

RAW FILE

ICANN

MAY 24, 2017

2:00 PM CST

ICANN CCWG-ACCOUNTABILITY WS2 PLENARY.

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

(captioner standing by).
>> (Speaking off mic).
>> Hello, hello?
>> Hello? Hello?
(silence).
(coughing).
(silence).
>> Check.
>> JORDAN CARTER: Hello, Jordan here although only for two or three minutes.
>> Hi, this is Dan, I will be in the room in the next three or four minutes.
(silence).
>> (Speaking off mic). We're going to -- we need a couple of minutes more and we'll begin our call in two minutes.
>> Hello, be it seems we can begin now as usual. We will be doing our roll call with those attending on the Connect, and if there is anyone in the Connect Room at this point, could you please let us know so we can add you to the roll call.
>> This is (?), I'm on the phone bridge.
>> I'm sorry? The lady who was speaking?
>> This is (?) I'm on the phone bridge, I couldn't open it. I'm sorry.
>> (Speaking off mic)?
>> Yes.

(multiple speakers)

>> On the phone bridge and we have (?) on the phone bridge. Anyone else?

>> Okay. Here and no one else, we do have apologies from our co--chair who will not be attending today's call, Tom. And I myself, I am just committing (?). I should be in until now, and we have a brand new co-chair with us, an old friend of ours, and we've been working with him quite for long time but today I would like to welcome in in his role as Co-chair to Jordan Carter who was appointed, so we have a new co--chair, assistant to (?) as you might have already known as we sent some messaging in the mailing list.

So, I remind you also that it is important that you update your at the same time of interest. If you haven't done so or haven't filed the statement of interest, please do so after this convening, if you have any problems with your statement of interest, please approach anyone on staff and they will be able to assist you.

And of course, we will try to remind you of the standards of behavior, which we all know quite well, but let's just remind them as to what it is. But with this, I would like to, as I said, welcome Jordan in his role as Co-chair of the CCWG and I will now turn to him next, Jordan?

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, for the welcome and handover. Hi, every I'm Jordan cart, one of the CCSO members and now ccNSO Co--chair of the group. I'm pleased to be in the group and I hope I do what you need me to do. I'm working through the agenda, and we've got a couple of administration items that the staff will take us through. Review of open action items from the last meeting and update on various consultations and submissions. We have the Legal Committee updates. We'll have a talk through the WS2 schedule for FY18 process for completion. We did a call a little bit with the chairs a couple of weeks ago.

We'll talk about the next plenary which is Wednesday 7 June 0500 UTC. And then AOB. Any other amendments or additions to this agenda that anyone would like to add?

If you think of something during the call that you wanted to raise and you wish he had said so now, you have a chance to do that in Any Other Business, that Item Number 7. And with that if there are no changes at this point, I'll hand it back to Leon to take us through the next item.

>> LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Jordan, and the next general da item is the administration item, and for that I would like to call better than Bernie to walk us through the different administration items we have today. Bernie we have

the floor.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good afternoon everyone. I hope everyone can hear me. I'll take that as a yes. Excellent, thank you. We'll start by going over the decisions and action items from the previous meeting, which was about a month ago, if we remember correctly. And we had the human rights FOI was approved for public consultation. Staff was to prepare under the action items -- excuse me. Under the action items staff was to prepare a extension note for the chartering organization, and this has been done and sent and the group has been copied.

The staff was to draft a letter of appreciation for Metsure. Working on that, my fault, been busy. But we'll try to get it done this week.

Staff to prepare human rights FOIle for public consultation, that's pleaded and we'll be talking about that a little later.

Any questions on the action items?

Not seeing any, we'll proceed.

Some people seemed to be wondering if we were having to a face-to-face meeting immediately prior to the Johanes berg after the meeting in June. Yes, that is the case. We are having a face-to-face meeting on 25 of June the full day.

The SOAC accountability publication is live and will close on the 26 of May.

The diversity questionnaire will be closing 1st of June.

The kowp hiem Rights Public Consultation will close 6 of June.

