

SOAC Accountability Meeting#32
7 September 2017 @ 13:00 UTC

RAW CAPTIONING – NOT A TRANSCRIPT – A TRANSCRIPT WILL BE POSTED TO THE WIKI AS A SEPARATE DOCUMENT. THIS IS ONLY MEANT AS A QUICK REFERENCE UNTIL THE TRANSCRIPT IS POSTED AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AUTHORITATIVE.

ask in this basic administration and welcome if there's anybody who needs to make an update to their section of interest? Not hearing anybody making any changes to their interest, we'll move on now to the agenda. And I'll ask, is there anybody who has any other business they like to let us know about now? We will call for any other business at the end of the call. And if nobody has that and has no suggestions for any changes to our simple agenda for today, we'll finish basic administration and do a very brief overview of our last meeting and any activities that have happened since then

To that, I will move to Steve, over to you.

>> Thank you, Cheryl, on our last call, I think Steven [inaudible] made two observations about errors we had in our draft final report with ropting to references the GNSO, I exposed those errors in the plenary report. That's an agenda item. One was the request when we convey to a plenary, we make a particular note to a follow up and a change to a draft report, just a request to the plenary. And that is all I know of right now. For changes for there. I saw no other edits made to the draft plenary report over the last 7 days. And then I went back to look at our other document, which is the analysis to the response of the public comment and that hasn't been changed to in the past 2 weeks and I'm not surprised because we went through 2 readings on that public response document already. And today would be a second reading on the draft plenary report and I turn it back over to you for the rest of the agenda

>> Thank you very much, Steve. I'm not going to hold this microphone at all. For the record here, and this brings us then to a primary agenda item, which is the second reading of our final report. And with that, Steve, just going to ask, Farzaneh is going to leave us through the meeting

>> This is Steve and with such a long report, I don't think we'll go through the paper, I don't think that's a good use of everyone's time. We criminal intended 7 days ago the red line and that red line of edits from that March draft still hold

So as far as walking through the entire document, I don't think that would be a productive use of time. But in order to feed into the agenda a team you noted, one of the key decisions for today is not only whether to approve for second reading but to decide whether the changes we're approving are sufficient that they would require another round of public comments or not. And I can see that discussion by believing that, no, we do not need to do another round of public

comments. So while the changes are important, they are not so significant as to require another round. Cheryl?

>> Thank you, Steve, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And it's my opinion, and I haven't heard from the others, let's ask them now -- the final report as we are listing to today's agenda for a second reading before it goes to the plenary is not if anything of a Stanive clang. It's certainly the CCWG itself will also be asking this question of whether or not it is a substantial change. We have said all along that we doubt that it would be seen as a set of changes that would require a second PC and certainly that would be our recommendation to the plenary with this document that this is not the case. And this will continue on the track of the single PC and for now inclusion into the final documents that the plenary will be putting together.

But let's see if there's anyone at today's meeting who has a different idea. So we'll call now for anybody who wishes to make, first of all, any comments or notes regarding the now final document. Looking at it at today's call as a second and final reading from our subgroup. And if you do have any of those comments, please make them known now. I notice in the chat that one of our members is typing, I'll wait to see what that says. While we are doing that and before I go back to Steve, the next question we will be ask you you is whether or not you all agree that these are unsubstantial changes to our document, Steve, back to you.

>> Thank you, Cheryl, I was going to note on page 7 in the final document, we do have a item we are keying up for the full plenary because we did not have a consensus either way in our subgroup. And can I put this in the chat and it was a god practice in the participation area. And the way we quoted it in the report is to say a [inaudible] elected its officers should consider term limbs and in brackets we indicate this is not a consensus item and should be discussed with CCWG. To my note, that's the only item we are punting to the CCWG on in the final report. And Kavouss asked in the chat whether the changes we making are so significant that we would tell CCWG and it's my view, Cheryl, we would tell CCWG, not only the comment response and the final draft report and we'll give them a list of the explanation of changes we made and after that --

>> The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will join soon

>> And we instruct the CCWG on whether we believe the changes are so significant as to require another round of public comments and it was my hope we can make that change here today. And we will tell CCWG about the changes we have made and also whether our judgment is so significant to require another round our public comments. And that's our recommendation to the CCWG. It's ultimately up to the CCWG as to whether there are significant enough changes to require another round of public comments.

