

IOT-IRP MEETING

Thursday, October 5, 2017 - 19:00 to 20:30

Hello again everybody. This is David McAuley speaking. It's 2 minutes past the hour so why don't we go ahead and get started. First of all, thank you for attending and can I ask the recording be started? Thank you. Thank you all for attending and let's see what we can do to get through this agenda in less time than we have allotted. Let's begin agenda item number 1 with administration, attendance, et cetera. We have an indication of who is present in the Adobe room. Can I ask if there's anybody in attendance who is on the phone only and not in the Adobe room? Not hearing any, let's move on and ask about statements of interest. If there's anybody that has a change update to the statement of interest that they need to make, feel free to do so now.

Not hearing any, let's press on. The next agenda item is just the typical update that we ask of ICANN legal at the beginning of these calls. ICANN legal is working in the background with their policy folks at ICANN to put together steps to get us towards picking the standing panel under the new bylaws. So, Liz if you are back from stepping away, I would ask if you could address that. Are you with us, Liz? Okay. I have I don't hear that. So, I'm going to assume that Liz who put in the chat she had to step away for a few minutes is not back yet. Before we jump into an issue of substance and I would like to read you the agenda just a little bit and address something that I plan to address in any other business at the end of the call. And I'll ask Bernie something in just a minute. And that is, I would like to schedule one more call prior to ICANN 60. And my suggestion would be that if a slot is available we do 2 weeks from now. But I also want to state in the background at the back drop sits my hope and I think we can do this that

Note: The following is the output resulting from the RTT (Real-Time Transcription also known as CART) of a teleconference call and/or session conducted into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

we get the rules and the public's comments of the treatment of the rules done and reported out by the end of the year. We've had a lot of discussion about a number of rules, not necessarily each and everyone but we are proceeding through that now and my hope is that between comments on the list and an ability to speak up on the phone calls we can get that done. And then turn our attention in the new year to the other things that the IRP IOT has within its remit. So, I would ask first if Bernie could comment on the veil ability of the time slot 2 weeks from today at the same time of day.

>> Hi, David. Pulling up the schedule right now. Two weeks from today.

>> The 19th.

>> Nineteenth, 19:00 is currently free.

>> Okay, thanks. If you could pencil us in, Bernie that would be appreciated.

>> Done.

>> And I would note to Brenda that there's a note in the chat from Kavouss. He's waiting to dial out.

>> We're trying to do that.

>> Thanks very much. Appreciate it. So, we will have one more meeting before ICANN 60 as we just discussed. Thank you for that, Bernie. Moving on to some issues of substance. The joinder issue I had hoped to get the first reading in the last call and while I'm setting this up if I can ask Brenda to put the joinder slide up on the screen. It's one of the slides I sent you earlier. I believe it's slide number 2. But, I had hoped to get this to first reading in the last call and then at that

time Sam expressed some concern and she followed through as she said she would with some language with some suggested language after the call noting her concern and as a consequence of that I tried to redraft the joinder treatment that I had suggested. And so, I'm going to read it out on the screen and just in order to get folks a chance to think about it as we go through it. And let me pull up my slide to do that. Okay. Joinder, here's what I suggest for joinder language. Number 1, that only those persons, entities to participated in the underlying proceeding as a

>> The host has left the meeting and will rejoin soon.

>> No problem. Let me start that again. That only those persons/entities who participated in underlying proceeding as a party referendum notice from a claimant in IRPs under bylaw section 4.3B III A3 of the full notice of IRP and request for IRP. Including copies of all related, filed documents contemporaneously with the claimant serving those documents on ICANN. And number 2 the new language is indicated in red. That subject to the following sentence, all such parties have a right to intervene in the IRP. Notwithstanding the foregoing a person or entity seeking to intervene in an IRP can only be granted "party" status if that person or entity demonstrates that it meets the standing requirements to be a claimant under the IRP at section 4.3B of the ICANN bylaws and as defined within these supplemental procedures. The timing and other aspects of intervention shall be managed pursuant to the applicable rules of arbitration of the ICDR except as otherwise indicated here. Subject to the preceding provisions in this paragraph the manner in which this limited intervention right shall be exercised shall be up to the procedures officer who may allow such intervention through granting IRP party status or by allowing such party, parties to file amicus briefs as a procedures officer determines in his or her discretion. An intervening party shall be subject to applicable costs, fees, expenses

