
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This meeting is now being recorded.

GREG SHATAN: Hello and welcome to the Jurisdiction's Subgroup Meeting number 12, on 5th of December 2016 at 19:00 UTC. I'm your co-rapporteur, Greg Shatan. I've just had possible regrets from our co-rapporteur, Vinay Kesari, who was caught on a business call that has taken on a life of its own. He'll join us as soon as possible, if possible. So, given that we, as David McAuley notes, we are competing with IGF and while I think this subject should win any such competition, I can understand that being in amidst of something like IGF tends to make the [inaudible] down on the ground for a little bit. But, in any case, we should get going. First, I will ask if anybody has any changes to statements of interest, changes to their employment or to their conflicts or any other thing.

I take it that there are none. In which case, we should probably jump right into Item 2 on our agenda. In fact, I'll ask staff to put up the third draft of the experience questions.

[AUDIOBREAK]

Thanks, if you could blow those up a bit, since the bottom half of the page is blank, that will probably help some people, or if you have your own control, you can go do that.

So, these questions have been on the list now, were discussed at the last two meetings, have continued to evolve somewhat. So, I'd like to see if there are any comments, suggestions, changes, criticism for these questions.

[AUDIOBREAK]

They can't be that perfect. David McAuley.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Greg, thanks, David McAuley for the transcript. I mean, I think the debate on this has been a pretty good one on the list, and I think that my feelings are probably fairly well-known, I just really wanted to raise my hand to thank you for doing your best to navigate differing opinions and trying to come to a conclusion. I'm not a fan of these questions but if they have to go I think the questions are getting in pretty decent shape. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks, David. You know, these are the questions that are supposed to act for a fact or experience facilitations. This was the first set of questions [CROSSTALK]. I guess question is whether is any objection? Whether there are any objections on this call to sending these – to basically saying that these questions are stable and can go into the process, which we'll need to discuss of sending out questions. So if there are any objections, it would be good to hear them now, or any further changes that could overcome objections, or even just changes that could make them better.

David, once again.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Greg, David again. A point of clarification based on what you just said. It relates to process and so I assume what you're saying is, these questions won't go out until we decide what the process is, including not only sending them out but also considering your responses, is that a fair statement?

GREG SHATAN:

Yeah, there definitely needs to be a pathway to getting these questions out and that is on our agenda, as number 4. We'll get there, so at this point we're just talking about the wording of the questions themselves and whether or not there is sufficient support to send them out, or sufficient objections to not send them out.

[AUDIO BREAK]

So, why don't we – if there's nothing further anyone wants to say on these questions, why don't we take down this question and put up the, what I've been calling the, additional question. At one point it was the third question but then the third questions was added to the first two, so technically this would be the fourth question, if we decided to send it out.

So, this question also has undergone a fair amount of editing. It was discussed really only at the last call but also quite a bit on the list. I have tried to edit the question to take into account the various comments that were made about the question. That doesn't necessarily mean that there's broad support for every edit. It also doesn't mean that there's broad support for sending this question out. Nonetheless, if there was enough interest in the question, as well as a considerable amount of

objection to the question, it makes sense I think to try to develop the question and see whether there is a version of the question that is suitable for sending out or whether the objection to sending it out continue.

Basically, I think we need to have rough consensus on any question before it moves out of this group. And again, we'll talk about process beyond this group. I would say that we have rough consensus on the first question [inaudible] in the previous slide, if you will. I would say we don't have rough consensus on sending out this question nor do we have necessarily a stable draft of this question. I think it's still to be considered in flux.

So, I'll stop talking and see if there are those who would like to comment first but not comment on whether or not to send out the question yet. Let's try to talk about the question itself and any changes or reservations you have about the question as a question. I realize it's a little hard to divorce the two topics but let's try to work on the drafting aspect of this first. So, I'll look for any hands.