>> Cheryl for the record here, thanks for that Steve, that's a goodically if Iing point and reading the chat has satisfied Kavuss's concern. [inaudible] indicated the summary of the changes will be created and we will present the CCWG with that review piece at the same time as we do with our final reporting

I noticed Bernie has turned up, back to you, Bernie

>> Thank you, can you all hear me? Yes, I can see that in the captioning, thank you. Just a slight concern of the punting such a specific question to the plenary. I'm a little uneasy with that for the following reason. This group has been working, has been working through the comments, produced the original draft, considered all the comments and now we're talking about sending this to the plenary so they can decide between the two options. And I'm not really sure. I understand the feeling about that. But the reality is as opposed to work stream one, a lot of the people who are in the plenary haven't necessarily been following through with this and we may end up with a protracted discuss of this point. And no resolution.

At the -- or no quick resolution at the plenary either. So this being said, I'm wondering if there's a way to maybe note this in the report that although there was no agreement, it was certainly significantly discussed and then we can -- that can go forward as a note to the recommendations and people can implement it as they will, always, given the nature of your other recommendations. But that's my concern. I'm just presenting it over to you to decide what to do.

>> Okay, thank you very much for that, Cheryl for the record, Bernie. Yes, I see your point and I wonder if this meeting today might not then look at that as a an unsubstantial change or not to the document. I'm catching up on the chat here. Kavouss I, I recognize you are not on the audio bridge, and please type and we'll wait to see what it is you wish to bring to our attention. Steve points out within the subgroup members, the active subgroup members, at least 3 oppose this. And so I'm certainly comfortable with the fact it wouldn't be difficult to do as you suggest, Bernie, and we may call upon you to assist with some of your drafting of that. But Kavouss has been able to join is audio bridge and he has his hand up. Before we go to you, Steve can we go to you and then lead to Kavouss.

>> I think Bernie's point was not whether the changes were significant for public comment is whether the recommendation [feedback] that of the recommendations, only one is being punted to CCWG and that's the question of whether term limits are a good practice under participation. And I think Bernie's point is it would be awkward for the CCWG who has not been following nil of our debate to be presented with a choice. I mean, I could see it happening at a face to face meeting, similar to what we did in cope haggan what we asked CCWG about term limits. It's simple and doesn't require a lot of explanation. And that could be difficult to do on the plenary phone call and next to impossible to do on a plenary email

So I would share Ber flrks ie's concern and say to you if at all possible, let's please determine within our subgroup whether we recommend term limits as a good practice. And the challenge there is we have 3 people that recommended it and she's 3 that opposed it and we're sort of at an impasse. I don't know what to do with it, it's possible we have to eliminate term limits because it didn't have consensus within the group. Kavouss, over to you.

>> Yes, sorry if my connection is bad. I think that we have considered all the comments in the public comments and we made changes to the best about of us. I think it would be more advisable we at goirize our [off microphone] support with the changes and we categorize them on two categories. Category one is the view of the [off microphone] and the group and subgroup, we believe they are not significant. And category two, we believe that they are

significant changes and if there is category for us, then it may be very easy for the [off microphone]. Been in the discussion, whether they are significant or significant, but they think usually listen to the [off microphone] but they are not or they advise or suggest these changes are not significant. So I'm sure [off microphone] this is the way I suggest. And it's up to you to the cochairs to come up with the group. But this is the way I suggest. Thank you.