and deposits provisions of the IRP as determined by the ICDR. An amicus may be subject to applicable costs, fees, expenses and deposits provisions of the IRP as deemed reasonable by the procedures officer. I'm just going to take a pause there for a second. Okay. I just wanted to see if there was anything in the chat. Moving on next two paragraphs. Number 3, no interim relief that would be that would materially affect an interest of any such amicus to IRP cannot be made without allowing such amicus an opportunity to be heard on the requested relief and number 4 in handling all matters of intervention and without limitation to other obligations under the bylaws the procedures officers shall endeavor to adhere to the provisions of bylaw section 4.3S to the extent possible while maintaining fundamental fairness. And that concludes the reading of the suggested language. 4.3S deals with expediting or trying to handle expeditious IRPs. So, with all of that on the table and as an attempt to take account of Sam's concern I have two questions. One, does anybody want to make a comment or concern? Otherwise I will consider this going forward for first reading I'll put it out on the list. But as I typically do for a couple extra days. And two, Liz, are you back with us on the phone? Those are the two questions. So, Liz if you're here you can speak up now.

>> Hi David, it's Liz. I'm back on the phone.

>> Thank you. So, let me invert those questions a little bit. Liz, since you're on the phone do you have any concerns with this attempt to take account of what Sam put on the list?

>> No. Not as to this.

>> Okay.

>> I do have I do want to talk about when we get to discussing the suggestions that Malcom noted.

>> I was just going to mention Malcom's. So, before I do that is there anyone else? I don't see any hands and I haven't heard it so I'm assuming we can move forward. Liz, why don't you go ahead and speak to what I'll ask you this Liz then I'll go to Kavouss. Why don't you speak to what you were going to say about Malcom's intervention on the list?

>> Thanks, David. Well I don't think ICANN actually has any objections in theory to what Malcom has proposed but what we would like to see is proposed language that captures his position.

>> Thank you. Basically, my reaction as a participant is the same as yours and I was going to try to capture some language after this discussion. Before I go any further, Kavouss your hand is up so you have the floor.

>> Yes, good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Just very, very small point. Why in two areas we have the upper case? Is it to indicate that this is something new? Usually any text we don't have upper case sometimes you might have an exception in something with bold but upper case, just [Indiscernible] and importantly in number 4, why we say shall endeavor? Because whenever we are not sure that somebody should do something with shall, sometimes we try to soften that by saying shall endeavor. That means it may not do that but they'll try to do that. So is it the reason that it says shall endeavor to adhere or they shall adhere or should adhere. So, shall endeavor, should endeavor or shall endeavor. Is that the intention. Thank you.

>> Thank Kavouss. There are several instances of upper case reference to irrelevant RP, to ICDR and procedures officer. The IRP and ICDR frankly I believe I just capitalized those because they are institutions and it seems like a normal thing to do. But procedures officer is capitalized because it's a defined term in the rules. As I recall. I believe it was capitalized in the rules. I will double check that and there's no particular reason for it to be capitalized. So, in the next iteration I may lower case that one. But, leave the IRP and ICDR up cased. Does that address that issue?

>> Yes. Now with the second issue, why shall endeavor?

>> The second issue is my thought on it was that there's no guarantee that in handling a matter of intervention, it will be as timely as if there was no intervention. So, it was giving a little bit of leeway to the procedures officer. It was basically my thought was stating 4. S as a standard not to be forgotten. That's really what the intent of this is. And not to allow the fact of intervention to let 4.3S become an afterthought. And that was my attempt to capture that. I'm happy to look at alternative language and I'm open to any suggestion. But that's really the thought behind it. So, my question now becomes Kavouss do you have further comment?

