CCWG-JURISDICTION SUBGROUP
Wednesday, August 16, 2017 - 13:00 to 14:00

Why don't we begin. So if we could start the recording.

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> GREG SHATAN: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and welcome to the call of the 16th and at 1300 UTC, people are still joining.

So, we will go right into the agenda after welcome. We will check and see if anyone has any changes to statements of interest. Brenda please see if anyone puts up their hand in the Q. If you are not on   if you are not speaking, please mute.

From the silence, I'll take it there's no changes to statement of interest. Do we have any audio only? Or telephone number only participants?

>> BRENDA BREWER: Nope we have that covered, thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thanks, noted I'm an audio only participant, this is Greg Shatan. This brings us to the agenda review. So Brenda if you just read through the agenda and then we will jump right into it.

>> BRENDA BREWER: Very good. Agenda item number one is our welcome, which we have already covered and we are reviewing the agenda item 2, you item number 3, admin, covered. Number 4, discussion of timeline. Item number 5. Discussion of way forward proposal   did someone have a comment about item number 3? Okay, number 5 was covered. Number 6,

---

any other business. Number 7 we will adjourn the meeting after we have accomplished all of those agenda items. Any comments? Thank you I'll turn it over back to you Greg.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Brenda. So first, we will review the timeline. I'll ask staff to put up the work stream 2 timeline which was circulated along with the agenda yesterday.

I think it was yet for me. I understand it was today for some. And if you are not speaking, or if you are grunting or humming, if you could please go on mute. Thank you.

Please let me know when the timeline is up in the Adobe.

>> BRENDA BREWER: The timeline is up Greg.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you. I should say the Adobe connect room. Not to use a trademark as a noun, rather than an adjective.

So as we've discussed, we have a short timeline if in which to gather up all of the various threads of work that we have been working on. For quite some time now. And I'd like to actually turn it over to Thomas who is on the call with us, who can discuss timeline issues from the perspective of the co chairs. Thomas, please take it away.

>> THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much Greg. And hello everyone this is Thomas speaking. Should there be any questions to respect to the discussions of the last couple of weeks, I have to ask you for a little bit of patients because I'm only just come back from my vacation and still trying to catch up. But I feel quite confident speaking to the timeline issue since that has been are prepared by Bernie and as you know he's very capable of doing these projections. And I'm not going to talk you through every item that you see in the chart in the Adobe room in front of

you, but the general mechanic of that is that we see June 2018 which is the completion date for our work. And then we have done the math backwards, taking into account the 2 public comment periods after the completion of our work. I either would be a public comment period for the individual reports and then one public comment period for the consolidated report, which as we have discussed earlier, only focuses on inconsistencies. So need to be ready with the individual packages of the sub team by March 2018.

And that basically takes us to October, when the plenary has to come to consensus on the sub team's recommendation. And if we want to take into account an additional public comment period for an individual sub team report you can that needs to be done in we need to get this ready by October at the latest.

I guess that there's one important thing to mention when it comes to the timeline. And that is, that this chart only includes a procedure where by the sub team produces recommendations and the plenary then signs off on the recommendations. IE comes to consensus on those. As you will remember from previous discussions in the plenary, there has been instances where recommendations came from the sub team and the plenary had more questions or concerns with it. So that the report or the draft report was sent back to the sub team to further work on it.

And this has not been taken into account with this projection. So this can even be tagged an idea scenario projection for the sub team's work. Which means that we would even, if possible, need to be fast with the production of the report of the recommendations then you see on this screen.