I've got David, followed by Pedro.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Greg, thank you, it's David again. This question, particularly from the beginning where it says, "What are the advantages or disadvantages if any" – et cetera, doesn't really ask for the point of view. In other words, what are the advantages or disadvantages to you, the responder, or to ICANN, or to Global Peace, or whatever it might be. It doesn't ask for point of views. So, it would, I think, invite people to pick a point of view

and that may complicate our ability to weigh the responses. I just picked up on that, so I haven't – and I'm reading into it now, anyway, I believe that's the case and that would be my comment. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

David, originally the question began, "What do you think are the problems?" it didn't actually ask anything about advantages but only problems, so that is kind of a biased question. So, then someone else commented that, "What do you think?" was called for speculation and instead people should ask for "What are..?" So that's why it reads the way it reads, that doesn't mean that this is a better formulation than, "What do you think?", and it doesn't mean that either formulation is necessarily a good formulation but that's kind of how we ended up where we are and I think due to your overall point, I think this question does seem to ask primarily for point of view, and among other issues we can discuss whether this is a good question, or whether this is a good version of this question, and how to deal with it. Pedro.

PEDRO DA SILVA:

Yes, thank you, Greg. Very briefly, generally in questionnaires I favor more straightforward word questions and more open ones that allow the reader or the respondent to actually weigh in as much information as possible. But also on the other hand I also understand that there has been lots of issues related to this question, mainly different points of views, and I think those paragraphs actually that you put in here try to accommodate different points of views that have been expressed.

So, general terms, I'll say that I would be in a condition to agree with the text that you have proposed here and to agree with the inclusion of this question. I favor actually the submission of those questions, the three initial ones and this, only considering that this part is also present in the questionnaire. I wouldn't favor a questionnaire that would only have the first three questions that you have shown so, just wanted to state my support for including this question and also the formulation that you have suggested here. Thank you very much.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Pedro. So, does anybody else have comments about this question in terms of its drafting or its intent before we get further into the question of support? And I know also, with 20 or 21 people on this call, compared to the number of people we actually have in the group or typically have on our call, we'll probably want to put these folks out on the list, and get a sense of the room. But I would encourage those who are ruminating quietly to chime in with their views on the question itself. So, I invite others to go to the table.

If there are no other comments on the question itself, why don't we pivot to directly discussing whether to include this question in the questionnaire along with the other question, as I've noted on the list the fact that we've continued to work on the question does not mean there's necessarily broad support for it. There has been, I would say, more objection than support based on my count. Of course, the question has evolved; it might be that that means that we'll get support from those who objected to it or it also might mean there are objections from those who supported the original question, because the question

now no longer fits their desire. So, if I could ask, for any comments on whether or not this question should go out at all.

[AUDIOBREAK]

David McAuley.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Great, thank you. And I'll qualify – this is David McAuley for the transcript – I'll qualify my comment by saying it's pretty much consistent with what I've said on the list. And I'm also, I don't believe that anyone's position should gain any strength by repetition, but just in order to help us along, I think I'll just restate it. I'm not a fan of this question. I think any question should be in the strict context of "with respect" to dispute resolution issues.

And I also am concerned that the questions aren't scientific. I mean, we don't know the body of people that are [inaudible], I realize the intent is to get it out to the global community. I just suspect the best, that's a very high lift. And so anyway, I'm among those who am not supportive of this question. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, David. Pedro notes from the chat has already expressed his view point as we wrapped up the prior discussion. Any other comments; pro or con? With regard to sending this question out?

I thought we would have a more talkative bunch, given the amount of volume on the list, which was with regard to this. Maybe we've just

achieved apathy; I'm not sure whether apathy is enough to support sending out the question. Phil Corwin.

PHILIP CORWIN:

Yeah, thank you, Greg. Phil Corwin for the record. I tend to share David's misgivings about this question, just because it seems so open-ended and it's not targeted the way some of the other questions are, you know, talking about actual problems, but this is about advantages or disadvantages relating to the current jurisdiction, and I think it needs to be [inaudible] that we're talking about the corporate jurisdiction, the place of incorporation. I believe that's what it's getting at.

Although, since rather than that, that's even more problematic because there's other jurisdictional aspects, but then it's [inaudible] advantages, disadvantages, and then for each one identified, identify alternative jurisdictions, where the problem wouldn't occur. I mean, it seems like we're starting to go down a path to explore pressing up different aspects of ICANN jurisdiction and think about where they should be. Relocated, possibly? Yeah. And I just think it's opening a Pandora's Box without a clear need to. I'll stop there.