>> No, on this comment shall endeavor or should endeavor or shall adhere, I think I suggest that you take either the upper level or lower level, either should adhere or shall adhere but not shall endeavor to adhere. That is my suggestions. I'm just saying [Indiscernible] endeavor. Yeah.

>> Thanks, Kavouss. I will put this back on the list to confirm first reading. So, let me take that and think about it and take a look again at 4.3S. I think if I may separately email you in the meantime. But, that is so thank you for that. Any other comments on this joinder issue? If

not, why don't we move forward to the next slide. Brenda, that's ongoing monitoring. And I will go ahead and look at my slide and I'll read through this too. And let me just set this up with a little bit of background and that is the ongoing monitoring request isn't really a rule. It has to do and it won't show up in our treatment of the rules. It's a request from the ALAC that we as the IRP team come up with a device for some kind of a formal periodic review of the IRP. It's an excellent idea. And it was already in the bylaws in some form but this we're going to tweak it a little bit based on the ALAC's input. So, I think you all may remember that I had made a suggestion and Avri took the leads on this, thank you, Avri. And Avri made a suggestion I should put. I put that incorrectly. And I had made some suggested tweaks to that and Avri was a little bit concerned that it wasn't as slight AS I had said so I attempted to find the middle ground between what Avri and I were both saying. So, I came up with what you now see on the screen. Let me just read it. This is how we would treat the idea of ongoing monitoring of the IRP. After the IOT finishes its current work items as indicated in bylaw section 4.3, it terminates as implied in that section. Next bullet, section 4.2N needs to be amended to remove section I one the IOT is terminated. And third bullet, the review of the irrelevant RP under bylaw section 4.6 B 2 F shall be made mandatory rather than discretionary and shall be amended to include participation in such review by a representative of the IRP standing panel. That's sort of sliced and diced to try to meet the concerns that both Avri and I had. So Kavouss' hand is up first then I'll talk to Avri, Kavouss go ahead.

>> First let us deal with what you have on the screen. I see again that the last portion and shall be amended is capitalized. Still the same issue that you capitalize that? Because you can capitalize a name or entity but to capitalize a sentence is not very usual and shall be amended to include participation and so on and so forth. Any particular reason that a part of the

sentence is totally capitalized? Then I have to go back to the number 4 that first of all why the whole not the whole but part of the paragraph is capitalized? Thank you.

>> On the capitalization, my recollection here is that I was concerned that the use of color in the email that I was responding to an email wouldn't capture the change. So, if I'm not mistaken I believe I just used capital letters to indicate changed language and that's all it is. There's no magic and I'm happy to move that to lower case going forward when I put it back on list.

>> Yes. And the first one, number 4 that you dealt with shall endeavor, I think you put shall endeavor one qualification then at the end of the sentence to the extent possible. If it is too weak either you retain and to the extent possible and remove endeavor or you put shall endeavor and remove to the extent possible. So not two times qualification, not two times [Indiscernible] adherence to the situation. That that is my point and I don't think you need to send me an email because I am part of the group and you have to discuss [Indiscernible] it is the whole group. Thank you.

>> Thank you Kavouss. Fair points. Avri, you're up.

>> Thank you, Avri speaking. First of all, I wanted to apologize for not getting back to you when you did ask me about the wording earlier in the week. Because, it was done in the header with a little IOT in the brackets, it got filed with the rest of the IOT group mail which I only reviewed this morning in preparation for today's meeting. So sorry I didn't get back to you to say what I'm going to say much earlier even though you gave me an opportunity to do so. I appreciate the effort to try to find the middle space. I think that's always a good idea. And, I think including a representative now one of the things that we may want to differentiate is whether