I think it   somebody has mentioned early on the list that we only have something in the area of 8 weeks to come to   to come up with con silence recommendations from the sub team but actually ideally we would need to be faster than that. Having said that, and having read a lot of email changes on the list program, you I think we really need to focus on substance rather than discussing other procedural matters or shattering discussions about minor things that do not necessarily help us come to consensus within this sub team. And I think what we should be doing as of now is something that we've done in work stream one a lot, that is the famous dye in the ditch test. So unless you have an objection to process or other things in the sub team that you would like to dye in the ditch over, you should reframe from sending it to the list, but rather we should focus on the work approach that Greg has recently shared which I think will be further discussed and then look at issue based solutions for the problems that the sub team has identified. Because let's not forget, if we have delays in the process that prevent the sub team from coming up with recommendations, these recommendations or there would be no recommendation presented to plenary. If no recommendations are presented to the plenary, then there's nothing to present to the chartering organizations or to the board. Which means that those who are delaying the process help [indiscernible] the situation which probably they would like the change most. And therefore we should look at constructive ways to come to con silence on recommendations, maybe we should even prioritize the most pressing issues because you know chances are good that if we fail to come up with requests for modifications or improvement, that it will not be the CCW accountability that can do something about them that leaves further accountability to the periodic reviews that we haven shined in our bylaws.

I think I should stop here and hand it back over to Greg to further share the debate. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Thomas, Brenda can you let me know if there's any Q after Thomas' remarks?

>> BRENDA BREWER: Thank you Greg.

>> We have Kavouss in the line.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Brenda, thank you Bernie, glad to see you're on the line. Kavouss, please go ahead.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Thank you very much Thomas, I hope you had a good holiday. I think we kindly be clear that [indiscernible]

No one delays the process. Please kindly reconsider your works. I think that no one really delay the process.

So we should be quite clear of that. Second, you said that we should content is substantive issue, you as a chair or co chair, can you please send us a [indiscernible]

And say that in your view, what are the substantive issues we have to discuss. If it is specific [indiscernible] days that would help us. Thank you.

Thomas, I think that's directed to you. So I'll turn to you to respond.

>> Thanks very much Greg. I will try to be very brief.

The issues that the sub team wants to focus on, IE the substantive issues that I want to mention are those of the sub team identified. It's not for the co chairs to prescribe what the substantive issues are. It's within the sub team. With respect to being focused if you look at the amount of

emails that have been exchanged over the last couple of days and weeks, you will find that there's a lot of email exchange focusing on process, on scheduling, on administrative issues. And all I'm asking is that the sub team should focus its engine on solving the issues that were identified rather than discussing other things that were not directly related to that.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Thomas, do we have anyone else in the cue?

>> THIAGO JARDIM: Yeah I'll go next.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thiago, please go next.

>> THIAGO JARDIM: Sorry, I arrived in late. I don't know if we are discussing Greg's proposal I will make a brief comment. The comment is, I find it disturbing and at the same time funny, not to say tragic, to every time witness the participation of this issue WG leadership whenever they significant opposition, I'll use this word, significant opposition proposal that comes from the [indiscernible] I find it funny because whenever there's no significant opposition to significant proposals that would perhaps suit direction to each one of the [indiscernible] to have us going. So we go along but whenever there's opposition as it seems to me, there's some opposition, lots of emails have been exchanged showing at least controversial to the proposal and then all the sudden we witness there's Thomas that comes and participates while ordinarily he's not present, thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: This is Greg. If I could just respond first, we have not yet reached the discussion of the path forward proposal. We will get to it after this discussion. I'd like on see if anybody else agrees with Thiago's world view of the group. I find it a conspiracy theory and I

don't indulge in conspiracy theories and but everyone is entitled to their opinion and worldview, just not entitled to their own facts.

In any case, Thomas has been participating since we lost Matiu as our representative from the leadership. And I don't know if there is significant opposition to the path forward proposal. I have seen a couple of emails, it seems rather rash to characterize it as such. Indeed that's one of the main agenda items for this call. To determine support, lack of support, more importantly to try to see if the proposal can be refined. My proposal is merely a starting point. And any proposal we end up with is a proposal of the group, how to go forward. And I hope we can avoid lengthy discussions of procedure. But understand that there's obviously a procedural discussion to be had around the path forward proposal. And this is one of the relatively few times between now and the end of our work when we should discuss process. So I will see if there's anything else here to timeline subject. Obviously we have to   we are aiming roughly for October 11th get a document moved forward. So we can come up with a more detailed week by week plan. I'll try to do that after this call. Probably not until the weekend. But ultimately we need to concentrate on identifying agreeing on issues, then on remedy. That is the core that we have a lot of work that is really far along in that regard. And we need to bring it to an end. So I will stop here and see again if there's any further discussions on the timeline point.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: We have no hands in the cue.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Bernie. I think at this point we can move on to the path forward. Proposal, which I put on to a slide. And if we can get that, not that it's really a slide, up on the screen, we can work through that.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's being displayed now.

