role of the Advisory Committee. So a number of comments that indicated concern over a possible duality of the governmental role in the model, and comments/questions/concern that providing votes (unintelligible) would fail to meet NCIA requirements.

There were comments expressed over the extent of the changes required in ICANN's existing structure to create the model.

As you noted, the proposal from the Board that enforceability for narrow community powers could be provided for by (unintelligible) the tracing to enforce fundamental bylaws, to use that process instead of community mechanisms.

Okay, so those are the areas of concern and divergence. And so we've got a few options to consider.

The first option to consider is (unintelligible)...

Jordan Carter: Sorry Robin, Robin, Robin? It's Jordan here; sorry. I would like to suggest that we deal with just a quick queue here to ask people whether in those three areas you've covered -- consensus areas, clarification areas and concerned divergence areas -- whether there are any key points missing. So whether from other people's reading of the public comments, there are some missing steps for whether they think it's a reasonable representation.

And if we can sort that out, then we can move on with the options bets and then the debate about the options.

Robin Gross: Okay, sounds good. Let's see who we have in the queue here.

I see Alan. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm just a bit confused about the percentages you have in the first section because I don't know which are mutually exclusive from the others. The first three numbers which I would have thought added up, added up to 105%. And I don't know what 66% of the vote is divergent means. I don't know if 66% of what of which number.

So probably this isn't the right forum for you to revise those numbers, but if you can send us something with some real numbers so we can understand which - how these are (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Well let me just explain; I can just explain how those numbers got (unintelligible) now and maybe that will help clear that up.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Robin Gross: So when the Staff went through public comments tool, they would note if there was particular - if a comment raised a concern. They would put a one down in that box. And if there was a comment where somebody agreed, they would put a one down in that box.

And so then they went and tallied that all up -- all of the comments on this issue. And so that's where those numbers come from directly from the public comments tool.

And then your question about the 66% of the divergent/concern the voting structure, that is from those who disagreed with the model that it's 66% of those who disagreed with the model I believe.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Robin Gross: Yes, okay. So is there anyone else who had any other questions about that, or Alan did you have any more on that?

Alan Greenberg: No, I was just trying to get clarity on that. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Okay it looks like Jordan is next.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Robin. I just wanted to say on the record that I thought that the areas of consensus, the areas of needing clarification and the areas of concern and divergent did match what I saw in public comments. It seemed like a fair representation to me.

And I think the numbers are reasonable but maybe vary a bit that we went afterwards, and (unintelligible) feel I always like to read the comments after and count them.

Robin Gross: Okay, so did anyone else have anything that they wanted to add on the areas of consensus, refinement, lack of consensus, or should I just dive into the options?

Okay, well I don't see any more hands at the moment, so I will dive into the options.

So first is the overall question of do we continue to evolve our sole-member model addressing the specific points of concern that have been raised in the public comments in maintaining the membership model overall. That's one option - and I know these options are not mutually exclusive.

The second would be to explore how maximum legal enforcement can be achieved for our desired community powers under an empowered designator model, and then maybe we can compare, you know, a comparison of how far we can get with the different models.

Another possibility, another option, is to decide which powers, if any, can be enforced under the (unintelligible) based model, and if they are sufficient to community powers and other requirements.

Since we're going at the (mam) rather late in the process as it's come up rather late in the process, there's still a number of things that we would need to work through on that.

For example, we would need to ascertain whether the community is entering into binding arbitration without personhood, we would need to ascertain whether the community has standing import (sic) to bring a matter without personhood, and we need to ascertain whether ICANN found by a binding arbitration to decline to enter into it or does it otherwise attempt to frustrate an arbitration process.

We have to ascertain the level of personal or other possibly financial risks that community members might undertake if they try to exercise or enforce any of the community powers needing to ascertain whether this meets the CWG stewardship requirements, the NTIA requirements, and any other external requirements.

And we would need to ascertain whether the (mem) meets all of our required stress tests, so there's a lot of work that would need to be done on that option.

And there are options for sub issues within the model. We talked in a number of these groups about possibly moving away from voting and report the consensus model for (unintelligible) making, and put the (unintelligible) of the community forum.

We need to consider an option of consensus definition depending upon the absence of recommendations or advice again or how that would be treated.

I think we need to reconsider voting allocations between the SOs and ACs to be more in line with the balance of appointment through the ICANN Board given the comments that we've received.

I think we need to reconsider the role of the ACs in the model community forum to some of the ACs to non-voting, non-decisional and rather advisory only.