they're participating as member or whether they're one of those experts that the group invites and whether they're participating just on this issue or as a general expert within the context of the group. So that needs to be clarified. The other thing that concerns me has to do still with the use of the ATRT. We still haven't quite overcome all the issues that say the ATRT is perhaps already overloaded but there's another issue which is the topic that a particular ATRT takes up as a review. I think in every other topic it's really at their discretion what they include in their agenda. Now I haven't gone back to the bylaws to make sure, but I think that saying and there's this one topic that they must do and they must do it at every review. And, I think that may be a bigger change to the ATRT way of doing things the ATRT mandate than is perhaps comfortable for everyone. If indeed I am right and it does change the nature of the ATRT to actually have a commandment as opposed to a set of issues they are supposed to consider and figure out what they're going to do within their one year of work. So, that's my concern. I think it's good that there be someone there from the standing panel but I would be curious about what I ask in the beginning. What is their role? Thanks.

>> Thank you Avri. Good points. With respect to the ATRT, and I don't have the bylaws up in front of me. But I believe that the current treatment is to have them under the ARTR but it's not mandatory, it's discretionary. Then you actually suggested language at one point. And so and I frankly am not very hung up between the version you originally suggested and this one and the one I suggested. So, could I ask you if you could return to what you originally suggested and maybe put that back on the list and give some my understanding of the participation by the panel is that a member of the panel, probably the chair, would be able to participate as a full member of the group. But, if I could ask you to go back and resubmit your original proposal in which you

>> Yeah, in the original proposal I had it not under the ATRT but I had it following the format that we were supposed to be doing this original one under, was working with them. But sure, I can look at that but really, we do have a fundamental difference of putting it in under the ATRT and at this point I'm willing to surrender to that. Sure, give it to the ATRT but I'm worried about forcing the ATRT's hand on what they will review in a particular year. But I'll go back and look at the language. Like I said apologize I didn't do it in the intervening week when you had asked but I just didn't see the message.

>> That's okay, thanks you Avri. If I'm not mistaken it is under ATRT in a discretionary fashion. It's not a mandatory review for them to do so if we come up with a recommendation that's not implemented that will remain, that's in the bylaws now. And I think your proposal was to in fact create a new section taking it out of ATRT and I'm fine with that too. So, as you go back and look at your original suggestion I think I'll be fine with it and I haven't heard anybody else object to it. So, I have a feeling that what you suggested will be what we send through for first reading. But if you could take that look and put it back on list, let's give us a chance to move it forward that way.

>> Okay.

>> Thank you. Thank you so much. So, if anyone has a comment on this on what we just discussed, please weigh in now. Otherwise we will move on in the agenda. The next one is translation and interpretation. I put an email on the list about this. I don't have a slide for it unfortunately. But I do intend to discuss it and I can read through the operative parts and I'm hoping that everybody got a chance to take a look at my email Monday, September 25th on this. Basically, what happened is the governments of Switzerland and Spain weighed in

supported by other parties. Spain said interpretation services should be free when requested by a claimant, documents in English should be accompanied by translations if requested by the claimant and the IRP time periods would be adjusted accordingly from when the translations are available. Switzerland was something like that but it wasn't based on request. It was based on need. And so, talked in terms of translation being required. And then in my mail specified the treatment that's given to translations under the ICDR rules then I got to a recommendation and discussion. And for those who can't weigh in now I would urge you to go back and revisit my mail. It was September 25th. But what I said in my recommendation is that I agreed with the idea that we should be using the concept of need. Thanks very much for putting that on the screen, Brenda. I said I very much supported the idea of need rather than request for being the touch stone that we would look to with respect to translation services. And let me interrupt for just a moment and I see Kavouss' hand is up so I will give the floor to Kavouss in case it is germane to what I just said. Kavouss, go ahead. If you're speaking Kavouss we can't hear you.