>> GREG SHATAN: Great, thank you very much Bernie. I am close to home but not there yet. So

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Greg I see a hand from Thiago and

>> GREG SHATAN: Let's take the hands briefly but it may make sense to review what the proposal is first. But if everyone has it in front and reviewed it and feels they understand it well enough to discuss it and have questions or the like, we can move forward on that. So why don't we take these two hands then see where we are in terms of discussion. Thiago please go ahead.

>> So thank you. Thank you. This is Thiago speaking for the record. My comment on the so-called path forward, the proposed path forward certainly in contradiction of the why the topic of jurisdiction was included in work stream 2 it was included as part of the commitment by the community to have all of the outstanding issues of the issues of ICANN for the U.S. jurisdiction for the expanding cycles we have the mandate and should fulfill the mandate at least we should be clear on this and honest about it. As about us not being able to fulfill the mandate and we should have these registered in whatever report we produce at the end. Since I mentioned Thomas intervention in the past, let me remind you despite the forceful turn in work of the subgroup in item 59 following the intervention of this issue which is leadership it was made clear to us that the outcome of the subgroup would not arbitrarily leave out any of the issues that were behind the creation of the subgroup in the first place.

In fact, Brazil and others not only did not propose the interference by the CCWG leadership on the work of the subgroup on the submission that any work of the subgroup would encompass

as many issues as the participants could identify. Of course we are aware there are constraints of time, but they are for the most part artificial and I'll explain why. If again it was because of a 2 part deadline to move the forward with a transition in work stream one that the treatment of work jurisdiction was referred to work stream 2 because there was no time to include discussions on jurisdiction to the time because there was now a window of opportunity prior to U.S. elections you may all recall, that you we then created a subgroup and mandated it to continue is jurisdiction as thoroughly as necessary. So we do not have to pretend or emphasize this we will not pretend that the jurisdiction will be closed because the subgroup will come up with some kind of recommendation just to meet an artificial deadline. Again, we better be honest about it and leave it on the record if that is the case as many issues as were raised remain untackled and further consideration. And to do that we certainly should not propose another artificial to fulfill the man a date as in this the proposal made by Greg that each participant should propose only one issue for eventually inclusion in the recommendation or report.

So since we are talking about limitations on artificial limitations, I think someone will again come with a suggestion that we find ourselves in the situation because there has been no significant opposition to the proposals leading to where we are now. The basis that I want this on the record, this is a distortion of reality. We have been led into the situation because of the way proposals have been framed not by the group as a whole but by leadership. I'll ask this question has any of the proposals had significant are support? They have not they have all come from above can they have all   there always has been some opposition to them again is there any signature support by the proponents and representatives of interest. Others and I have for example opposed creation of additional layers to categories as was already there. We

were proposed to the addition of additional requirements to the new and new lists to catalog issues already identified in the mailing list and during the calls. We were oppose to that because we felt that this approach would leave out issues that had already been identified in the mailing list and during the calls. And our concerns are proposal proven to be true, the concerns not just representatives of government different in federal government but also representatives of civil society, Internet users. Our proposal despite lack of significant support they have carried on and several emails not been answered. Who did it benefit? Thomas said it didn't benefit users or you civil society, it benefit this one constituency. This one constituency of lawyers comfortable representing can do not want to see changes in this status code. Do we have to come up with a recommendation at the end to pretend issue is closed and certainly note and Brazil will propose any outcome that suggests that this is what we are doing here. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Thiago. Next speaker is Kavouss.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Is Parminder next?

>> GREG SHATAN: Originally was Parminder he dropped off then came back in. So if we go by the Adobe room he was next. And you are now. He will be after you.

Kavouss, if you are speaking, we are not hearing you.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me?

>> GREG SHATAN: Yes, we hear you now.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. I think as I mentioned I supported Thiago two times. I want to clarify what he said is not [indiscernible] differently we are not accusing anybody. We think they say something and then come back and say something else. It's not interference of such. It's something lately it would be better that either they participate only in listen to the debate then propose something. Take it in that frenzy and not differently.