I know there's different views on this, but I prefer to see people asked to actually identify a real problem that arises from the current US incorporation, because other jurisdictional issues can be – contractual issues can be dealt with by choice of law provisions, they are not of the same consequence as corporate – the state of incorporation. I'll stop there. I'm not going to [inaudible] to stop this question from going out, but I'm not sure what the purpose is, and I think we're going to get back

-- if we get back answers, it's going to open up a can of worms. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Phil. Anybody else? I would respond, Phil, to your point about scope with the footnotes. Now, is the same footnote as with the other question, and that, as a result it is broader than just, "I can't incorporate – jurisdiction of incorporation". So, I think the question when it was originally formulated actually was more focused on trying to elicit problems with ICANN US jurisdiction. But the feeling was with that, too directive.

In terms of falling on your sword, as I said I don't think there's a decision to send out this question so nobody – pro or con – needs to be falling on any swords, we need to figure out whether there is broad support for sending out the question. And if there isn't, then we're not going to. So, that's what I think is the posture, and I will say that counting those as on the list, again, before the question develops fully, I would say it was about 2:1 against sending out the question, just based on people that weighed in on the list, but again, the numbers were not incredibly high. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Greg – Cheryl for the record – and you can count me in most the not-particularly in charge with sending this one out. But I've put it down the record. Look, fluffy question get fluffy answers, and fluffy data comes from those fluffy answers, and we all know what we do with fluffy answers and data. You go, "Yeah, right, fine, noted".

So even if it did go out, if we [inaudible] would be, could I suggest minimal on our outcome. So, if anyone is overwhelmingly desperate to have it go out, notice the sigh in my voice as you deliver it. Then so be it. But what one would do with the codswallop that may come back, is another question, you know. It'll be entertaining, I guess, Greg? But definitely count me in the "don't bother sending it" list.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Cheryl [CROSSTALK]. Thank you for bringing the word "codswallop" into the midst of our call today. Anybody else wish to speak?

What I'd like to do now is take the temperature of the room on this. So, if you would like this question to be sent out, please give a green check. [AUDIO BREAK] If you would prefer that the question not be sent out, please add a red "X".

I would hope we could cut down on the number of extensions, but that doesn't seem to be likely. Pedro, your hand is up. Can you wait until we finish the temperature? I can't do it if you have a vote under your hand.

So what I see here are four opposed and one in favor, although I think I actually saw two in favor, yes. So, that's somewhat consistent with the numbers I was seeing on the email list, but I think with regard to decisions by this group, especially given the relatively small numbers today, I think we should put this out on the list as well. Pedro, I'll come back to you now that we've – if everybody can uncheck or uncross, we can record that, the numbers, and move on. And Pedro, I'll come back to you.

PEDRO DA SILVA: Yes, thank you Greg. No, I just wanted to precisely mention that there are many people, active participants, of this group which I think, because of the IGF in Mexico, are not able to be in the call and I think they would definitely be willing to show their view points on this topic, on this question, or this decision that is set. So I would suggest submitting this to the list for decision. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Absolutely, and I will do that will all of the questions, we'll figure out a way to ask separately for people's responses, and also take in – some way to take into account the comments such as what you made which is that you support a questionnaire with all of the questions but not one that excluded the questioning [inaudible]. Maybe I'll talk to Bernie and see if they have some – what people think is the best tool, other than just merely having a free form thread for this.

So, maybe something like a Google form or Survey Monkey or something like that that will help us to record answers a little bit more separately from just general discussion. With [inaudible] we tend to get drowned on the list.

So, I think that really takes us now to Item 4 our agenda, which is the mechanics, and details of the questionnaire graphic. Erich, if you could uncheck yourself, good as we're moving on. Now, it's been raised by Kavouss on the list that these questions need to go through the CCWG, and we do have one of our co-chairs, Mathieu, on the call and reviewing the recent history of Work Stream 2 at least, I think the only other

group that has decided to send out questions was the SO/AC Accountability Subgroup and as I noted on the email list last night, that could get a first and second reading of those questions, with the second reading taking place at the Hyderabad face-to-face. So, I assume we would follow that same procedure and not nearly the send these out from this subgroup. So, Mathieu, if I could ask you for your thoughts if I'm along the right track or if a choice for this group tonight or what your thoughts are on this, if you have a microphone.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thanks, Greg, this is Mathieu speaking, and I given those who already in this call, congratulated you on your efforts at making sure everyone's voice is heard in this group. I think a process to your outlining is definitely on the right track. The precedent we've set with the associated accountability is certainly the way forward, and so the questions should definitely be shared in the plenary and be reviewed in the plenary before going out to a target group which remains to be defined, but it seems it's a good way forward.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Mathieu. So, normally it's not a controversial topic at this point, that's actually 4b, 4a was introduction to questions. The other thing I had noted about the questions that were sent out by the SO/AC Accountability Group was that they provided a preface, or an introduction, a set-up, so we are just not sending these questions out whole, out to people.