There is a new role for Jordan Carter. I think we've heard that Jordan is now our new Co-chair and will be taking over from Matuire and it's our pleasure to welcome in.

Implications from sub-group calls. Yes, just a reminder to everyone, if you know that a call is not going to be held because we now have transcription or captioning, rather, if we don't cancel ahead of time, we will be billed for it, and that's very normal. So, please, if you are aware that you are not going to be able to hold your subgroup meeting, please advise staff as soon as possible so we can make the necessary arrangements, and advise everyone in the subgroup who may be thinking of showing up.

There are only two plenaries left prior to ICANN 59. That's the 7th and the 21st of June, just for those who are thinking of submitting documents for first reads.

If you wish to submit a document for the plenary on the 25th of June, please make sure that we've got that a week ahead so we can distribute it to the group as per our usual rules.

APRT request for members. I'll depart here for a second, and is Patrick on the call?

I'm not hearing him. Oh, there you are. Would you like to speak to this for a second, Patrick?

>> PATRICK DODSON: Yes. Just a very quick update on the call for volunteers for ATRT3 has been extended out to the early part of June to help give people more time to submit applications to participate in that review. So far the feedback has been very low, of attendance, as I'm sure all can understand given the general fatigue. I'll try to speak up there if my audio is a little bit faint.

We are in the process of working with Leon and the co-chairs to draft an email that will be sent out to the broader accountability meeting, which there are several hundred individuals on that list, and so Leon has graciously accepted our suggestion and asked that a very brief email go out to try and spur more interest in volunteering and participating in that review.

So I think that Leon has that address right now and it should be going out to the accountability broad email list, I would think, in the coming days. That's the update on that.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you very much, Patrick. Do we have any questions on that topic?

Not seeing any we'll carry on -- oh, I see a question from Sebastian. The floor is yours.

>> Thank you very much. Yes, I have a question about takeover from the co-chair, the new co-chair, Jordan, he will take all the same responsibilities as Mathieu or will the co-chair reassign, for example, who will follow the subgroup and other tasks like that? Thank you.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you for the question, Sebastian. Leon, want to take this one?

>> LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, if I understood well, the doubt is whether Jordan will continue to serve us co-chair or for some of the subgroups in which he was actually serving under that role, and I -- I can tell you that we haven't really spoken about this with Jordan, so in the meantime, he will continue to serve in this role, not only as co-chair but also as corroborator. I remind you that also Mathieu and myself have served for different reasons, so I don't expect this to be a problem with Jordan, but yes we will need to speak with him and sort out with him. And as soon as we have this conversation among the co-chairs, we will let you know in a timely fashion so that everything -- so that everyone is informed and on the same page. I hope that answers your question, Sebastian.

>> If I may, Sebastian again. Sorry, Leon, thank you for your answer even though it didn't answer my real question. I wanted to know, you know, in the, at least as a subgroup, we have the co-chair assigned to each subgroup, and for example you are assigned to the university, human rights and review and so on and so forth, and Mathiure was assigned to three IFPs and (?) and I wanted to know if Jordan will do the same job or if you will reorganize all of that. Sorry for that. Thank you.

>> LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Now I understand. I understand, and yes, in the meantime, of course, Jordan will substitute Mathiure in all the roles that he hadn't signed but we might change it depending on the conversation that we have among co-chair, but in the meantime, you can assume that Jordan will assume the role that Mathiure was having on the assigned groups as well. Thank you.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Leo, in. Kavouss I see you are next, please.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, on the recent issue, I think normally, normally Jordan is expected to replace Mathiure to also resume the activities that he did. That is a normal situation. If there is a position that maybe it's difficult because it was (?) but that's a normal situation. But you're almost at the end of the two months, so the continuity had to be taken up. Thank you.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you for that statement, Kavouss. Christopher?