In respect to one person, one subject [indiscernible] in any case, if and only if there's a consensus that only one subject per person, my subject is open and I have given already sufficient information, 5 question on that. Plus I have sent a copy of the [indiscernible] generally blogged which mostly covers my point I didn't like to repeat what was said there. So I don't think you should expect anything from me. I have already given that and I hope for me OPAC is the most important thing I want to apply to some people that are worried about the TNC and the CCPLD advantage and support issues look avenue everybody's problem we have this problem and this problem is at the top of the issue. Thank you very much.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you Kavouss, Thiago I see your hand up, if you can lower it. Now Parminder.

>> PARMINDER: Thank you   Greg, Parminder speaking for the call. First I want to agree with Thiago points and also Kavouss on OPAC. I'll go back to Kavouss points I think it's important whether we agree to certain recommendations and solutions or not, that we do not first forget the problem. The problem or the jurisdiction issue has been there since the day ICANN was formed. It was very, very evidence during [indiscernible] we need to respect people's views. And not only just a few people but whole big part of the world community which has been consistently framing the jurisdiction issue as it is. You cannot artificially be made into some

other issue. Just by saying that [indiscernible] saying go to specific in some country, once you have the problem that's a jurisdiction issue. The jurisdiction issue is not what attune permission of ICANN people talk. That's not how political realities work and we cannot change those realities in this group because there are, you know a lot of people spending a lot of time that Thiago reference too. And not to say that no, this is not jurisdiction issue and people are saying to the people that say that's a jurisdiction issue in a very reverent manner they are confused and yeah.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Parminder can I ask you to slow down for the transcript please.

>> So we get to hear that people that raise that original thing that has been the question as confused by out of focus and all that. Let's be honest what the question is. We can be honest about some people not ready to go to solutions. We can know that but we cannot change the nature of the original question. There would be could be original question but the original question is the application of the whole range of both problems of the state of the USA. To ICANN normal subject to [indiscernible] that's the chief question. That again about delays. Has been because we have been changed from the start let's talk about the top issues and the solutions together. But I think many different cycles of successes have been tried and they cause delays. At times we were told that we should only talk about issues and not talk about solutions. Certainly some solutions were excluded. I think what we are now going to try is what we have been asking for the last one year. Top problems and solutions talk about them together.

Which brings me to my position for how we should chart the path forward. I think we should in the next week or two discuss the key main issues along with their recommended solutions.

Together have a focus discussion and then people can have views on whether this issue does not exist or is wrong or whether this solution is not any good. Let's focus on what we should of focused on there the start. About the positions and the recommendations of solutions and one by one have a discussion on them together.

So, this is what I would propose we do in the next weeks or a few weeks. And again, if we do not agree on a solution that does not mean the issue has disappeared. We have to discuss this was an issue that we could not except on a solution on that. Thank you.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Greg you're in the room now. So I'll return team management to you.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Greg, if you're speaking we're not hearing you. Next in the cue is David McAuley. David, please.

David if your speaking we are not hearing you.

Okay we hear you now.

>> DAVID McAULEY: Can you   Bernie was anything heard?

>> Not yet Bernie, not yet David.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: It may have been my audio.

>> I was just going the comment on the path forward. Since there's 70 participants, over 70. If we each pick one that's over 70 issues. I suspect if someone wants to pick more than one this group is not going to shout them down. I don't think that's a major issue and it's a fair comment to this draft. Secondly I think it's important to note with respect to 8 weeks

remaining that we have one repertoire that has carried water on drafting so far, ably in my opinion. And we as a group get to constructively pick those things apart. That's the way the system works. I don't mean pick apart in a pejorative sense. I would urge people do what Greg said calls for drafting pick up a pen is and let the rest of us pick it apart and that will make the next 8 weeks. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you David. Thank you all. There's been a lot   wide ranging set of remarks to this issue so far. I'd like to concentrate on the proposal itself. Which we may be able to get more agreement on than some of the other broader points that were made. And for instance, I think there may be significant disagreement on what the mandate of this group actually is. And the mandate as stated by Thiago may not in fact be the mandate. But, I'd like to concentrate to proposal and we can figure out within this proposal how to deal with the issue of scope. As well as the issue of issues.