>> Sorry, coming Cheryl for if record, I think we a grewed Kavouss and thank you for your comments that the overview of the summary of that changes will be going to assist the plenary in its deliberations. I think we had um until right now, for example, maintained that there were no changes from our last report that were significant that they were minor and unsubstantial changes that were brought to our document as a result of our public consul deliberationings. We'll reminded everyone there is a staff-based formal reply or record to the public consultation and that our notes from our deliberation will form part of that reporting. Bernie did cover us with that earlier. It seems to me that what we have here with the question of term limits is an opportunity, perhaps, to make a final modification in our document that hopefully we'll do what Bernie has pointed out to be useful. And that is not to punt this over to the CCWG itself as

a item or a question, but rather note in the document that there was a diversity of opinion or a divergence of opinion on the matter of term limits and they were deeply held views by some of our team members that the position of such was a good idea of a good practice. And there was equally held views by others in our work group that we did not need to make that specific detailed recommendation. Rather that the ability for each of the AC's and SO's to be self-determined on this matter was sufficient.

So if we can craft text along the lines of something that happens is a little more articulate than what we have now recorded now from my ramblings and put it to our list as a final adjustment to the report, it might be one way forward. I see hand up and with that, I will go to him, alan, over to you

>> Thank you very much. I support that way going forward. It's clearly we have not reached consensus on it here. But I think we could also note in parallel that for most of the AC's and SO's, where term limits makes sense, they already have some level of term limits for most of their appointments. The GNSO already does for its council. And for if CCNSO, you certainly can't put term limits on the CCNSO members, they are self-selected. You could put term limits or have term limits on the council

But my upsing is they effectively operate in that mode anyway. And they may make exceptions in cases where they decide it's applicable. The same is true for the GAK. I'm not sure the impact of your recommendation would be that large anyway and I think it's reasonable to say we do not have consensus. Partly because of the reason it's not applicable in some cases. And leave it at that. Thank you.

>> Cheryl, thank for that, Arc lan, certainly we could look to the group here today at today's meeting to see if we have support for that way forward and obviously we would be taking it to our list and asking perhaps in the next 72 hours or so if the lest wanted to react to that type of text. But I see Farzaneh is one of the people who is one person who thinks this should be a hard

recommendation, where AC's and SO's have elections. It's her subgroup of the GNSO that put this point forward so let's go to her followed by Sebastain. Over to you.

>> Thank you. Yes, I am in support of term limits and to recommend term limits for the groups that hold elections. Alan argued this the ones that want to have term limits already have. If you want to argue this, a lot of our recommendations are a lot of the groups actually follow with good practice recommendations that we have in our reports, so that's not -- I don't think that's an argument that can hold. The other thing is that yes, these are good practices. They might not seen be followed by groups. By, well, as far as they are just good practices and groups can and not binding and then why not put the term limits in there? They are not binding anyway. So I think at the moment in this group and during this meeting, I don't think we can decide on this. We should take it back to our mailing list and as Steve said, we can put a deadline for it like in two days, just say whether we should recommend term limits or not. And then take your votes on that and

wrap it up.

>> Sebastien speaking, I guess Cheryl might speak, we can't here her

>> Professor: No, you were next in coup, go ahead.

>> Thank you, I want to make sure you were not talking just to your mic, thank you. Sebastien speaking. I think it's a question, even if we don't go out with something in this report, we'll have to discuss and I understand that it's maybe not so obvious why this point is raised. And I am missing the problem. I will take an example and please consider that it is just an example and it's nothing at all with the person who holds the seat and then I am very happy we have done that, but I want just to show you one of the problem of the time limit in [inaudible] to one body. When you are fixture, if I am not -- taking a liaison to a board member, I really think compared with all the other board member who are very often for 3 years, there's an unbalance. And therefore, we need to find solutions for this unbalance. And I can take another example of people from one seat to another seat to another seat. And I think we need to find a way to have some rest in between

and that's one of the reason why I think this point must be raised. Now, the way you want to raise it, I have no problem. I think just supporting to say it's a question we discussed and we don't need to find the solution today. And we will have some years before finding a real solution, thank you.

>> Cheryl for the record. Sebastien, I'm clear if you could briefly indicate, please, does that mean you are supportive of us stating in the final report to the pled we had divergent views on this point and it needs further discussion or you believe we need to continue on and delay our progress until we can come to some form of consensus?