>> Good evening, everyone. Jordan, I just have a simple question to you because of your and my long-standing participation in the transition process. In CCWG, you have an assignment of particular points of view. I would just like to be reassured as co-chair of work stream two, you have taken fully on board the final results of CCWG and WS1 and from that point of view we start from a clean sheet. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Yep, Chris, I think that's a very reasonable question and the answer is, yes. My job in this role is to help with the process of completing WS2 and that's what I'm here today. It's not to turn my mind back to 2016 or 2015.

>> Thank you very much.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Jordan. Thank you Christopher. Kavouss I see your hand is up again.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, sorry to comment again. More confirmation of what Christopher said, I think some colleagues, they attempt to put in question the ultimate role in one we will discuss for many, many weeks, so I suggest that these

co-chairs or Jordan taking care of that need to respect as much as possible the outcome and not to allow the opportunity to change the (?). The reason is that in some groups there are review, sometimes a number of participants is not more than six, so this sixth person could (?) of some 40 to 60 person (?). This is an important issue to be recorded in the outcome of this meeting that the decision of the (?) needs to be maintained. Thank you. better than.

>> Thank you, Kavouss. Bernie, back to you?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Leon. I think we were up to WS2, extension status. We have had one response supporting us. Of course, we would be glad if any of the chartering organizations would support our request for an extension for fiscal year 18.

The other thing that is on-going with the Workstream 2 extension is that the PCSD is working with ICANN Finance and SSI to develop a budget. And just to be clear, what we had were spending estimates. We have to develop a budget if it's going to be included in the fiscal year 18 budget, so we're working on that and we're hoping that things will go well, and are also expecting that most of the questions and requirements will come at ICANN 59.

Our next and final element for administration is the frequency of reporting. As you know we have been producing monthly reports since the beginning of Workstream 2. We've had a look at this and believe it's time to amend that formula and to bring us up to date, I would like to have Nathalie come and speak to the proposal. Nathalie?

>> NATHALIE VERGNOLIE: Thank you, Bernie. Hi, everyone, this is Nathalie. So echoing what Bernie was saying, as you all know, we've been publishing monthly reports throughout this last fiscal year, since the beginning of the project, and given the fact that we are now extending the work into another fiscal year and the level of activities that we're seeing in the group and the fact that the level of expenses being spent is significantly much lower than it was in the previous years, we brought this for discussion with the co-chairs and they suggested we bring it up for discussion here with the larger group to potentially decrease the frequency of our reporting. So, this is what we're suggesting for the few upcoming months. We would like to suggest to publish a May Dashboard that will be available for ICANN 59, so that would be the dashboard that we would publish early June and that will include, as you know, the finances of the previous month, so it would only have finances up until end of April.

And then we would like to skip a month, not publish a

dashboard for the month of June, and publish a July dashboard in early August, which would include the financial of the full fiscal year, FY17, so that one would be available early August, and it would give us the full picture of the fiscal year in terms of expenses.

And then what we would like to suggest is that we skip a few months of reporting again and produce a dashboard in time for ICANN 60. And what we would like to try to do for this one would be to publish, and we're going to have to rush this one a little bit because ICANN 60 starts on October 28th, so we still would like to reflect the activity of October in that dashboard, but it's going to be a bit of a challenge to get finances -- to get financial numbers for the first quarter, but I'm sure Finance will try its best to help us bring out those numbers that would reflect the first quarter of FY18 in terms of finance. So, that's what we would like to suggest, and then we would like to propose that we re-evaluate after then the cadence of publication depending on the activity of the project and so forth. We can decide if we want to increase the cadence again, or what we do moving forward. So, that's our proposal and I'll stop there and hear your comments. I'll hand it back to Bernie to facilitate the discussion.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Nathalie for that. I see I have one hand up, Greg, over to you.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thanks, it's Greg Shatan for the record. I think that makes sense overall; however, with regard to ICANN 59, it might be good to do an interim dashboard, not necessarily updating the financials but updating the status of the subgroups because otherwise we would be going into ICANN 59 which is at the very end of June, basically with a month-old dashboard in terms of status updates. Thanks.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Greg. Any other comments? Not seeing any, we'll be wrapping up this section. I just have been in offed that the GNSO has supported the Workstream 2 extension into fiscal year 18, so we've got two down, so that's great.