And I think actually see an agreement, if you will, in the end of Parminder's remarks that I can see them in the transcript or the captioning to spend the next couple of weeks going over the issues and recommendations and develop them to move forward. And I also note David McAuley's remark if there's more than one issue per person, that probably will not be shouted down. And that is in the remarks I have seen so far on the list, probably the point in this proposal that has received the most disagreement and I would Thiago in terms of sarcasm, I know you disagree to what you think the mandate is, but that does not mean you are right.

So whether you beg or be sarcastic doesn't make you anymore correct.

So, in any event, the   in terms of coming to more than one issue, there are a couple of different approaches we can take, one is to   one is to take the different issues rather than having one

per person, if someone wants to propose more than a single issue, that they prioritize them. Any event the issues will be put forward to the group. The group will discuss them and prioritize the issues. I think that if some restraint is indicated, if someone comes forward with two or three issues, that's not going to be the end of the world. If somebody comes forward with 30 issues, that would be rather different. Also, we are ourselves need the prioritize we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We need to solve some issues and those would be the most pressing issues. To try to resolve. The alternative of resolving no issues, I think is not going to be effective for anyone. If there are issues that people believe are significant that somehow we are not getting to, and not because at   and it may be an issue of mandate or other reasons why we decide an issue is not an issue, that's not what I'm referring to. What I'm referring to is if people believe we are essentially ignoring even the discussion of an issue that's something I would like to avoid doing.

So I see a hand from Kavouss. Please go ahead Kavouss.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes Greg, okay, thank you that we are now in the Adobe room. I think that even one subject per person, if you count 17 or 20 person may be far from our capability. Why not reduce to [indiscernible] you ask that people having more than one question or one subject, they prioritize that. That's good in the order of priority, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. And then in the end you pick up sometimes you put a deadline for that not forever. Then may be a topic will be repeated by several persons and that topic will have its own top priority.

At the same time you as a copulatory or chair or leader of this group you have listened in this one and one year and several months to the discussion and why not you also put a proposal from the chair of the subject. And none of them will prevent the   prevent the others. But at

least we have two channels. Questions on subject by the chair, identified by the chair, according to his understanding and questions raised by the people 1, 2, 3 with the order of priority and with you put them together in a call and try to find out from that. But we need to have some kind of [indiscernible] 1 day 2 weeks these are the things. As far as I'm concerned my first priority is OPAC. There's no needs that are explained it has already been explained several times and one generally have a numerous explanation of the problem and the difficulty of that. But they have no problems with the two [indiscernible] channels. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Kavouss. We have any other discussion of the proposal, the path forward. I'd like to hear from as many people as possible. Since this is, if you will, our final, or our last best chance to set our course. And then try to send little time talking about process and the most possible time talking about substance. So, I see kind of a revision to this proposal developing in regard to the you one person, one issue approach. We will try to refine that on this call.

Thiago, please go ahead.

>> THIAGO JARDIM: This is Thiago speaking. I want to say I'm opposed to the one man, one issue approach. I think I just read David saying he would not oppose having some leeway regarding issues we can include. And I would also like the refer to an email sent in the by Shawn who is also against the proposed path that limits our ability to propose number to just one issue. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Thiago. In the interest of washing out viewpoints, I'd like the see if there's any support for a rigorous one person, one issue viewpoint. I have not heard any. But

I just want to make sure before we move away from that, that there are   there's nobody that wants to speak in favor of it. Kavouss, please go ahead.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes Greg I think you have not heard any opposition   any support. I don't know. There was a position to one person one question. The way that you put it I think maybe good, people could put some more than one questions, more than one subject. But prioritize that and see what happens. This the does not waste the time on this one subject person 10 subject per person. Let's use to have the views on any subject they want in order of priority and see to what extent they can do that. Why not take that proposal that you make and I have amended this. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Kavouss, my only point was in managing debate to make sure that we heard any significant different points of view on the one person one vote aspect of the proposal. As I said, I have not heard it, any vigorous support for the one to one rule. Just making sure that we get opinions out on the table.

