

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Welcome to the 13th meeting of the Jurisdiction Subgroup on December 13th at 13:00 UTC. I hope there's no one here who believes that the number 13 is bad luck. I hope that it's good luck instead. In any case, we will begin by asking if there are any updates to statements of interest.

AKINBO ADEBUNMI: For the record, Akinbo Adebunmi from Nigeria. [inaudible]

GREG SHATAN: Sorry, who was that?

AKINBO ADEBUNMI: Akinbo Adebunmi from Nigeria. How do I link?

GREG SHATAN: Are you on audio [crosstalk]...

AKINBO ADEBUNMI: Yes.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

GREG SHATAN: Welcome. Do we have anybody else who is on audio only?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve DelBianco.

GREG SHATAN: Hi Steve and welcome. If we have no further administrative stuff, we'll launch into the first item which is the on-going poll to discuss whether and how to deal with the questions for the questionnaire. The questionnaire is on-going, obviously still in progress. If you haven't already responded, it would be good if you would do so as soon as possible so that we can see what the results are. I can give an interim report right now on the questions, but it would be... Perhaps what I will do is if there is anybody on this call who has not yet participated in the questionnaire, it would be good if they would do so now. And I'm putting the link in the chat.

If you know what the questions are, it will only take you a moment to answer the poll. So I'll give people a moment to respond.

One piece of administrative trivia, we have a phone number ending in 5316. Could whoever is 5136 identify them self, so we know who that dial-in is?

Avri thank you very much for having done the poll. I'm sorry that the [inaudible]. I appreciate the level of commitment.

Note that Phil Corwin is the 5316 number.

---

So is there anybody who is currently doing the poll?

AKINBO ADEBUNMI: Come again, I didn't get that?

GREG SHATAN: Is there anybody who is currently answering the poll about the questionnaire? Questions about the questionnaire?

AKINBO ADEBUNMI: Chairman, may I have the floor?

GREG SHATAN: Yes, go ahead please.

AKINBO ADEBUNMI: Okay. I've answered the poll before now [inaudible] in the [inaudible] of proof or evidence, or informations to back up the results. I want to review the area of dot Africa. Dot Africa is one of the domain extensions [inaudible] ICANN [inaudible] concerning the AFRALO and the procedure of ICANN at the moment. For ICANN to consider that Africa needs to be given a due process, the court that is currently trying to [inaudible] or take charge should've been dealing with Africa, or if ICANN had heard in the United States, for an extension that speaks more of another continent, which is Africa itself. The unfortunate truth is it would have been right to have African courts to decide over dot Africa, rather than a non-African court.

---

In our jurisdiction, it begs the question of what can ICANN do to ensure that, even if it needs to be self-regulatory and accountable to certain jurisdictional laws and procedures, how does it shift its plans away from a continent that should not have had any jurisdiction over it, to a continent that does have it? That is my own reaction to the fact that dot Africa is being decided over in the court of law, in another country, in another jurisdiction, that for me should have no local standing on the discussion. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks for that. I don't think that's really... it's not on topic for what we're discussing at the moment, but we'll note that and come back to that at the appropriate point in our deliberation.

If nobody else is doing the poll. I see we've had one participant, a member of this group complete the poll. I will give a report now on... Paul McGrady thank you very much.

The results of the poll at this point are, and we'll keep the poll open after the meeting for a while, but we have a plenary call tomorrow and we need to decide what to do. We actually have fairly good... we have 25 answers which is nearly half of the group. From the point of view of the number of attendees on the call, it's fairly similar to those who are actually actively participating. It's a fact of the matter that we have some people who are signed up as members but aren't really participating, but that's life.

---

The current results of the poll are that we have, for each of the first 3 questions, a 92% support putting those questions forward. That's 23 out of 25, now we have 24 out of 26 completing that and saying those questions should go forward, so that's very strong support for putting those questions forward. For the fourth question we have 14 in support and 12 not in support. So that's 53.8% and 46.2%, just about complete divergence on putting that forward. And we have, on the question of whether, "if question 4 is not approved I support sending out a questionnaire containing only questions 1 to 3", there are 22 responses, we have some abstentions on this last one. But out of 22, 17 support which is 77.3% and 5 do not support. So that, I would say is strong support but also certain... a reasonable number not supporting sending out the questionnaire at all, if question 4 is not approved. That is where we stand at the moment.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Greg, could you repeat those last numbers please so I can get them for the notes?