The SO/AC questions were only going out to SO/AC so by definition it was already an insider group to some extent, or at least a reasonably well-informed group. The need was seen to have an introduction. I think that at least as important here, in that context, both because of the complexity of the topic and also the possibility, which we'll get to, of sending this out beyond merely going to a direct mailing and to SO/AC.

So, I'd like to see if there are any thoughts that other people have about that, pro or con [inaudible]. I'll also put this out on the list, but I think we need a, maybe a small drafting team to draft an introduction, which is to be on part on some of the documentation you already have in hand, but should allow someone to start answering the questions with reasonable amount of set-up and information. Any thoughts on this?

I see some, I see support, I don't see any objections. Of course, we also have to see volunteers to draft the preface and I am getting stretched out a bit at being – at the drafting department. So I think we have, I'd say, general agreement, no objections to having an introduction. And David McAuley has picked up the sword, [inaudible] and agreed to help draft.

So the next question is "c" which is: how to send it out and who to send it to. I think those are really kind of hard to separate. There has been some support for sending it out within the ICANN Global Multi Stakeholder Community and also some support for sending these questions out in some broader fashion or at least making them available in a broader fashion. Typically, ICANN's public comment period is made available to anyone and noticeably they've sent out in a way that there's not a campaign to put into everyone's email box to spam the

world or anything like that. So, any thoughts both on how to send it out, and who to send it to?

[AUDIOBREAK]

I'm particularly interested in whether people think we should send it just within the ICANN SO/AC community or find some way at least to make it available to a broader community, for instance by posting it on an ICANN page somewhere, assuming that ICANN is willing to do that, but I suspect they would be. Pedro?

[AUDIOBREAK]

Pedro, your phone is on mute. I see a red circle flashing.

PEDRO DA SILVA: Okay, can you hear me now?

GREG SHATAN: Yeah.

PEDRO DA SILVA: Okay, thank you. Yes, I would support the second option that you just mentioned, so I think it is a subject that is dear to actually many different actors in the multi-stakeholder community and therefore I think this should not be restricted. I think putting out this questionnaire hopefully with the four questions to the wider international community to this usual ICANN public consultation method, I think it's the best way to achieve our objective here. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Pedro. Anyone else agree with Pedro, disagree, have different ideas? Who wants to do it some other way? Put it on hot air balloons and blimps around the world. David?

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Greg. I should have put my hand down when you mentioned hot air balloons, because that sounds pretty good. But, here's my question. I think Pedro makes a good point; on the other hand, it depends on the timeframe for response. If we're going to have a fairly quick turnaround time, the people that normally reply to ICANN posted calls for comment expect a fairly large – they expect a certain amount of time, 42 days, or whatever it might be. And so I guess, the only qualification I would say is; what is the timeframe we're talking about for asking for people to reply, and it may have a bearing on how we send it out. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, David. I would note again as kind of a comparison that the SO/AC accountability question was sent out with a 30-day window, and I believe that at least one responding SO/AC is asking for an extension. Bernie says now, 45 days, so 45 days would certainly be ample to allow for both dissemination of the question and some fairly considered responses, certainly as long as any commentary can be expected to be, though there has been some that have been longer, but certainly for a few questions where we're – we hope to get these in the time we fashioned, 45 days would be ample. Bernie, I see your hand is up.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Greg. Just to comment, we've finished prepping the documents for the IRP/IOT public consultation which is currently going on. In that, 45 days as the response time, there is certainly a non-negligible prep-time and requirements for formal ICANN public conversation of documents that need to support this and check that need to explain it. So, just a word of caution that I'm not sure this could actually get done before people start to detaching for the end-of-year break, and that would be one of my concerns.

And so if we only get this done in early January, if the responses come in 45 days after that, and then we have to have a look at how to classify that. So, I'm just trying to set the scene for timing, so there's no unrealistic expectation. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Bernie. Those are good points. First, I would say that I would not necessarily view this as being sent with the full force of the public consultation, because that's typically reserved for preliminary file reports of working groups and other more terminal or deliverable types of things.