Parminder, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

>> PARMINDER: Thank you Greg, Parminder here. My opinion is that if we make it a clear condition that every issue which is proposed should be matched clearly with what should therefore be done. If we go this path there would not be more than, say 10 proposals. I think even less. Because a lot of issues are mentioned hanging on it there, without anything being said what should be done. Because we are a group who is talking about what should be done. We should make it a condition, mention an issue, but clearly say what should this group do about it. And what should in general be done. Which this group should push for. If, I'm repeating myself, if we make this condition I'm sure this problem would not be any issue of

their   it would be less than 10. Then we could focus and this each of them, one by one. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Parminder, I agree with that. And that's very helpful. I think it also helps us to focus on the proposal in front of us. Putting aside the one to one rule for which I hear no significant support. That the third bullet point in front of you is proposed solutions. If you have a possible solution recommendation which should be considered please include it. Again being sent.   So I think it's very important that we concentrate both on issues and remedies, recommendations, solutions, whatever you want to call them, that is really the key to having a report that can go to the plenary. Is to see if we can come up with recommendation.

As far as let's take to Tijani and see the one person one issue and Tijani, please go ahead.

>> Okay thank you Tijani speaking.

If we adopt this process of one issue per participants, what would happen if all of us take the same issue? Means that we would be limited because we don't have the right to submit more than one issue. But if everyone has or thinks that this is the main issue and everyone submit the same issue, that means you would be short of subject to discuss later. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Tijani. It's true, if we took sort of a black box approach, kind of like the new gTLD program many. If everyone put their application in without knowing what everyone else said we would end up with a lot of statements of the same issue. It points out regardless of what our rule is, is putting the issues out in an open fashion, is critical. And then we can see if people may feel that their issue is being address asked they may not have to put forward any issue and they can see the issue they great address is not being put forward they

can put forward even if they see someone else's issue is important. The importance is tease out the issue but do it quickly.

I see that also support, you know, you a side from Parminder as well from David McAuley that putting an issue forward without a proposed solution would be unhelpful and certainly would be strong recommended not merely state an issue but state a situation. Kavouss I'll take your hand next. Go ahead.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes I think this discussion would be perhaps endless. Let's relate in the following way, due to the time constraint or complexity of the issue it is preferable that one person one question however does not prevent the people to send more than one question to one subject provided they Associate's degree of priority on that. I think you have to kindly wind up this discussion. We cannot spend another hour on that. So many people. We have to go some middle ground on that. And not to strictly speaking one question one person. Say that this is a purpose that does not tell me   does not prevent the people from asking more than one question provided that they could associate their priority of that. And they kindly if possible finish that and go to the next step of the work. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Kavouss, I agree. I think we have come to the end of this discussion. I don't think we have support for a one person one issue rule. I think we do have support, hopefully I can recap this appropriately, for each person who wants to put forward an issue to exercise some restraint in the number of issues they put forward. And second, when they put forward the issue, to put forward one or more proposed solutions, that would at least be strongly recommended as an approach. Then last, in terms of how to go forward with that, it would be most helpful to have people put them forward, the issues in an email. We can

continue to use the spreadsheet with the issues list or some issues have been listed. Although some have objected to that or at least there's been one or two objections to that. I find that having a central repository of issues would be helpful rather than referring to multiple emails and documents. So that is not intended to be a repository and not to be an abstract way of trying to ignore issues. That was never the intention. So, what I'd like the on do is see if there is general support of   for the approach I've out lined which is put forward the issues you believe is important in the order of importance. Please state them as they are stated in the bullet points, please be specific. Please be succinct, brief, but not so brief that we can't understand the issue. A mere link to another document is not incredibly helpful, if you can take the extra few minutes and cut and paste into the email. As an alternative if you want to enter it directly into the chart which is our most recent chart, that would be helpful too. But if you just put forward an email, staff and I will get the issues on to the chart.

So you have two alternatives, either put forward an email or put it directly on the chart. If you put it on the chart, then in the group sheet, just send an email to the list that says I've added an issue to the list entitled X. You don't need to repeat the whole thing. I'm not trying to make work for anybody but I do need people to work. And then we will look at it on the chart. I think that is a flexible approach. I'd like on see if there's any opposition to that approach. Or lack of are support.