GREG SHATAN:

Sure. On the last poll question, 17 supported sending out the questionnaire without question 4 and that's 77.3%. And 5 did not support which is 22.7%.

So that is...that's the poll. We also have a...I have all of this on a spreadsheet as well which we can circulate.

---

Kavouss I see that you have voted in the poll and your hand is up.  
Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Excuse me. At the beginning you said something else and then you referred to the previous meeting. At this meeting the results of the pool, were 52. Something in favor of sending question 4. Is that right? I would like to add my name also to that one. After listening that the people are in favor of the three questions, I join the others and I have no difficulty to send all questions, including question 4. So please can you add that one and give the exact value of that and I think that if a simple majority is in favor of question 4, that also will be sent out. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you Kavouss. I see that would change your vote which was do not support, to support. So that would be 15 to 11 to send out the fourth question.

That raises an interesting question about whether that is sufficient support under our rule. Normally we'd look for some form of consensus and not simple majority. And my view is that falls short of consensus. Kavouss has now said he supports all questions which changes his vote entirely. If we have anybody else who has not...it looks like the poll has stopped being answered so at least for the moment, we'll hold that question. David McAuley.

---

DAVID MCAULEY: Greg thank you good morning, David McAuley here. I was just going to comment to your question just a moment ago, of what does this...I take it the tally now on question 4 is 15 to 11. 15 being in support of sending that out. What should we do, is that consensus? I think it's a sensitive enough issue that at level of support, we might want to...or you and Denay might want to think about chatting with the co-chairs. And whether this is something right for plenary action. I can't...I don't know it's a very difficult support level so maybe that's one way out, thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you David. Mathieu, speaking of co-chairs your hand is up.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you Greg, for not saying speaking of the devil. That's much appreciated. I think that the question of the decision making rule here is a little complex, because the decision made here is about how to collect input from the public, and not a decision regarding the recommendations from the CCWG of the group.

In any case I would tend to agree with David, that we should certainly always go to the plenary when trying to assess consensus. Because as you know the sub-groups themselves are extremely helpful to craft documents, help prepare them and then any consensus or decision making is supposed to be at the plenary level. So I think there's marginally now substance here to report to the plenary, including on the way in which the sub-group itself is split on the opportunity of this fourth question. And then we'll need to have the discussion in the plenary about how to address this.

---

Bearing in mind that this is a questionnaire. This is a list of questions to gather input and not a decision on a specific recommendation by the group. But I think the sub-group's been making very intense work on this, it's good to report to the plenary and not take everything upon your shoulders, in terms of how to proceed because it's obviously a very sensitive issue. Thank you very much.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you Mathieu, I saw Kavouss' had go up and down again and back up. That may have been a glitch. I don't think Kavouss intended to put his hand down, so we'll call in Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Excuse me, excuse me I apologize to Avri. I was after David, someone put me off but not my side. I'm sorry....It is not up to this meeting to decide what is majority, what is minority. We just report the result of the poll to the CCWG and CCWG decide on the procedure. This group is not entitled and eligible to say that what is to be out and what is not to be out. We just report the result, considering my last agreement to all four questions, that's all. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you for that Kavouss. That is one alternative, which to report everything to the plenary. And with these levels of support and then allow the plenary to decide how to deal with these questions and with the level of support in the sub-group. Avri?

Avri we cannot hear you.



AVRI DORIA: Can you hear me at all?

GREG SHATAN: You are extremely faint and I do mean extremely.

AVRI DORIA: Okay I will adjust my [inaudible] I have it at a very high level already. Can you hear me any better now? I'm really...What I think...

GREG SHATAN: We can almost hear you properly now so... Just go ahead Avri.

Avri we're not hearing you at all at this point. Well while we resolve Avri's audio problems we should move on. If there's anybody else on this particular, would like to give their opinion on how to deal with the split question, the split answer to the question 4. Happy to hear opinions on how to move forward. Kavouss again.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, please don't say again. Because you insistently taking your own views. This group cannot decide on the issue. You just report the results to the plenary of the CCWG. 22 people cannot decide for themselves CCWG. Just you report the results. That's all. Thank you.