And this is also a very important option. We need to consider determining a fixed understanding of who which SOs and which ACs will vote or otherwise make decisions in the community forum before decisions can be made by our group about which model to finally propose into two parts of that (unintelligible) are interdependent.

So I know I just threw a lot out there at folks to queue on, but we've got a lot of meat on the table. So let's just start taking the queue, and if anybody wants to weigh in on some of these options and (unintelligible) some preferences or suggestions about how to proceed that would be great.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Robyn. And to make this easier, if it's possible for you Robin, could you - would you mind giving your number to Staff so they can phone you on the public phone network and so your voice will be much clearer for any ongoing discussion. Are you okay with that?

Robin Gross: Yes, that's no problem.

((Crosstalk))

Jordan Carter: Okay. So I think the person to do that too would be Brenda. If you can send Brenda a private chat with your phone number, she'll go get a call out to you ASAP.

And in the meantime, I'll just take a query that was out in the Chat. Rosemary asked in Item 4 on the sub-issue thing considered determining (unintelligible) who (unintelligible) in the community forum? Yes, that needs to not read community forum; it means in the mechanism.

Okay, so I feel they're saying that there are lots of questions to be asked.

And while Robin is getting a dial-out, I will just share this to ask are there other big questions or matters that the CCWG needs to discuss in relation to the model? We've got the basic question of the actual enforcement model, if you like, under penning (sic) that we need to resolve; we know we need to resolve that.

And that's captured there with three kind of questions. We've got the decision approach moving (unintelligible) towards consensus. We've got the relative weight of influence within the decision in Option (Unintelligible) number 2. We've got, you know, the participation or not on decisions by the various ACs and SOs. And we've got a kind of another question beneath that in number four.

So the first question I'd like to ask you is are there any other big calls on this topic area that arrive through the public comments or through the discussion in LA that we need to push back to the CCWG for decision in Dublin or a specific one?

I can't think of any; I'll tell you that straight off. I'm only one person and we're a multi-stakeholder here as Fadi would say.

Kavouss, I will take your contribution. Your hand is up. And Kavouss, we definitely cannot hear you, so if you are speaking there is merely silence.

Okay, well when Kavouss comes on line through whatever means that would be good.

Quick fire responses to my question if people would be helpful. Are there any other issues that we need to get the CCWG to focus on or are the main issues of this question all here. Saying yes or no would be helpful.

And using - if we could try the (text-and-crosses) in the room, but that doesn't seem to work all that well. We could try and do multiple frames (sic) at the same time if you'd like. And you could just type in the Chat whether you think the questions are covered. If you think there's a big gap, we need to identify it tonight.

Another hand -- hooray. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. You said for decision in Dublin, I was hoping actually the CCWG could be considering some of these things before Dublin but maybe we've run out of time on that.

I would say as we're going to pose these questions to the CCWG we have to give them - replace the percentages with the maximum number of comments in each direction because when you start taking 51 comments and then 19% of it and then 66% of that, you come down to pretty small numbers. And that's not reflected when you just look at the raw percentages.

So I think we need to make sure that we're presenting the numbers so decisions can be made without hours of discussion. Thank you.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Alan. I personally 100% agree with you. I think we should, first of all, prioritize -- and hope we'll do this at the CCWG next week assuming there is one -- which of these set of issues that have (unintelligible) up from across this public comment review do need to be dealt with at Dublin in the extended amount of time that we're going to have there, and which of them can be resolved by the working parties in preparing a kind of a central proposal for the CCWG to agree with or send back. That working methodology I think is going to make more sense.

But yes, we're not going to have 85 decisions to take in Dublin and suddenly make (unintelligible); you're quite right.

Alan Greenberg: But the point I was making is to the extent we do have decisions, we have to make sure to present simple cases and nothing that will require deep analysis.

Jordan Carter: Yes, I concur with you. I hope (unintelligible).

Kavouss, your hand is up still and do you have audio and would like to add your contribution here?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, my hand is up again, but it's not again. It was up (unintelligible) but the line was disconnected, so please (unintelligible) as my hand is again. It is only one time that I've asked for the floor during this session.

Can you confer with me please?

Jordan Carter: Yes, I understand and agree with you.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you very much. Don't interrupt me when I am speaking. Please do not interrupt me when I'm speaking, and that would be very very kind of you.