>> Thank you, Cheryl, sorry for not being clear. I don't think we need to discuss more. I think we have -- sorry. Different views and that's okay. We can just say that it's a different views and the weight on the basis [inaudible] will be another question. But I think it's important we raise the issue, we don't need to discuss more. I would be happy to discuss that with you again and

again. But I think we know what each part of the size of the coins I want to say and we will not reach any consensus in this type of discussion, we need to change places of discussion and point of view of where we are, but it's not within this group we need to from my point of view and I suggest we start the discussion, thank you.

>> Cheryl for the record. Thank you, I'm taking this is something you believe we should articulate as a divergence in our ability to get a consensus in the report and pass it on as is. I have Kavouss, I think the order is Alan, Steve, and Kavouss, and I see Bernie, Bernie, you often have the ability to bring sharp clarity in our desperate fumbblings at these points in time. So if you don't find, I'll go to you first followed by Steve and Kavouss and Alan. Bernie, to you first.
[overlapping speakers]

>> I'm sorry, who is speaking now? Kavouss, have you taken the microphone?

>> Can you hear me?

>> Cheryl, for the record, so Kavouss want delirium tremens microphone now and everybody else will have to wait. Please go ahead.

>> If I can go ahead, I ask why we are working this close. Why we were active in anything. We didn't have anything we voted on [off microphone] we tried to solve the problem by consensus, but what we find is the term limit of voting and supporting opposition, why can't we find a way back to the [off microphone] is the question, thank you.

>> Cheryl for the record. Kavouss, thank you for that intervention, I don't believe anybody has indicated this group would be going to any form of vote or polling or taking the temperature of the room at this stage. I think at this stage, what we were specifically stating is that we would like to note in our report that we have divergent views on this single matter and that should be reported in the report. We can take the temperature of this room in today's call and continue taking the temperature of this work group in this discussion, but that is simply a mechanism of establishing a degree of consensus, I don't believe there's been a call for vote and I don't believe we would be at this point on this matter asking to do that. Let me now go, as I had planned to, Bernie, followed by Steve and Alan, Bernie over to you.

>> Thank you, I'm not sure I should comment given [inaudible] is objecting to me participating. I will simply note what I was going to say is it sounds like you have a discussion. And we have gone forward, even in work screen one in notes about minority positions and in this case maybe it's more of a split position. And I think the approach proposed by Cheryl essentially goes back to that kind of a approach, which we have in our roles, thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Bernie, and I can assure you while indicated in the chat and I'll read for the chat, I think Bernie as a staff member should not get involved too much with substantial issues and I appreciate your sensitivities to such an accusation, Bernie, I don't believe you are overstepping the mark, I think you have a great deal of practice articulating what you hear a members of the vast number of work teams struggling to put in the best form of words. And so I certainly would have appreciated your specific input. But I'm not alone in leadership in this

group. And we won't go down that pathway and we will continue to go down our list, which is now. Steve followed by Alan and then Farzaneh, does she have go ahead.

>> Thank you, Cheryl, I want to react to what is the criteria to make it to a good practice list? Avri put several items in the chat suggesting because they should consider it's a soft good practice, what's the harm of asking it in there. And I want to clarify all 29 of our good practices come with a special caveat on page 8 of the reports. The groups are expected to implement good practices to the extent they are applicable and an improvement of the current practices and a caveat we got several weeks ago. In view of the ACS participants and we say on page 8 we don't recommend implementation be required. So a good practice needs to have consensus report of this group to suggest this practice, if applicable is a good one. Is objectively a good practice. And if a ACSO group will be more accountable with this practice than without it. The caveats of if applicable and improvement over present practices apply to all 29 items and it probably

doesn't do justice to our decision making to focus on the word should consider. The good practices are in here because we objectively have consensus that if applicable, they should be implemented. So I think the difference of opinion is whether term limits are objectively.

>> The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will join soon.