So I don't know if there is a somewhat more lightweight way to make the question available appropriately, I think there will still be non-negligible prep time for any question we could ask, but I wouldn't necessarily want this to be confused with a public consultation of the typical sort. I don't think that's what this is. I think it would in some

sense create the wrong expectation around what it is, if we treat it like a public consultation.

That said, I don't know how many different utensils we have in the drawer, but we can give some thought to how we could disseminate something like this without putting it in the full ICANN public comment process. I would also say with regard to timing, if we are as we discussed, then we can have a requisite to reading at the Plannery that the next meeting of the plenary is December 14th; and we should certainly have the questions ready for that Plannery based on where we stand.

And, there is no scheduled meeting after that because we run into – two weeks after – it would be our typical meeting time is the dreaded Christmas to New Year's week, which potentially doesn't exist for work purposes like this. Which would put the following meeting either into the January, second week, possibly on January 4th, or even on the January 9th, so I don't know if our esteemed co-chair or staff have an idea when we're next meeting after next week will take place for the Plannery because that would be the minimum time when we could say that we would start that non-negligible period or hopefully there will be some parallel work going on, nonetheless you wouldn't have questions ready until after that meeting; that second meeting. So, I'll take the silence to mean that the – have not yet planned the next meeting after this upcoming CCWG planner, but soon it will be in the first or second week of January.

So, the last point here is how to collect responses, which I think to some extent goes to the "how to send it out" point. Maybe something that

where a questionnaire or form type of response is worth considering, which has been done a few times in public comments and other questionnaires, or it may be that this is the kind of thing where you're just going to have people submit free forms, written PDF documents, responding to the question. We clearly have ample time to consider those mechanics and whether we're better off having people fill in boxes with their rants, or just submit PDFs to some extent. That goes to the issue that how we will analyze and build the tool to be able to review these in the group when it's done.

David says that if we go free-form PDF we need a word limit. I think it is possible when we're so inclined to write a paper, especially on the final question, could – if handled a certain way and envelop every jurisdictional question anyone could possibly ask about ICANN as well as the various forms of legal analysis that could go on for days. So, when one would hope we have some encouragement at least for being relatively limited.

I see that Mathieu says that January 11th is the first plenary in 2017 so that also informs our timeframe. So, I think we're probably pushed it as far as we can go on this call. I think we have some tendencies with how to deal with this, and we can put together a proposal so that can be considered on the list, a default based on two readings of the CCWG and sending with that an introduction. And putting it out in a way that gets potentially broad results or at least can be broadly seen akin to the way public consultations are seen. And we can figure out from there, where to go. We'll also push the asking for someone to work – people to work with David on the introductory document. Although there is some appeal to the lonely scrivener turning out a first draft by himself,

but the fewer people that work on a document, the more comments it will need from others to make sure it is well-rounded.

Any other comments on the whole question process, or on the question, before we move to the next topic on the agenda?

I see none. We'll move on to the next topic on the agenda, which is the document that we decided some time ago was definitely was in scope and was part of the core of our work, which is the Google docs asking for this proof to working on answering the question here. What is the influence of ICANN existing jurisdictions relating to resolution disputes? i.e. choice of law and venue. I think that we should probably change that to "governing law" because not all disputes involve the party's making a choice of law.

On the actual operational ICANN policies and accountabilities mechanism and I have to say that while we have a reasonable amount of momentum, working on this document, going into Hyderabad. We have not recovered that momentum; we have instead taken what energy we did have and directed it toward the questionnaire issue. But this really is important work and we've only had contribution of a few people, and I don't that we are on this particular toll, we can go into this and draft.

But we have all but ten minutes left, and there are a lot of unresolved comments and first draft points made in here. We are going to have to come back to this document and give it a close reading, and I would prefer to do that after there has been more interventions in the

document. If there are people who are questioning whether this is what we need to work on, I'd be interested in hearing that.