I have seen this problem with the voting approach -- this difficulty -- because of these (unintelligible). GACs do not participate in the voting. One of the SO may not participate (unintelligible) -- T out of 7. Then you go to any threshold, you will come up with out of 29 you all currently weighted may be only 10 will be able to change the fundamental bylaw and that is not correct.

And second, voting means that you provide power to some of the Advisory Community that currently they don't have any decision-making power, and that is why ICANN (unintelligible) as change of the balance within the private sectors and governments in these notes.

I am not in favor of either as proposals, but we have to address this issue. Why not we go to the consensus and we don't need to discuss what the consensus means? Consensus has a procedure in every SO and AC (unintelligible) do it. Even (Unintelligible) for instance, ITF, has its own consensus; GNSO has its own consensus.

Why not we go to the consensus? It's a difficulty that we (unintelligible); thank you.

Jordan Carter: Thank you Kavouss for that intervention.

For myself, I would just take the liberty to add that there are only two reasons why you would need to "voting". One reason is if you give different levels of influence to different decision makers, so if you - and in our (unintelligible) we did, so that was one reason we needed voting.

And the other reason is if you want to allow each decision-maker to split its decision. So if you want to, let's say, the ccNSO cast most of its support on one side of the decision but recognize the an RT on another.

Those are the only two ways we do it. So if we don't need either of those then we can move to a consensus model of which I assume you mean. And each SO or AC makes a decision internally according to its process and says what it is. And if everyone is align with the decision, then the (unintelligible) gets exercised.

So that is option to sub-issue number one. That question is on the table here for resolution, so it has been successfully (unintelligible).

Avri, your next on the queue.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking; hopefully I can be heard.

The first thing I wanted to say was just, certainly, we can add the absolute numbers in, and that provides a good check on the percentages given. And yes it is did show such things like 66% maybe in two answers out of three.

So certainly, you know, I just wanted to say that in the next pass following this, you know, it makes sense to put the numbers in.

Not to get into any of the issues I think it's important that we're going to have to make a decision of what path we want to go down.

I certainly, you know, I support the position that Kavouss took on let's look at replacing consensus I mean replacing voting with consensus and in fact have discussed that on the list.

And I think to answer this question was it (Jonathan) that in defining consensus we would actually have to define.

You know (Jordan) just presented the case of, you know, unanimity of full consensus You know perhaps we would want to discuss some other models of consensus, you know, that don't include voting but like we've sort of done in the CCWG is how many objections, you know, is it one objection is enough to stop something, you know, then that looks like a veto or is it two?

Now yes you're counting and such but it's not people have to vote it's just you have to feel strong enough to object.

But in any case that is a secondary question that has to sort of be looked at after we decide I think what path we're going down.

I think it's very difficult but it could be done that we go down all three paths and see where we get to but I don't know that that leads us to making decisions anytime soon.

So I think we're going to have to deal with, you know, understanding maybe that's what the elephant is, is which of these paths are we going down? What are we exploring? Are we exploring the fixing of the model that we've submitted for comment or are we moving to one of two other different models

and exploring those? So I think that's the other thing I wanted to bring up. Thanks.

Jordan Carter: Thanks, and Avri. And the next person with their hand up is Alan. Alan you have - go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. A couple of very quick comments and we're getting dangerously debating the issues but I'm going to go ahead anyway.

Jordan Carter: I'm going to say if you can resist do because soon I'll have to cut off the debate...

Alan Greenberg: I will...

Jordan Carter: ...if we just descend totally into that.

Alan Greenberg: I will just raise some issues that we need to decide if we're going to go down the path that Kavouss was talking about.

Number one I have no problem at all about each AC and SO making decisions according to their own process by consensus or whatever their own rules are and coming out with a yes no.

We decided earlier that we would allow fractional votes. I don't mind reversing that other people might but anyway.

But that doesn't answer the issue of once each AC and SO has come to a conclusion how do we meld them together and decide whether the community has made a decision or not?

Do we need unanimity? Is one objection from one AC and SO enough to kill it? That part is not clear because we do not have right now any mechanism that we already use to establish consensus among the community. So that's the elephant in the room on that perspective.

The other thing I wanted to mention is Kavouss said something about, you know, right now ACs don't have decision making capability they only advise.

Well SOs don't have decision making capabilities either they only recommend. The board is the only group right now that has any decision making capability. So we are going down a new path regardless of what details we end up with. Thank you.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Alan. And the next person with their hand up is Greg. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, it's Greg Shatan for the record. Avri and Alan said a lot of what I want to say but a couple of other points.