>> The question is, are term limits objectively speaking a good practice for those groups who hold elections? And that's the weight of the decision on us. And I think that is the question about which we are divided. And we're probably divided, Avri because of experience we have. Because many of us on this call having 12, 13, are 15 years in various kinds of leadership roles in represented AC and SO groups. And myself included believe term limits have not been helpful in the sense we are finding it very difficult to attract candidates who will stand. And the term limit doesn't really seem to be an effective motivator to get people to stand for the extra work and aggravation of a leadership position. So objectively let's examine whether term limits are good to recommend and plows don't let the word could consider make you go soft on this recommendation. We probably ought not to have the consider should consider in there because, again, the caveat of all items is

these are good practices that should be implemented suggested to the AC, SO decision that's applicable and an improvement over their current practices. Thank you.

>> Cheryl for the record. Thank you Steve, I fear we are going to go down a rabbit hole here and the one thing I for one don't want to do is come to the end end of today's call and not have a document in some primarily agreed second reading completed format to be able to get to the plenary for the September meeting. But if we wish to continue ad nauseam on a specific point on what should be a rather sub part of a important part, as opposed to a important part in its own right, so be it. Alan,.

>> Thank you very much. I will only support what Steve just said. Term limits are controversial. There are some people who believe in them strongly, there are some people who don't. I agree with Steve, I've seen examples where term limits are counterproductive and it

would have applicable if there was an exception in some cases because a particularly useful person is forced to step down. I have seen other cases where the term limits are there and sidestepped beautifully by a person being appointed every second time and alternating back and forth and the person has a huge number of years but nonconsecutive in a group. And we are clearly divided. If we are divided, we do not have consensus and on a small other note, I support Bernie being allowed to provide input in the process. Bernie has for more years as a volunteer with ICANN than a staff member. Thank you.

>> Cheryl for the record and I'm sure Bernie appreciates that vote of confidence, Alan, and I hope he hears it with the heartfelt support of several of us. Farzi followed by Avri put your hand down, I'll check to make your you didn't drop accidentally in the AC room. And Farzi and Avri and Kavouss on this minor issue, we would have thought.

>> Farzaneh speaking. I think that well I said first of all, when I said Bernie should not get involved in other substandard ideas, I think we should not. In this group or other groups. You can kiss disa I grie with me but that's my opinion. And I think that should be the practice in ICANN stuff involved in substantial issues because it's a the supportive group to decide. And it's not an accusation, I wanted to reminded everyone that Bernie is a staff member not a member of the commons. The other thing is Avri said in chat, why can't we qualify this recommendation as a good practice for term limits? That they should consider it and they should consider a term limits and when they consider, they should do so carefully. Considering the dynamics of their groups or something like that. Because it's not just the term limits are the basis of the democracy, for me, it's like okay, so it's really good for a president to also be a president of a country for like 20 years because he

has or she has the experience, but no, we don't do that, we have term limits for a reason. And I think like even if a smaller groups, we need to have a the groups should look at it and decide whether they want to have term limits or not and I think this is a good practice for accountable for sure. So this this is my idea. The thing is we can qualify this recommendation saying the consider the dynamic of your group. You will shot be shunned upon or anything if you do not consider term limits. Something like that. But we have to qualify it and but if we need to vote on this or go to the mailing list, and give two days to discuss it and come to a conclusion, I'm okay with that too. But just that in this call, I don't think we can take a vote or anything like that. We just need to decide whether we can qualify our recommendation and add an explanation to it and come an agreement, thanks.

>> Thank you, Cheryl for if record. Kavouss, the flor is yours.

>> I think my understanding is different. You remember I asked and you presented the report to the CCWG, describe what do we mean by the term recommendation? Recommendation is just a recommendation. We should not ask to study not carefully, we should not ask to give the reason why they are implementing or not. We said these are the practices that we found from the view point of implementation that they are good. And we recommend in the real term of recommendation without obligation, we recommend to consider them and implement them where applicable. That's all. We limit the group to do that without asking them to give a reason

why they are applicable or not applicable. This is the [audio out] meaning of the recommendation. But our view [off microphone] recommendations are probably practical point of view or a implementation of the point of view or considered labeled as good practice and we recommend them to SO and AC to consider them and to implement them where applicable and leave it to them to decide. Thank you.