Greg, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Thank you.

All right, Leon, done with this part and over to you.

>> LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Bernie and whoever commented on this topic. The next agenda item is the update and we have no pending requests, so we can go to the next slide, please. We have no pending requests, and then the last activity that we had was that we received the questions that the jurisdiction subgroup submitted to ICANN Legal, and they have to proceed. They have been analyzed by the Jurisdiction

Subgroup and therefore we have no pending requests on the Legal Committee side.

And now I would like to turn back to Jordan for a (?).
Jordan?

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Leon. Jordan Carter here. Item 5 on the agenda, which is the next slide, is just a reminder of the Workstream 2 schedule, and I'm pretty sure we went through it on the last plenary call, so I don't want to run through it in any detail, but just to remind you, if we go to the next slide -- yeah, I'm not entirely sure if we did do this in the plenary last time or if we talked through it with the co-chairs, so just to talk a little more time to talk it over. The essence of the work is if the chartering groups in ICANN do agree the extension through FY18. It's very unlikely that we will get a further extension, so we have to think of July 2018 as the highest deadline for our work, and not an elastic one, not an extend bl one.

Today is the 24th of May, 25th where I am, and we have this first meeting coming up in about a month for ICANN 59 and then there is the Abu Dhabi and that includes the summer break when many of you like to go on holiday for some reason, and then four months after that the October meeting is ICANN 61 and then three months later, 18 June in ICANN 62. The publication of one and a half months or so, what the point of that is to remind you that there isn't actually that much time, even though there is a calendar year available.

Can we go to the next slides, please? And so to reiterate the point I made for staff, June 18 is the end. I don't think anyone should be planning on work of the CCWG continuing beyond that a date.

And if we go to the next slide, and to complete that, if you step back from that, it means that all of the subgroups need to be finished with their work, and that doesn't mean finished drafting. That means finished completing their work after public consultation by March 18, and so that means the very latest to get sign-off of a draft of the reports is the previous ICANN meeting, November 17, because that would be the plenary chance for the CCWG to talk it through, and if you think your area is going to need two public comments, then you really have to have it finished by June to allow public comment and plenary discussion of the public comment.

And if you want to have a revised draft in time for that ICANN 60, it means the public comment needs to happen over the northern summer. So, for example, Staff Accountability, the group I've been working on with Avri will need to have it over the summer for public input.

So this time table isn't presuming that we do get an extension, and I have to say that ccNSO is unlikely to make a decision on that before the meeting in June, and I'm sorry about that, that's the way that we work. And we will have, at most, a year after that. And the chart in front of you now, and 5.4 in the slides, just shows the revised timeline and what needs to happen by when.

I would just ask Bernie, do you want to talk through this timeline at all with the group? This timeline slide?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Really, and thank you, Jordan. This just recapitulates what we were discussing for doing one public consultation, the yellow lines are the ICANN meetings, and so the two major lines here, the top one is for the groups that are only planning to do a single public consultation, and it's sort of a worst case. So basically asking for an approval by the CCWG by ICANN 61. I see Nathalie has her hand up and she was the drafter of the slide, so I would be glad to let her speak to this. Thank you.

>> NATHALIE VERGNOLIE: Thank you, Bernie. This is Nathalie. I just wanted to add a brief comment because it is a question that was raised by one particular -- when I presented this at the diversity subgroup recently, what they asked is whether this was a hard timeline, that all subgroups needed to comply to? And of course my answer to them was, no. This is not a hard timeline, and it doesn't mean that every subgroup needs to comply to this timeline. It is what we consider the best -- the latest timeline to work toward, so if you -- if you can be or want to be ahead of this, suit yourself. And if you're ready to go for public comments before that or whenever you're ready before this is totally signed, it's just if you're planning for one or two public comment sessions, this is like the latest milestones that you should work toward if you want to make sure that you finalize the work within the next fiscal year. Thank you.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Nathalie. As I was saying, if you're going to go, we will as usual distribute the slides a little later, but if you go through the slides, the top line we've got is the worst case scenario for doing one public consultation. The second line is the worst case scenario for doing two public consultations if you haven't done one yet.