You know clearly I think one of the reasons we're discussing consensus or what this thing that we're currently calling consensus is that, you know, the concerns that were raised about potentially disenfranchising or leaving out sectors of the community in the voting model or it seems that not all SOs and ACs would kind of sign up to vote in the single member and that therefore they would just be kind of left out.

And the best that they could do would be to kind of make their views known in the community forum, that didn't seem to be sufficient.

So exploring a methodology by which no one is left out I think is the essential nature of the task that we're going at.

That said the idea that each group would come to a decision by whatever methodology it comes to that decision which is some form of consensus typically among all the SOs and ACs I assume that's the case but each one has their own personal definition of consensus and they use it although, you know, frankly the GNSO Council if that's the decision making body does not operate by consensus they operate by a voting structure.

So but in each case each of the SOs and ACs with issue for something that was either a guess, or an advice in favor of, or an advice against and then we would tote those up and, you know, have to deal with abstentions of course.

And, you know, the question is either, you know, is that - do we require unanimity what about abstentions, what about noisy abstentions in other words, you know, people saying that they're participating in the process but they abstained from the voting.

You know if we say it's unanimous then, you know, of course a single holdout can stop everything from happening.

And if we don't deal with consensus then we have the issue of, you know, how strongly, you know, we want to - we worry about whether there should be a minority view and when issuing, you know, the issue of community powers.

So it's - I don't think what we're talking about really can be called consensus per se because we're coming up with decisions from each group and ultimately counting those in some fashion.

So I think calling it consensus we either have unanimity or we have something where there's, you know, some who are not agreeing with the rest but unless we're going to engage in a consensus building process among the communities I wouldn't really call it consensus at all. Thanks.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Greg. And as I said and this will acknowledge the temptation is strong the power is strong for us to get into the debate.

And a few issues that have been teased out already in the discussion do add some points that need to be teased out.

I'm sure you can put a big block of text into the chat before it needs to be taken into account under number three in the giant elephant in the room section.

And I am I really strongly hope that we can keep the discussion and the three people on the list back to the issue of are there other key items that need to be determined here? And so back to the speaking list, Cherine the floor is yours.

Cherine Chalaby: (Jordan) thank you. I don't want to add more to what you said. I've put in the chat what I think my view the list of items that needs to be covered. So I would appreciate if those are in the comments in the papers themselves. Thank you.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Cherine. At least an interim point I'm going to add a comment to the Google Doc on those and ascertain moments that has that block of text from you so that we just make sure that it's there in the records and being worked on in the Google Doc. So I've done that now.

Cherine Chalaby: Thanks.

Jordan Carter: And thank you. And Tijani your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: For other powers...

Man: We can't hear you Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You don't hear me now?

Man: Now we do.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Do you hear me? Okay thank you. Thank you, so I repeat I am also for consensus against voting. And I think there is several kinds of consensus for some powers will need full consensus means one objection we kill the petition. For others we may have other kind of consensus such as two objectors or three objectors extra.

So it is possible to do everything with consensus in my point of view because consensus will include everyone.

And what we have to discuss yes we have to discuss very deeply the issue of abstention if we go with consensus because there is a lot of options in this case and I think that it must be discussed very deeply. Thank you.

Jordan Carter: Thank you Tijani. And okay. And so I'm going to make a last call on my question which you may think is a bit of (unintelligible) which is whether there are any other major items?

This isn't at the end of the road. If you come up with another major item that needs to be dealt with here in terms of CCWG on this question you can raise it on the email list, wonderful tool email.

And on that basis having talked through the analysis of the public comments having agreed I think in the call that we've got the areas of consensus, disagreement and clarification.

And having agreed what the key points that need to be resolved are and then my initial thinking is that we're done with this agenda item.

So I'd invite any other views about anything else we need to do for this public comment analysis of GSN topic - and if there are any? And I can't see how we progress that analysis any further in this call.

And I think we need to make sure so this discussion about how to decide what consensus is, you know, to me (unintelligible) I think not the right time.

So an invitation then for any other points that you do raise the standing one on the list otherwise we'll move on to our next agenda item.

And the next agenda item is Item 3 review previous discussion where required. Now I'd like to remind you that in respect of budget items that was on the Agenda 3C we're going to move it to our next call which we now have to have on 9 October and Jonathan Zuck is working on that.