>> Cheryl for the record, thank you for that Kavouss, and I know Steve responding to jury intervention, which I'll read for the record. Right, that's the standard, good practices that should be implemented if applicable and an improvement over current propaganda. Is tieses and app avri asked why eliminate a word and the word here is consider. Isn't considering term limits a good practice?

So what I for one have heard is even amongst the repertoires is we still have no change in our previous established divergence in views, previous discussions dare I say, lengthy at some point considering the time of this devoted to a subset of a out of public comments from an entity on this have not managed to bring a overwhelming consensus from all of the active participants on the call where we discussed this topic. We have, I believe, still deeply held divergent views. Is it the will of this meeting today then that we note that we have deeply held divergent views on this? And that we some members of the subgroup wish to have it articulated as a good practice. Others do not. And in noting that, we therefore have diligently advised the plenary, at least in our subgroup we were not able to come to a specific single consensus on this matter. Avri says good to go to the list. And in fact we suggested it should go to the list and I think if we make that editorial

change to our review, that is where we would like the list to respond in, say, 72 hours or so to that additional text. So from today's meeting, that we clearly articulate in our final report with a fresh sentence or a short paragraph that we are have been able to reach a single consensus on a recommendation on the matter of term limits and our group continues to have diverge ent views on this particular topic. Is there anybody who wholeheartedly objects to us making some draft text to that effect based on the transcription and records from today's call? I'm sure many of you have put into the chat or in the transcript very good words that we could use. Is there anyone who objects to the creation of such a paragraph that that paragraph goes to our list for reaction, if you would please let us know now by either putting your hand up and saying so or marking the traditionally red check against that. Please let us know now. I'm not seeing any objectives in the adobe

connect tools and I don't hear objections going forward. And I think from our proposal from 20-odd minutes ago, ladies and gentlemen, but perhaps it's earlier in your day than it is mine and you've been excited and rewarded by or deliberations, more certainly than I have. So if that's the case, it would appear your action item is to create that clarifying text noting for the plenary that we have been unable a a subgroup to come to a consensus on this particular aspect. And Steve notes here I'll read this after what I was reading from the chat earlier Avri indicating it not go to the list, I think it's important it go to the list. We try to take anything we would consider and even slightly substantial change to the list, so we'll continue that practice. It is a good one. [inaudible] suggested it does go to the list. And then Steve pointed out, of, wean with the

3rapporteurs here have a different view on term limits and we'll find a consensus putting this question to

the group. I'm waiting for feedback and while we're waiting for that, we'll go to Steve, Steve, over to you.

>> Thank you, Cheryl, I went and re-examined the 29 good practices of the document, in which term limits are one. In in other place do we say the word consider. It's a good practice to consider. In every other instance a good practice is something that is objectively open to be [off microphone] and believing it's an improvement over current practice. I believe we made our recommendation meaningless by saying the word consider. And it would be my preference, among the rapporteurs is the question we key for the rest of the group is no the whether consider is a good practice, but term limits is a good practice, where applicable and everything is on the kafyacht of where applicable. And if they don't do elections it's irrelevant. And we have a caveat with good practice, the everyone limitation is sub to the ACSO group pleefing the practice is an improvement over current practice, and hair view and not an outside consultant view. And I say

we get rid of the word consider, we don't use that, the good practice is theeveryone limit term limits where applicable. And that's the question to put to the group. And we have 7 minutes left and the key question in our group is whether anyone in your group whreefs in our report it requires something so significant it requires another round of public comments. We probably won't get to this on this call. With you when we get to the draft of the plenary and summarize and describe the change to the report, maybe that will give the less than members of the subgroup to evaluate whether the total of our changes are so significant that public comment should be required and we'll address that question on our next call, thank you, Cheryl,.

>> Thanks very much, Steve, Cheryl for the record. And up until now we didn't plan on having a next call on this matter before we went to the plenary and we retired until such time as the plenary wished us to interact or react on anything.