---

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you for your opinion Kavouss. I think in fact sub-groups can make certain decisions if all of us... all but one of us decided that a question was proper or improper. We could either put it forward or not and we'd make many decisions along the way. The question how to deal with this particular situation.

Avri's put her comment into the chat. She says it makes sense to report the failure to have a consensus on the poll. But should not ask for them to decide as it was a procedural process. It can decide on it's process. I suppose 'it' being the plenary. Well that, it's own decision to make about whether to support or not support sending out the fourth question. And for that matter on the other polls. Avri also says the failure was on sending the poll out at all. Well one way to try to get opinions and to try to line people up, especially given that we...it's hard to get much frankly, other than opinion out of people on the poll sometimes. So that is a way to try to get the broadest possible participation.

I'm not sure that we have a way forward. But we'll take this under consideration, including with the co-chair about both whether this is right for tomorrow's plenary, or deserving of further study by our group.  
Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Hi, Paul McGrady for the record. So the poll's already out there, it's a thing right. For us not to report the results of the poll, or only to report parts of the results of the poll, it really won't work. Because whoever was...it's for, questioned for. However inconsistent that question is with

---

the entire accountability framework of Work Stream 1, but whoever is for that and whoever's been pushing for that and whoever's kept that idea alive, is simply going to say in the plenary, "by the way, they're not telling you about question number 4" right?

So we just have to I think, tell the plenary here's the poll, here are the results. We have great consensus it seems, or pretty strong numbers around 1 through 3. We have pretty mixed numbers around number 4, or have slightly more people for than against it, but that's not consensus. And we continue to struggle with this idea that there are...that folks want to unwind Work Stream 1, by changing ICANN's formation jurisdiction. If the plenary has any instructions about whether or not that's a proper question still, this late in our process and whether or not we should be spending time on it, terrific. Then lets have it. But I think that not reporting the results of the poll really is...that's a non-starter. The poll's been let out into the universe so there it is. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks Paul. I do agree that we will...It's hard to un-ring the bell so to speak. And that you would dictate probably putting this forward as is, without a decision by the group per se. But noting the results of the poll. So then I guess...we're going to...while we take a minute or two to get the preamble up in front of us, lets discuss that. Continue to really...we've kind of worked into question 4, which is reviewed by the plenary. If there are any other further comments on whether or how the plenary should review this, please let me know. Put your hand up. I see no hands, but we now have the preamble in front of us.

---

David McAuley, if I could ask you briefly to...you don't need to read this out. But if you could give some, an introduction to this and your approach on this. And then we can see if there are any views on how this should be edited if at all. David.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Greg thank you. David McAuley here. In the last call, we noted that there should be a preamble to the questions that go out. Much like the SO/AC accountability group did. Cheryl kindly shared that preamble with me, and I believe that it took the approach of being a straight out introduction to the questions. Putting it in context and I tried to do that.

Basically what I'm trying to do in this is simply tell the reader, here is what has just landed on your desk. In other words, we are a sub-group in Work Stream 2 working on jurisdiction. The bylaws have directed us to do this. Annex 12 has directed us to do that. And in pursuit of that we're asking questions and that's why these questions below are on your desk. I hope to make it anodyne, with no view one way or the other.

I thought Mathieu made a good comment in the mails supported by Kavouss and I tried to incorporate that. But I was trying to avoid getting into any more...any deeper explanation. Because one of the things I think a preamble should be is very short so that's where I was coming from. Thank you.

---

GREG SHATAN: Thank you David. I appreciate that. I think the approach seems appropriate to me. But it's really a question for the group. So I'll take a pew on anyone who either wants to express support for the draft in front of you or has further opinions on it. There was some additional discussion on line as noted. Steve DelBianco says I like the preamble. Thank you Steve. [inaudible] back on the South Africa thing, we'll stay on topic here. David McAuley, is that a new hand?

DAVID MCAULEY: It is Greg. Hi, David McAuley again. The one thing I note on the screen is, it does not include the language that I added at the behest of Mathieu and Kavouss. I can read that language out if you would like.

GREG SHATAN: Yes please.

DAVID MCAULEY: At the bottom of the preamble on screen it says: "to help the sub-group in these endeavors, we are asking you to consider a response to the following specific questions" And that's where I initially ended.