And in terms of the individual director removal sorry in terms of A, 3A fundamental and regular bylaws I apologize if I've missed it but I haven't seen any revised stock. And I don't think we had any revisions to the documents to make.

Does anyone have a different point of view on that question and if so please speak now otherwise we'll go on to individual director removal.

And for that item Mike and (Tarjea) had done a second iteration of the public comments. And based on the previous discussion and I will invite him in a moment to take the floor of the meeting and to talk us through the changes and updates that have happened to that document.

And I don't see any hands so Mike are you happy to go ahead and take us through that and as you're just appearing on the screen now?

Mike Chartier: Yes sure.

Jordan Carter: Go ahead.

Mike Chartier: Okay we could - thank you. We can just move to Page 3. And there weren't...

Jordan Carter: You - everyone has their own scroll control. Yes.

Mike Chartier: And there weren't any great revelations but the first discussion was useful in that it highlighted that we have essentially, you know, a strong philosophical I think divergence of opinions.

So actually on Page 4 and it's mostly just reformatting is what I did so I just made it a little more clear, you know, exactly what the difference is.

The - our second proposal basically fit the approach that directors appointed by the SO or AC that they kind of served at the pleasure of that SO or AC.

And even though the SO AC had a document the reason why they wanted them removed as long as they reached a threshold of 75% of their members that director was removed.

And the counter view in the minority but still who are passionate about it is that while that's, you know, not the intention that was pointed out that there's a code of conduct for board directors and in fact they're expressly forbidden from acting in the interest of any particular community other than ICANN so really the - it should not be the case that they could be removed by one SO or AC because that could lend itself to them being more of a parliamentary type system. So that's the basic the fundamental difference of opinion that we have amongst the commenters.

A second big area of divergence is whether or not those directors that are removed they can be removed, you know, basically at will, you know, because the SO AC didn't like them or should there be a documented standard of behavior that they have to behave by or is there going to be a documented thing that they could be removed for?

And again - it was pointed out there is a code of conduct but that was another strong area of divergence.

And so when you look at this I just put it graphically that if we move to the options it basically shows that there's kind of bipolar the comments right?

And the CCWG proposal basically had kind of the least difficult level of difficulty in removing directors however there are multiple commenters that believe, you know, the threshold should be much harder and areas to explore for CCWG, you know, is there any trade off in between that if you want the

full community to decide on whether a director is removed can that be done for something less than then for cost.

That's just something that, you know, might want to look at. I think it might also while it's not directly related I think the temperature could be changed depending on the model that's eventually chosen. So that something to keep in mind.

And finally we might want to look at limiting the frequency and the number and stager the time periods for the individual boards for removal because there was some concern that you could have almost a de facto entire board if you did these things quick enough and also you don't even want to get into a situation of serial, you know, directory removal an SO or AC was just, you know, one after the other rejecting their directors.

So far the changes there weren't any really significant changes from the last document. I just - the discussion was useful and that it really highlighted the areas of divergence.

Jordan Carter: Thank you Mike for that presentation. I've got a question just about the document. Right under your little chart at the bottom of Page 4 there's a number four down there. It says limit the number and stager time periods. Is that in the wrong place? Is that - or is that in the right place is the options related to number three?

Mike Chartier: Yes, no it's a wrong number. It should be number two right? There's only a couple of options number one...

Jordan Carter: Okay.

Mike Chartier: ...is for. So that should be a two yes, very good.

Jordan Carter: Okay, thank you. And so once again the question to those stockers whether this is a kind of a fair representation of what was in the comments? And we've had to go through that already and the options for the CCWG to consider.

Personally I thought as I said in the chat that we've had a bit of a consensus on that there would have to be an explanation. There would be a public process and so on.

But I am personally uncomfortable with the paper that's there and hands up for a discussion on it. Mike do you want to chair this discussion?

Mike Chartier: Sure, Kavouss...

Jordan Carter: Okay.

Mike Chartier: ...I see your hand is raised.

Kavouss Arasteh: First of all thank you very much for your presentation. As I told in the other sessions I have not had or seen any argument against the removal of individual board member to the entire community or by the entire community other than by the designating SO and AC.

I have not heard any argument against that. What is the problem of that? As I have mentioned the causality is an important and constitutional issue need to be respected.

So still I would like to know what are the difficulty that a board member individual cannot be removed by the decision of the entire community other than designating authority or entity of that board member. Thank you.

Mike Chartier: Okay. Are there any more comments? I think (Robin) actually Kavouss has been most articulate supporter of the CCWG proposal that was our proposal had just the SO AC remove them.