Failing that, I do think this was undeniably one of our poor assignments, maybe the poor assignment. We need to work on it and I will remind you all, at the risk of sounding a little pedantic or didactic, that, or even [inaudible], that the concept of these working groups that people would devote themselves in these subgroups to the work of the group, and I know that many people, including myself, have joined several groups and have spread themselves thin and others are being participant observers because being an observer you can't actually join a call, so, but lecturing people or signing people, I would really like to have some thoughts or more work put into this document. And Mathieu, if I could once again put you on the spot of the interest to have your observations on this point as well.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thanks, Greg. I can only echo what you said about the construction of the subgroups and the clear requirement with me is to make sure the rapporteurs are rapporteurs, and all group members actually contribute to the work. I think actually this, the document on this, which currently is displayed is already quite an interesting piece of work – very promising – with loads to actually do to make it as valuable as it can be. And so I encourage everyone to contribute, comment, expand the document if need be, but I think that if there's a need for it to become a joint product of everyone's inputs, that will certainly advance the work of the group.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you Mathieu, David McAuley.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Greg; David McAuley again. As an original skeptic of the Google doc format, I would just encourage my fellow rapporteurs that once you go in and start it, it gets a little easier, it can be done, it is a bit forbidding to take a look at, especially the larger the number of comments, but once you get into the rhythm of it, it's not that bad. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, David. And I recall there were some requests which I think we have not fulfilled for a primer on how to use Google docs for those who do feel a little bit challenged by it as a format. In many ways, it's not a lot different than working in Microsoft Word but it does have its quirks.

And I will look for something along those lines so that people can feel like a – like they're not going to go in and blow up the document or be unable to do what they want to do. And I think another point, David, as well taken is that when the comments build up, and build up and build up, as they have in portions of this, all of the byplay on the side, especially on pages that are numbered as the second page, it's quite weighty.

As rapporteur, I will need to try to resolve these comments or maybe, I think, I am one of the commenters here, and I believe it was Pedro but whoever commented on the other hand, maybe we can work together

to resolve any comments. Jorge, sorry, Jorge Cancio, who I believe is one of the IGFs; he and I had a back-and-forth, maybe we can do that, in general try to resolve the comments so that we're working on the documents and again, the last point which has nothing to do with Google docs as a format, is that we do need to work toward editable text as opposed to comments. Comments should be an extraction of the text and work needs to be put into the text itself.

So, you should all have the link that's been sent out any number of times. Including today's set of documents or the agenda. And so you should be able to find, so I encourage all of you to weigh in to the document because this will be one of our key deliverables and we really need to be able to deliver. It would be nice to have something we can sent up to the plenary before too long, even if it is a preliminary document. So, we have five minutes to the hour. And that brings us to AOB. So I want to see if there is any AOB to bring up.

[AUDIOBREAK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl here, it's not AOB, it's a point I made in the chat – now I got lost because I didn't particularly articulate it well. When you were talking about a primer for Google docs, I didn't look at it, because I use Google docs and I'm comfortable with them but I vaguely remember – well, now I remember absolutely – I thought Bernie [0:52:43 – INAUDIBLE] been the full CCWG list, but certainly a list, so maybe he could get that tutorial link back up and redistribute it to our group here. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Cheryl, that's very helpful, don't want to reinvent the wheel, so I'll ask Bernie to resend that Google docs 101 for idiots, primer, dummies, guide. Keep a list for those of us who will need it and I think that is as good as AOB as any, even if it's part of the other business.

So, other than that, I would just ask that we try to focus our work on first. I'm preaching a bit to the choir since you are all on this call, we'll be sending around as soon as possible, some things to the list, so we can get the temperature of the entire group with regard to the two sets of questions. And sending them out, and then we'll be preparing an introduction that will go along with the questions; and David has volunteered, and we hope for other volunteers but if not, David can work on that and then send it around.

And Mathieu notes not everyone has access to Google docs due to employee/employer IT security issues or other issues, so we'll make sure to offer an alternate path for those as Mathieu says, comments by PDF and emails should be okay, and we've also sent around Word versions of the documents, I worked on those as well as long as any changes were clearly marked, say in Tracked Changes as well.

I see Brenda has just posted the link to the Google doc tutorial, as was previously noted, a YouTube video. So hopefully, people who will have access to Google docs will also access to YouTube. So, that I think is helpful.

So let's just keep our eyes out, try to work on the documents and try to answer the questions, even if you've answered them on this list, on this

call, rather. Please respond to whatever form of temperature-taking mechanism we send out. So I think, with that, we can adjourn this call, and I look forward to our next call, which I believe is scheduled for the 13th – so that’s one day before the plenary – the 13th at 13:00 UTC. So, thank you and we can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]