After hearing from Mathieu and Kavouss I added this language in the same paragraph. "In this regard, the sub-group is asking for concrete factual submissions (positive, negative or neutral) that will help ensure that the sub-group's deliberations are informed, fact-based and address real issues. The sub-group is interested in all types of jurisdiction related factual experiences, not just those involving actual disputes/court cases". That's it Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you David for bringing that up. Since this is a living document and that seems like an appropriate addition. Especially since if these, when these questions go out or if they go out, depending on what the plenary decides. They're going to people who have no deep Saunderson of our deliberations or our charter so to speak. Or remit so I think that is very helpful.

Is there any other comment on the preamble? If not I think we can consider this to be essentially a non-controversial, put forward as part of the document. I will ask if there's anybody who objects to this preamble. Somehow I can't believe either we should send this out without any introduction or thinks that this should be significantly different. Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Can I be heard this time?

GREG SHATAN: Loud and clear.

AVRI DORIA: Can I be heard? Oh okay thank you I re-heard it. I figured there was not much. Okay. So obviously is this...and I missed a little so forgive me. This is a note that's going to the plenary? Or this is a note that's going to everybody you send it, the questionnaire with? I assume it's to everyone you're sending the questionnaire to correct? And I also

---

---

wanted to check; you decided that you had enough consensus to even send out the poll? And will that be reported to the plenary? Thank you.

I'm sorry for asking questions, perhaps out of order or out of scope or out of turn. But I did miss while I was rebooting. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you Avri. First, the idea that this preamble would proceed the questions when they're sent out to the world, or however they will be distributed. Posted on ICANN website or however it will be done. And there will essentially be a package. We go directly from the preamble to the questions. Then the question of...when the poll was proposed on the last call there was no objection to sending out the poll itself. So we went forward and sent out the poll, tried to get a sense of the group.

With regard to how to deal with this in terms of the plenary, I think the view that seems to be forming is that we report out the results of the group, including the results of the poll. Then at the plenary level determine whether the poll should be sent out at all and if so, which questions should it contain. Taking into...

AVRI DORIA:

May I comment?

GREG SHATAN:

Yes please go ahead.

---

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. So thank you. That's good that there's a prelude to the [inaudible] questions. What I wanted to mention and just so that I'll be forgiven when I mention it again in a meeting. I do not think you have consensus for sending out the poll. Because you do not have consensus for sending it out without the fourth question as I understand it. But I may be wrong on that, I'll think about it some more. I know you guys decided so I'll bring this up again in the plenary. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Just to recap the answer to the final question on the poll. If question 4 is not approved, I support sending out the questionnaire containing only questions 1 through 3, we've had 17 out of 22 supporting sending out the poll without question 4. And 5 out of 22 not supporting sending out the poll. So that seems like the strong support, but significant lack of support level. But again, this is, just when I think something that we...there's divergence with a slight majority, or somewhat of a majority. 15 to 11 with Kavouss' vote changing on question 4, support for question 4. And then 17 out of 22 supporting sending out without question 4, if that's the decision of the group. So those are the current support levels and we have 26 voting.

So if there's nothing further in regard to the preamble. David you have your hand up again.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thanks Greg. David McAuley again. I just wanted to mention about the preamble. When you asked whether this is acceptable, I've muddied the waters a bit by having two preambles. One is the one that you see on



---

the screen and the other is the one you see on the screen with the language that I read out, added. And I've put that language in the chat. Sorry to muddy the waters, but because Mathieu and Kavouss asked for some additional language, I thought I should note it.

I'm not sure my language responds to their concerns but I did put it out on the list, and it's now in the chat. So you might want to be a little bit more clear about what we're agreeing to. Version 1, just what's on the screen; Version 2, what's on the screen plus that additional language; or the other alternative is some other preamble that we will come up with. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you David. Well why don't we take a sense of the room. First if you support taking the..., or sending out the questions with the preamble including David's addition which is in the chat, which he also read out. Why don't you put up a green check, if you support that. And a red X if you do not support sending out that version.

Okay. Looks like we have support and one abstention noted. One stepped away no objection. Why don't you take down your checks for this one. If you support sending out the poll but only without David's addition, why don't you put up a green turtle just so we don't confuse it with any... This is only if you support sending it out without the last addition and do not support sending it with the addition. Please put up a turtle.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Greg, Cheryl here. Can you note a turtle from me, my AC room's gone flaky.