You'll notice there is a third line in there, and we're going to be talking a bit more about that in the next steps, is how do we consolidate this and get it out for final approval? Now, we've discussed this at the last plenary and we followed up and refind the process, but before we go there, I see we

have a question from Kavouss. Kavouss, over to you.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Jordan. I think that this (?) public consultation, if we are at the point we have to go back, I don't think it is necessary that we have two public consultations with a consideration that in the course of action (?) is quite different from (?) because of the subgroup arrangement of some kind, the number of very, very few, and then we would come to the CCWG plenary also less than the number in (?). (?) is almost double, so two in one -- I'm sorry, two public consultations seems to be necessary, and the question to consider that it should be of the things, there are some issues that need to be really put forward for the public consultation allowing people not able to comment to have a possibility to do so. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Kavouss. Jordan here. I think the point about the one or two is that it created space for areas that might be difficult or controversial where people thought there might be a different view in the wider community from within the CCWG to be able to revise and seek more input on difficult recommendations. So I don't think anyone, certainly from my point of view, the community attention of this process is less than most transitions so we don't want to beat people over the heads with unnecessary consultations, and so if one public comment period is done, and kind of the interaction a subgroup has done, there is no need to have a second one. But in some situations, if stuff comes up that means there does need to be changes, significant changes to a -- to a set of recommendations from a subgroup, and then there does need to be another public comment on that, that's what this timetable is designed to allow, so thanks for the comment. And Bernie, can I -- is there anymore of this that you would like to explain at this point?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think I'm done unless there are other questions on the timeline, and we probably can move over to the process for final identifying Workstream 2 it recommendations and the document that was circulated with the agenda, so I'll hand it back over to you for that.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Well, bad news for you is I was planning to hand it back to you to talk through that one, so if we work through the timeframe, what Bernie has just mentioned is the document that was circulated to the group about how we will land this thing, how welcome to a conclusion of our work and make sure that it contains consistencies and stuff, so Bernie, you're back on the spot on that one.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, sir. Just trying to come off of mute here. So all, we've discussed the need to how

we were going to wrap up all of this, and we were -- we discussed last time about it's reality and we've got -- we've turned it into, I think, a really great graphic, and I want to thank Patrick for stepping up to that.

So basically, we've got our public comments, potentially a second public comment, but we've basically agreed that we're going to have to gather all of that material together. It's just a reality that our chartering organizations are going to want to see all these things together and can't really approve one without understanding if another one that is going to come later is going to have a knock-on effect on the one they just approved and that's just the reality and I think the ICANN Board is in exactly the same position.

So we have to plan as a group, to gather up all of those recommendations from all those subgroups, and not only do we have to gather them up, but as we agreed, we're going to have to look for dependencies and inconsistencies. I mean, it's possible that as people are referring to the work of other subgroups and making requests for the use of other resources that are being looked at by another subgroup, that there may end up being dependencies or inconsistency, and that we will have to decide how to settle those before we publish our final report. That's the reality of it. We have to provide something that's going to be stitched together and hold itself together for all of the recommendations from the CCWG Workstream 2.

Once we have that, because this is going to settle, if you will, any inconsistency, it doesn't mean that there will be inconsistencies or dependencies, but there may be, so once everything is stitched together we will publish it for a final view.

Now, what we should talk about at this point is, of course, as subgroups complete their work, we will be distributing this to both our chartering organizations and the boards, and asking for any early comments or early warnings so that we don't get surprised by the time we publish for this final publish comment.

We would hope and recommend to everyone that what happens in that final publish comment is really that we're asking people to focus on how we are resolving any interdependencies or any inconsistencies.

We hope that all the individual subgroup recommendations will have gone through public consultation, are will have been finalized, and will have been sent to the individual chartering organizations and the board. And if anything comes up, we will be aware of those before we are providing that final document

for that final public consultation.