>> I said that please kindly consider my areas of suggestion in number 4. Either delete endeavor and adhere to the extent possible, not have both of them. Number 1. Number 2, with respect to translation I have no problem because I am not involved in how language, it is not [Indiscernible] but whenever they have translation it's always a critical issue and some of the countries immediately come for political reasons. But not for any other reasons. But, I have even no problem with that. But language interpretation incurs cost. Have we considered the cost? It depends the length of the document, one page, 2 page doesn't matter but the length of the document, the translation in 6 languages or 7 or 8 languages is costly. I don't know how much cost for ICANN but I have information for other organizations that one page is \$320. But

we have to consider the length of the document and is it summary, yes, if it's a lengthy document perhaps we should consider whether the cost to be born or not. That is the question but I have no problem with the interpretation because it is a very sensitive issue. Thank you.

>> Thank you Kavouss. I'm sorry for not addressing the endeavor comment that you made previously. And I take your point that it was essentially being mentioned twice. I will look at that and not mention it twice. So, either endeavor, whatever it was and the other language was to the extent these whatever. I take your point and I will look at making an adjustment there. With respect to translation, I take your point Kavouss about certain documents may not need to be in a sense but let me just finish sort of setting this up then I'll address that. And what I was saying is I think that the standard should be a need, a requirement. Remember that the ICANN the new ICANN bylaw 4.3L provides translation services for claimants will be available if needed. And obviously that's the word that they use too, need. And so, I think we should stick with that. I also offered some observations that because ICANN uses 6 official UN languages we should take account of that. So, if a claimant or someone seeking translation services speaks one of those 6 languages as well as another language that they want a translation into that the translation need not be provided. Otherwise, the concept of need would take account of the languages that the claimant speaks and reads. If they speak English as a second language, then that's fine. If they speak one of the 6 Arabic, Chinese... As a second language then that's fine. In other words, it's not simply giving a translation because someone thinks it's convenient. I think the rules should get to that point to make that point that the panel not exercise anything like that.

And, if the claimant is a company and somebody in the company speaks English or Russian or Spanish, then a translation would not be needed. Somebody at the officer level, Director level,

that kind of thing. So, I was asking to incorporate these changes and that's where I think this proposal is going. Kavouss' point raises an interesting one and that is what about documents 120 pages. It raises fairness here. I did note in setting this up that the ICDR rule 5 says that it's supposed to be an expedited hearing and the IRP panel shall consider accessibility, fairness and efficiency both as to time and cost and the conduct of the IRP. So, my guess is or my hope is that that would give the panel the discretion to rule on such instances as Kavouss raised. But it might be worth noting. Kavouss I see your hand. Is that a new stand in.

>> Yes, because I'm dealing with this issue for many, many, many years I have some experience in that. I don't think that if the claimant is do you hear me?

>> Yes, yes, I'm sorry.

>> Yeah, if the claimant speaks Arabic and the initial document is English that claimant can ask for translation in Arabic. Why should we translate it in Chinese? Because the claimant does not speak Chinese. Why should it be Russian? I think we should put some sort of qualifications that an additional language done initial or original if requested in one additional language if requested. But not automatic translation in 6 languages. It will be very costly. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Kavouss. Those are good points. I thought this was implicitly part of this but you're making a good point. It should be explicit. So good point, thank you. So that would be my suggestion for treating the language issue, language and translation. And, I would propose that I put this on list seeking a first reading within the next week. Something like that. But if anyone has thoughts in addition to Kavouss' please speak up and make them now. And seeing or hearing none okay I'm going to move on then. So, we just did translation/interpretation. I had on the agenda payment of fees and it's in response to a note from the IPC. But to be honest

with you I've not had the time this week to tee this one up sufficiently. I tried to last time and I have some information about it but I would prefer that I take this out to list to set this up and we address it in our next call. If I approached it now it would be haphazard and probably not help us. Having said that since I have it on the agenda, if anyone here would like to comment on the IPC's comment about payment of fees, et cetera I'm certainly happy to hear that now. So, I'll call for hands or a voice or anything like that. Seeing none, hearing none.

>> The IPC, could you refresh my mind? I am sorry I have not followed that. What is the IPC?