GREG SHATAN: Okay, I'll note a turtle from you. Thank you. It is not turtles all the way down, that is the only turtle. So thank you for that. Finally if you object to the preamble in either form, please put up a yellow rabbit. Again if you object to the preamble in either form, please put up a yellow rabbit.

I don't see any rabbits, so that's good. Also a good test of mental health. I think we can move on, it seems that there is a strong support with one turtle noted, for sending out the preamble with the additional paragraph. So lets take down the preamble and go back to our agenda.

This takes us to question 5, which is mechanics and details of the questionnaire process. Couple of... We discussed this on our last call, but didn't necessarily come up with any final decision, although I think there was a general leaning. In terms of how do publishers send out the questionnaire, since this is not a public comment per se, it doesn't seem quite right to put it on the questionnaire, on the public comment page for ICANN. But we do want it posted in some fashion. So it seems to me it should be posted on a page and then announced by ICANN in it's, however it announces that a question is open for comment. There are actually 7 or 8 different places that ICANN announces that it has things open for comment, plus it puts in the media. Depending on the type of thing that it is. Which always makes it fun to find things like this. Our separate quest and other things like that. And then there's the elite

---

bulletin and things like that. That go out and mention things like comment periods and other things.

It would be my view that there should, we should have some sort of collection page for people to respond, assuming again that the decision is to send out the poll. And that it should be announced by ICANN in that fashion, not posted on the public comments page. Which seems to me to be reserved for certain types of public comments as such. But I, that's my thought only. I am interested if there are any other thoughts at this time. Again we can discuss this on the list as well; you do have some time to decide it. Even though we need to put the questions themselves in front of the plenary. David McAuley.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Greg thank you. David McAuley again. I do have some thoughts on this and I noted Bernie's time check go to 15 minutes being left a couple of minutes ago, so I'll be brief. But I think this particular agenda item, number 5 is going to take some thought on our part, because we also need to consider how long this comment period is going to be open. And we also should discuss I think, perhaps separately in the next meeting, how we're going to handle these things. And this I think will raise again my hesitation to do this in the first place.

And that is I think we're going to get a lot of opinions as opposed to facts. Question 4 in my mind asks for opinions which I think is a bit of a mistake. So we're going to have to come up with a way to deal with this. And personally I think, with respect to questions 1 to 3, we should discard opinions and deal only with facts if that's what we're asking for.

---

But we're going to have to come up with some methodology as to how we as a group will deal with this. And so I think it's a separate discussion that we might want to have in the next meeting and by that time we'll know if the plenary ok'd the poll in any event. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you David. That's very helpful and I think it points to two issues. The first issue is the opinion issue and the desire to...I agree that we are looking for facts but the last question is likely to get opinions. And secondly, the issue how we are going to deal with the answers once we get them? What is our processing process so to speak?

I think that we can perhaps ask staff, what's been used in the past to do this? I think, we've seen a couple of different types of forms for input as well as just taking PDF's or whatever people submit in the traditional public comments format. Or we could, as we did with this poll, we could use a Google form which allows for free input and I believe allows for attachments as well. But we'd need to check that.

And then the question of course is, what are we going to do with all of this information once we get it? So that it's useful for our group's deliberations. Clearly it'll be something we'll have to figure out and especially how to deal with the weight of any particular fact that we get and also any particular opinion that we get. I don't know that we've given that a lot of consideration yet but it's worth thinking about. Any other comments on these?

Phil Corwin notes that if we start putting poll questions out for 30 days, public comments in this working group will take years to complete.

Just to clarify, when we use the terms 'facts', I think what we've actually really meant and I've tried to actually not use the word facts per se, is experiences. In other words we're looking for interactions that have occurred, where the jurisdiction of ICANN has been a factor, either positive, negative or neutral, but been a factor. And where there's actually been an experience that has taken place. So that's actually prefer the term experience to fact. There are facts that can be used to form a hypothetical or opinion about those facts which is a bit different. I tend to believe that's the job of this sub-group, but that's an open question. Mathieu? Your hand is up.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you Greg. That's part of the conversation about how to proceed with the input and I think the document, that is under item number of 6 on the influence of ICANN's existing jurisdiction, constitutes a useful framework to map the inputs that the group will get from the questionnaire. And check whether they fit into which category of this document. And it could also be helpful to distinguish between those feedbacks or inputs that relate to actual cases, actual experience as you say. Or simply to concerns or potential scenarios.