I think that's sort of walks us through the picture that we've got here and I think it covers exactly what we had in the document as a process, so I'll be glad to turn it over to co-chair to manage the queue if there are questions. Jordan?

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Bernie for that run through. That was helpful. So I think the key point there is that we will need to -- the reason we need to land the work is so that we can do that consistency check and get the final package pulled together.

If there are any comments or questions, I'll start with Kavouss who has got his hand raised. Kavouss, please go ahead.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, the course of action described by Bernie seems to be satisfactory that each of the output of the group or output of each group either in the (?) or some of those which have been grouped together, would be subject to one public together. And then when we put everything together, we put everything for public comment at this time for just inconsistencies and discrepancies that might arise from (?) of one to the other, so it will have a different scope of complications. I think that is something that could be interesting. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Kavouss. Yep, that's right. Are there any other comments on this? I realize that people may be seeing it for the first time here, so we'll be, I think, reiterating and talking this through as part of the plenary agenda in Joberg, so it's not the last time you'll see it, but if you have a think about this contents, have a mull, if you think of anything that needs to be raised about it, fire an email to the list or let the staff or co-chairs know, but thank you Bernie and the staff team for pulling together the graphical representation of that. I think it makes it nice and easy to see and understand.

The other thing is, I guess, that those of us who are reps from various chartering organizations or members of the CCWG as it were, might want to start familiarizing our organizations with this process between now and Joberg there is a chance from any feedback from those groups in the Joberg meeting about the proposed process.

Right. I think that is Item 5 in terms of the Workstream 2 schedule and process for completing our work. And I'm just going to work out who it is among us who is helping out with the next plenary. I think it might be me. Is it me?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Jordan, just someone small comment for our overall process. As we are -- as I mentioned during my explanation, it is our hope that we will be presenting this

process to all the chartering organizations and the board so they understand how we're approaching that. And because it's going to be an official document, we've actually listed it as a first reading. As Jordan has mentioned, please give us your comments if you have any. It will come back at the next plenary on 7 of June, and if it gets approved, then we'll take it as an official CCWG document which we will start distributing to our chartering organizations and then the ICANN Board so they understand our process and how we're looking to complete our work.

And I imagine, that given the timing, that we'll be answering questions and then presenting this in Joberg. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Bernie. That's a important sort of thing to highlight, which I hadn't done which that this count is part of this process. That is a great segue to the next item, which is the next plenary meeting, so if we could go to the next slide. The next plenary as I mentioned is on the 7th of June, in 0500UTC it will definitely include the second reading of this process.

For subgroup reporters and everyone else a reminder that documents for that meeting are due by the 31 of May at midnight UTC to have our normal 7-day chance for people to review and read the material, so you can submit those to staff who are on the list directly. And then the agenda item requests would be good to have before the 31 of May so we can make sure that they're incorporated in the agenda for staff.

And I think with that, if there are no questions on that, I'll hand it back to Leon for the Any Other Business Items.

>> LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, this is Leon Sanchez. At this point I would like to call for any other business? Does anyone have any other business to raise at this point?

Okay, so none. Then I would like to thank you all for attending this call, and I see a hand up, so Sebastie, in, you have the floor.

>> Yes, sorry Leon, I just want to say, this is Sebastien speaking, I want to thank all the ones on this call for want as (?) view or who want to survey of the review of the omnibus (?) of ICANN, it's very much appreciated and it was very useful, and I hope that your subgroup will do a good job with all of those inputs. Thank you very much.

>> LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Sebastien. A note for the transcript. It's not omnibus, it's Ombuds. So help with the transcript services.

>> CAPTIONER: Thank you!

>> LEON SANCHEZ: Exactly. Well, thank you very much everyone for this call. I think it's a good call, and we'll talk to you soon again. Thank you very much.

>> Thanks, everyone. Bye.

>> Thanks, bye.

>> Thank you, everyone. We can stop the recording. The call is now complete. Good bye.

(call completed at 2:48 p.m. CST)

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