>> Thank you, Kavouss and I'll bring it up on list. But basically, they asked that there be language included in the rules to the effect that nothing in the new rules is intended to supersede some ICDR rules. And those were rules that dealt with allocating costs from a party's delaying things or otherwise. And so, it was just a request for clarity as I understand. Greg is on the call and Craig if you have anything to offer or shed lights I may have thoughts that refreshment of ideas but I would be happy to hear it. Otherwise Kavouss I'll put something on the list. Greg, is that you coming on the line? I take it not. So Kavouss that's roughly what it was about. And not having any other hands let's move on to the first treatment of evidence, discovery, evidence, statements. And this is something I put in the slide that I mailed just prior to the call and Brenda can throw up on the screen. And it came out under an email that I put out several days ago. But there were requests, various requests from members from the public comments about certain evidentiary issues, statements and things like that. And after considering all of them I came up with the idea that we should make an addition to rule 6. The rules that actually apply here are rules 6 and rule 8. But I recommended that we make a change to rule 6. I'll read out the language of rule 6 then the last sentence is what I'm suggesting that we add. The initial written submissions of the parties shall not exceed 25 pages each in

argument, double spaced and in 12-point font. All necessary and available evidence in support of the claimant's claims should be part of the initial written submission. Evidence will not be included when calculating the page limit. The parties may submit expert evidence in writing and there shall be one right of reply to that expert evidence. The IRP panel may request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the board, the supporting organizations, or from other parties. I'll now begin that last sentence that I suggest we add. In addition, the IRP panel may grant a request for additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the board, the supporting organizations, or from other parties upon the showing of a compelling basis for such request. And that's in response to the comments about there should be additional chance to make comments to submit evidence. But then I also went on and dealt with some of the other requests in which I said this. Whoops. Oh, otherwise, with respect to rule 8 discovery method I recommend no change. That's me David McAuley speaking as a participant. The rule directs the panel to be guided by considerations of accessibility, fairness and efficiency both as to time and cost in considering discovery requests. This leaves the matter to the panel where it will be better handled than by us trying to imagine a context to fix. I also note that ICDR Article 21 states that depositions, interrogatories and requests to admit are not appropriate for these arbitrations. Article 21.5 deals with exchanging confidential information. We should keep in mind that the IRP is not just for U.S. lawyers and is meant to be stream lined and efficient. Those were my words. I cited Article 21.5 confidential treatment. That's in response to a comment from the international trademark association. I mentioned that Article 21 of the ICDR deals with depositions, interrogatories and that's in response to a number of people that said we should have provisions for depositions and interrogatories, et cetera. So that's my suggestion. And I would like to move it to first reading

on the list. But here's an opportunity for folks to weigh in who are on the call, tweak it, comment, suggest something else as you wish. Liz, you have a hand up.

>> Thanks, David. I think with respect to the proposed sentence that you have in red, our concern is with the reference to allowing the panel to seek written submissions from the board or supporting organizations or other parties. It would may be circumventing the joinder intervention rule. So as a way around. And it doesn't tie it to the requirements of what a party has to meet in order to intervene under the joinder rule.

>> Thanks, Liz. Excuse me. If I'm not mistaken the sentence just prior to that that says the IRP panel may request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the board, the supporting organizations that language before the red sentence is actually in the rule that we came up with as I recall. Does that make a difference to what you're saying? How's that factor in?

>> So, I apologize. I wasn't part of the group when we came up with the initial language but I was focusing on the new language, the red. I see what you're saying. I guess to your point I guess the IRP panel can request to the first part. IRP panel can request written submission from whoever they want. But, I think other entities shouldn't be able to ask to be able to submit additional submissions unless they are a party or they qualify as amicus to the IRP.

>> Okay, that's a fair point. So maybe a tweak to this would be, you know, if qualified or something if qualified under the rules.

>> Yeah, I mean we can tie it back to perhaps like under the rule anti it back to the joinder rule or someone reference that back and any other section that is might be applicable. Then I think that language would be okay.