And with that in mind, if we structure the document well enough, then I think the input gathering exercise can be extremely helpful in mapping where people have concerns. Where people have bad or good experience. And as a consequence, having a better view of whether or not recommendations are needed, to improve things. Thank you.

---

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you Mathieu, that's very helpful. And I think it also points out the importance of the influence of the document, which is sitting here on our agenda. But I'm afraid we won't get to on the call. But I think it's more important to have that on the agenda to note that we really need to work on that document. That is a substantive document that is at the heart of our work, and it has been feeling neglected lately. So if I can ask people to go forward and go back into that document, we'll recirculate the link again today but you should have received it a number of times. Steve DelBianco.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you Greg. I'm one of the three Co-rapporteurs for the SO/AC accountability sub-group in Work Stream 2 along with Cheryl and with Farzaneh. And we too took a few weeks to have our sub-group decide upon the right questions to ask. We also surfaced those questions on a plenary call to see if there was any input, general input from the full CCWG plenary. But we did not put out for public comment what our questions would be. Nor did we try to poll the entire plenary on that.

You're the group that asks the questions, you're jurisdiction. And when the answers come back it will be the jurisdiction group that decides whether the answers have value. There may be answers that express opinions but provide no actual detail about the specific jurisdictions, or specific evidence of issues that we can use to come up with answers. So ultimately it'll be the jurisdiction sub-group that makes the determination about whether the answers to the questions are relevant to the recommendations that come forth. In that regard I would just advise, not to put your questions themselves out for any public

---

comments. Nor would I suggest that they need to be run by the entire plenary, with an ability to get them to approve it. The jurisdictions sub-group controls the questions and then is responsible for interpreting the answers. I would encourage you to get closure on which questions we're going to ask and get them out. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you Steve. It seems fairly clear that we have closure on the first three questions. The last question raises questions, with regard to the distribution of support and lack of support. And just to clarify, I certainly do not think that we should put out to the public, the question of which questions to ask. But given the divergence on question 4, I think we may want to put it in front of the plenary, as to whether or not we should ask that question and report to them on the...while reporting to them the results of the sub-group's deliberations.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

30 second follow up Greg, would be that, when the answers-. If questions were to be included, answers to question 4 in many cases wouldn't contain actionable, specific information that's necessary to even weigh the consideration of alternative jurisdictions. The questions will be merely opinions about the optimistic hope that the perfect jurisdiction could some day be found. And those answers then won't really matter in the recommendations. I'm just trying to realistic, that what the question says is certainly important but it's far more important what the answers are.

---

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you Steve. I agree. The last question is going to engender a broad spectrum of types of answers. And we'll need to determine how to deal with that. I think we'll also need to determine whether we bring this to plenary, or whether we continue to work and see if we either can achieve a fourth question that would actually get a level of support that is similar to the first three. Or at least is strong support with significant opposition as opposed to slight majority that we currently have. I think that is something we should consider and discuss on the list today. We do have the plenary meeting tomorrow. And then I don't believe there's another plenary until next year. It should be three weeks away or so. In terms of Phil's note that we get pushed into the future, that is a concern.

In any case if we, the SOAC questions did get two readings at the plenary level before they were sent out so I think that sets somewhere of a path for that. So I think at this point we've reached the top of the hour, so I have, I would say somewhat of a feeling that we do, as Paul noted and others noted, the fact of the, where the group ended up are the facts. And we bring them to the plenary. On the other hand it is somewhat of a not completely cooked result but in any case that's I think where we stand.

And I'll take any final comments. I see both Mathieu and Paul typing so if either of them would like to speak and not just leaving for another call. Fair enough. As Paul notes sometimes plenary calls happen when you're only half way through taking something. I think that's probably somewhat where we are. But in any case thank you all for your participation, for answering the poll. If you did not answer the poll, please go ahead and do so. And I look forward to seeing many or if not



---

all of you on the plenary call tomorrow and this call is adjourned. I may stop the recording. Thank you.

UNKOWN SPEAKER: Thanks Greg. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]