I see a check four support if you if support this, please go ahead and give me a check. Not me, give the group a check. I'm just trying to facilitate. I see support. I see no hands. I see no opposition, I see one person that stepped away.

So it looks like we have support and no sign of opposition. So I think in terms of timing, it would be critical to get things on the list somewhat in advance of the next meeting. I think Bernie I'm going the turn to you and see what thoughts you have on process and whatever else your hand is raised for. Bernie please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you Greg. Given the approach, some people may see   some people may on post an issue which other people may feel is exactly their issue. So instead of reposting the same issue, if you see an issue that is posted that you wish the support, maybe just sending an email to the list supporting this specific issue. Clearly identifying them. Then it would help us tally up which issues have the most support.

And for timing, I guess our next meeting is on Wednesday the 23rd one week from now. If people can have their submissions in by the   I would say, 23:59 Monday the 21st that would give me and Greg a day to go through them and make sure we have proper listing for them and proper counts and we get to the Wednesday meeting and then we can have an efficient meeting at looking at which issues got the most support. And hopefully allow us to go from there. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Bernie. Much I think that seems like a good approach. So, if we are now at 9:56 eastern time. About 4 minutes left. Parminder, please go ahead.

>> PARMINDER: Thanks Greg, not in opposition, but I just wanted to stress one point which you made. And say that if anybody who gives their issues, try to give a solution to it. We should go by that as much as possible which is only the reviews, the numbers and, also, focus on the recommendation. Thank you. Which you already said, I was just adding that. Thanks.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Parminder, an issue without a resolution only gets us halfway home. Thiago please go ahead.

>> THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you, this is Thiago speaking for the record. So if I stand correctly, we should once the subgroup has received the different issues proposed by each participant, we as a group should consider when those issues are issues within the remedy of the sub group within the next call. But I have doubts whether we are going to be able to go through all of the proposed issues just in one call. That being the case, I don't see why we should have a strict deadline on the 21st for submissions of issues. And I'll explain. If we can't, for example, exhaust all of the issues proposed during one call there would still be time for, I don't know, people who came in late with propositions by the 24th and so. I understand it's imperative to haves as many issues as possible and have people stick to the deadlines of the 21st to have the group by the next call but understand we want to exhaust examination of the issues in one call. I don't   I think we wouldn't, shouldn't reject out rank all times submissions that can't come in a little late. Thank you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you Thiago. Obviously, I guess if somebody were to come up with a burning issue that they somehow have not yet identified, after 42 meetings, and came up with it after the 43 meeting and it got a great deal of traction, wouldn't be rejected out of hand. On the other hand, we have a time you crunch. And moving forward, I think we have spent a lot of time identifying issues and now we really need the get things into hopper. So, I'm not one who generally loves hard deadlines. I'm kind of a softy that way. But nonetheless, if we keep recycling issues after we move forward, we are just going to run out of time. So, I would ask that everyone use their extra best every time over the next several days to bring the issues to the list. I'm fairly confident that we have had enough time for everyone to kind of identify what

they believe are the issues within our remit. Or at least with the issues. They can believe they are within our remit. And then we can move forward from there.

In any case, I think we have our work cut out for us. And so I'll just in final remarks ask that everyone who has not already done so, bring their issues to the email list. Best if it's one issue per email. Just follow the notes in front of us in bullet points. As an alternative, you can put it in the Excel spreadsheet or really it's a Google spreadsheet. And just let the list know that you have posted it there. Please do so by 23:59 UTC on Monday. It really will help our process if we have everything there.

So, we will summarize this on the email list for those who were not able to attend this call while everyone is charged with the responsibility of knowing what goes on in the call, given the relatively short amount of time, we have clearly informing those who were unable to participate as quickly as possible, is you know all for the good. And we will do that after this call wraps up.

So, I thank you all. It's 10:01 here in New York City. I think that brings us to the end. I ask everyone to make their contributions and we will be back here in one week. Thank you very much and this meeting is now adjourned you can stop the recording. Thank you and goodbye.