Is there any other comments? Okay I don't see any other comments so I'll hand it back to you.

Jordan Carter: Okay. Thank you Mike. And sorry I've got too many chat windows open. And I appreciate you running us through that. And I think that we've got that sort of basis there ready to go.

And now if we've agreed that in terms of fundamental and regular bylaws there isn't anything there that we need to discuss if we've agreed that budget and AOC reviews along with a second reading of today's discussion will happen and are now definitely happening on an October call.

And I'd like us to briefly consider Item 4. And I'd like to give a heads up. The lawyers on the call mentioned the memorandum that they've just sent they sent it on the chat it has gone around the email list about the enforceability of the member's matters which is a core issue for our model.

I'd like to take the - once we finish our agenda I'd like to invite them to present it. So we'll make a decision on that after we've finished our other agenda items.

Just have a little think about it and if you happy for them to present that memo to us to get the discussion started on the questions they've raised in it -- I haven't read the memo I don't know what's in it -- but then we can do that for the last 20 minutes or we can finish early. And it's up to the group my instincts I'll share with you later.

So in terms of any other workgroup required to make the (unintelligible) October deadline the way that I've been thinking about this as the (unintelligible) is to take a kind of consolidated document to a CCWG for our work.

And it would be - it would have the number of sections in it one for each area of the public comments and would largely replicate the areas of concern, and consensus and divergence just as in each of these papers, so people have a sort of 20 page doc that sets out all of those key issues.

And then I'd separate out into a document a repetition of just the issue for a decision. And in that document it will be good to have a bit of a sense for the CCWG. So what the critical issues are.

And if we can get that in time for the CCWG call next Tuesday and then the CCWG can make a decision informed by our analysis about what the key things are to focus on for Tuesday for next Friday's meeting and then that will hopefully encourage you all to read the public comments again that relate most closely to them.

So I'm not aware of any areas of the report or public comments that have been skipped by us. So I'm not aware of any gaps. And that's kind of my central proposal for how we present what we've done back to the CCWG.

And I will write that down in an email and send it on the list. But if there are any immediate gaps that people have identified in the work now would be a good time to hear them and if you keep thinking about those - and that's okay then, no speaking.

And Holly has just posted in the chat that she's got early board meeting for another client at 1:30 AM. So my question now would be whether we'd like to discuss or not.

I think, you know, (Chris) has suggested not. And I don't think it's fair to ask Council to suddenly present on a memo that they've sent just a half hour ago at 1:30 in the morning personally.

And having a presentation on it is easier when we've had time to read it. So with your permission folks I won't to drag Holly onto the call to do that and if she violently objects please tell me.

But that leaves us with our last items on the agenda, Item 5. Is there another meeting yes there is on 9 October? And on 9 October is tomorrow I believe for us in New Zealand and about 36 hours away.

And the meeting is proposed for 17:30 UTC finishing at 19:30 UTC. It's an ugly time for some folks and it's the only slot that can work on that day.

And yes confirming 17:30 on 9 October. We need that meeting to go through AOC review comment again, budgets again and any second readings of issues that have been raised on this call.

Are there any other items of general business or items to raise for that next call? And I too hope that it will be the last meeting of WG1 before Dublin.

If it helps anyone there won't - none of the material on that call will be new material because it's all been discussed on previous calls, the second reading for everything.

And Greg your head is up. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Yes. I just wanted to note I think I think I owe the WP1 a third and final version of the recall of the entire board analysis. So I'll get that to everyone before the Friday meeting.

Jordan Carter: Fantastic thanks. So if on the call that document and the budget document that Jonathan Zuck is working on the AOC document those three docs will be the ones that we need to look at on that call.

And I suggest you all read the memo that was sent by (unintelligible), Holly Gregory then in the subject line the comparison with individual independent processes review does go beyond review so it's not just WP2.

Please think about whether you think it's something that we need to have presented to us on our WG1 call?

And Kavouss I don't entirely understand your intervention on the chat. And I know we haven't decided on the model. I know we haven't decided on the board removal.

We will do a second reading of those ones on the next call and that we're not here to make decisions about those. We're here to make sure that we've reflected the public comments about them adequately and accurately.

And so unless there's any other business to raise people I think we're finished. Is there any other business items that anyone needs to raise?

If not thanks everyone and we finished half an hour early. Let's keep that up - and Kavouss now I understand your point. See you later everyone. Thank you.

END