>> So then let me ask you to do that, Liz. If you would submit that language to the list. But when you do it let me ask you to take a look at rule 6 in the current draft that was out for public comment. Because, those entities that are listed there, the board, the SOs, other parties, et cetera, those are in the rule in the preceding sentence. So just take a look and keep that in mind as you make a suggestion on the list.

>> Absolutely. We'll do that.

>> Okay, thanks. Kavouss, your hand is up.

>> Yes, I have two points to make. First of all, I agree with the previous speaker that we need to inject some words in the red part such as with justification or if justified. So, in addition to the IRP panel may grant, if justified... We need to have a justification. But not request and give it full blank check to the panel to grant the additional submissions, so on. This is number 1. You need to add something, if justified. So, we need to put that in. Second, the main submission is 25 pages. I have no problem. This is all taken from American standards, 25, double spaced, 12 font. I have no problem with anything. But, there is a but. The main is 25 pages but additional, how many pages should it go? Fifty? One hundred? So, we should put some limit here as well, the additional submissions. So, we should not be more than we should have not exceeding, and you have to discuss what figure you put. I think it should not be 25 percent more than the initial one. About 5 to 6 pages. But not additional pages or

additional submissions more than the existing or more than the initial one. So, we have to address this issue. Otherwise it makes clear some problems. Thank you.

>> Thank you Kavouss. So, Liz I would suggest you capture some of that language that Kavouss just mentioned with respect to justification, et cetera when you offer language on list. See if that might work into it. Then secondly with respect, I understand the point about a cap. I'm just this language appears in the rule, I believe. Let me just take a real quick look at rule 6. Kavouss let me think about what you said about capping the additional submission. Part of why I'm hesitating is it's likely that someone is coming to the panel and saying I can't state my case in 25 pages. I need additional room. And, there's an assumption in here that the panel is going to be exercising appropriate oversight. So, before we put a cap let me think if I can find a way to word that that says the panel can approve that but only in compelling circumstances or something like that. And let me see what I can come up with then if it's not satisfactory you can comment then on the list. But I guess what I'm saying is I don't know what to say right now. Let me try to work on it. Kavouss, your hand is back up.

>> Yes, David, you are expert in U.S. law. I am not. But you have seen that this 25 pages does not come from nowhere. It comes from somewhere. I don't think somebody could come to the panel thinking 25 pages is not sufficient for me to explain. They should accommodate in the 25 page, not write a book. So, this 25 has some basis. And then it might be particular cases that some additional pages will be required or [Indiscernible] on certain cases, justifications. But it should have a cap. So, I don't think that we should leave it open and I have no problem to leave it to you to think it over, look at any presence denies anywhere in any court, in any circumstances, I have no difficulty. But not to be open as it is now. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Kavouss. I will take it under advisement and see what I can come up with. I do note your very kind observations that I'm an expert in U.S. law. Unfortunately, I wish that were the case. I'm not sure any such person exists but thank you.

>> This is what someone said, you are an expert in U.S. law.

[Laughing].

>> I noticed it when Thomas said it and I will have to have a chat with Thomas. Thank you. Does anyone else want to weigh in on this issue? And if not, you can look for treatment on the list but I'm going to be in the list and on the call saying let's get this to first reading and I hope second reading will be fairly easy beyond that. So, I've talked about my inability to deal with payment of fees right now so that brings us to the end of the agenda to any other business. And I'm very happy that Bernie could accommodate us to get some time. I'm hoping this is a nice turn out. Thank you all very much. If there's any way you can help process, you know, getting these rules moving, certainly would be appreciated. There's a couple I think left for the sign up sheet but in any event, I want to thank folks. I have no other business myself but I'm opening the floor if anybody else wants to bring up anything else right now. Seeing no hands and hearing nothing, I will then simply say thank you to all for your participation on the call today and that will wind up the call and that's the end. We'll see you next time and on the list. Thanks, very much.