But it seems obvious that we on this I would have thought a minor point alone, we'll drag it through. And let us, first of all, to ask staff if they can have a look at the time and availability for yes, ladies and gentlemen, yet another meeting next week so that we can complete our week that complete our work that we had planned to complete tonight. And with that with that happening and we'll come back in a moment, I want to make a note for the record what happened in the chat. Alan pointed out he could certainly raise some case studies, I won't go in the details here, I'm not quite sure many people could and indeed now raise all sorts of case studies as this particular deliberation bubbles off into whatever directions it may do. [inaudible] responded there are multiple examples as well. What we got here, ladies and gentlemen, is a classic example of a lack of consensus. And I thought all you're trying to do is note in your report is that is in fact what we have, a set

of diverge ent views and lack of consensus, however, we never let a good idea and down and be reported as divergent. We will try to do our best to word something as Steve said that could go to the list, I am I guess like Steve concerned about having a softening such as consider in. and we

will I suspect raise to the list our concerns there as well. Avri said in the chat she thought defining the room as divergent is a fine suggestion from her point of view. And Steve was reiterating about the particular aspects of making a good practices for any ACSO group that it's clear and of course also one of those things that is all best practices are is still a matter of self-determination for the particular SO's AC's or groups. So rather than continue on -- sorry, something came up from Farzi, and that's one remaining issue, and we are done by the way, when this is solved we can submit st the report. And that's been the intention for the last 3

meetings. 3 meetings ago, we had expiration we thought and had the final report completed and ready to go to the CCWG. We have taken our first reading from two weeks and meant to take one. And we have taken our second reading over an almost record number now of weeks and eventually if we finalize this, we'll get the report to the CCWG.

However, I think we're all aware when the dates are and what that means, as you pointed out, Farsane herks, we have plenty of time that we have plenty of time until the 20th of September that we will indeed have another meeting. It would have been nice, however, if we could have come leelted it before the very last possible deadline. That's not the case.

Right. Avri notes is this is one of the strangest discussions, and I tend to agree with her. With that and with the last minutes left in today's call and I'm noting from my point of view regrettable lack of progress to a final document. And I believe Bernie has his hand raised to let us know whether the next meeting will be. Bernie, is that the case?

>> That is correct. If you wish to stick with your process of going from one time slot to another, next week, the 1900 time slots that are available are Monday, Tuesday, Friday.

>> Okay, not we normally run it towards the end of our week, so I assume we would probably be going for Friday slot. Can I ask our corappateurs is the 1900UTC time slot on Friday one you can participate in?

>> Friday, what date next week?

>> Bernie, could you repeat the details again for Farzaneh, please?

>> Yes, that would be Friday the 15th of September, 1900UTC.

>> I can't make it then.

>> [overlapping speakers] it's Sebatien, how about an invitation for the Thursday the 14, is this slot alreadying about pied by another subgroup?

>> Oh, my goodness, I did not notice we had indeed scheduled it for Thursday the 14th. 1900 razz a precaution. Thank you for pointing (as a precaution).

>> perfect. So we can now thank you for that Sebastien and Bernie, we can go ahead and confirm we will be having yet another meeting to hopefully finalize what yes we all agree is just a single point, but it seems to be a single point that won't settle. We will between now and that meeting, hopefully have a reaction from the rest of the sub group, and with that, I certainly can see no reason why we need to continue with today's agenda. The final item on whether or not we

believe it's a substantial change in our report that may require a second PC will have to be held off until we have the final report. Bernie your hand is still up, new informs or an old hand? Old hand. Okay. I will now call for any last comments and any other business? And with a couple of minutes after the hour and certainly my apologies for this meeting run over time, I like to thank staff and particularly thank or captionist, sorry, someone wishing to speak, please go ahead.

No, that must have been background noise, Cheryl trying desperately to finish this meeting and thank you the captionist and the staff and the subgroups for attending today and if not finalizes, apparently furthering our discussion. We can stop the recording, bye for now.

[end of call