

## IRP-IOT Meeting #36

22 February 2018 @ 19:00 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.**

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Hello, everyone. This is David McAuley speaking. Welcome to the IRP implementation oversight team call. We are probably lacking a quorum, but I'm going to be make can some remarks, so I would ask for the recording to be started.

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you. I see that we have several participants and some servers, but probably not enough to make a quorum and that's disappointed. I would like to make a few comments and have them recorded and ask people to take a look at the comments and in the mean time we might gather a quorum, but we are so close to being finished that I am going to encourage folks to pay strict attention to the list. I think we can accomplish and perhaps close this out on the list, to look to encouraging our fellow participants when we see them at ICANN 61 to get more deeply involved. Once we finish these rules, and as I said, I think we're within a hair's length of finishing them, we have other things to do, including rules for appeals and things of that nature. So we have quite a bit on the plate.

I see we now have five on the line. So let's proceed and we will proceed with the meeting and do the best we can. I don't think we're going to fill the allotted time, but let's go through the agenda and then we can finish up on list and draw people's attention to this on list.

And as I said a moment ago, I'm going to encourage all of us involved in this, both as observers and participants to encourage our fellows in this group to get more deeply involved. We have -- we're about to finish one project and launch into some others, all of which I think are quite important. And then in tandem, the SOs and ACs are about to get much more serious about looking to establish a standing panel. So the new IRP is coming very close. We are going to be instrumental in making that happen, so let's encourage each other to redouble our efforts.

Welcome everybody to the call. I would like to ask if there's anybody attending the meeting on the phone only and not showing up in the Adobe meeting.

>> Hi, David. This is Sam Eisner, I will be joining the Adobe room soon.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Sam. Anyone else? Not hearing any, I'm going to ask if there is anybody in the call who has a change to their statement of interest that they would like to note. Not seeing any hands or hearing any, let's proceed.

So the next item on the agenda is the time for filing issue and this I put in our agenda as a status discussion and made some notes lower down in the agenda to describe what's been happening recently. And as you heard in the last call, this is the one serious issue, the one that's taken up most of our time -- or a lot of our time, I should say, the single issue that's had the most discussion, and I went back, as I promised I would in the last call, and looked at the record and came away believing, notwithstanding an inclination for an overall repose period, I came away that the bylaws struck me very clear, that the time for filing issue, in so far as it relates to an overall period of repose was correctly stated by Malcolm Hutty's suggested text. The one concern I came away with was, did we have a consensus? How do we determine consensus? And so in a moment I'm going to ask Bernie to talk about that from the perspective of the CCWG-Accountability. So far procedurally we have operated as the CCWG-Accountability has and we have not made any decision to do otherwise. So that could be an illuminating remark, so I'll ask Bernie in just a moment. I know Malcolm, Sam and Liz may be interested in making comments on this, too. And so I'm going to open the floor for comments and I'm particularly wondering if Sam, Liz, or Malcolm want to make a comment. And then I will turn to Bernie. So that being said, does anybody want to make any comment about the status of this particular issue?

>> David this is Sam from ICANN. I think in some ways we're back in the conversation we had around June or so of this year on it and so we're at the point where, for those who have been participates in the IRP there's agreement to go forward with language that reflects there's no statute of repose on -- no outer limit on time for filing and so, you know, as we discussed before, that's a material change from what was posted for public comment. Within ICANN, I think -- and we've heard some other voices in the IOT as well that have not necessarily been supportive of the no IOT. I don't know the consensus process or how you determine consensus, but I know from ICANN's position, for purposes of the public comment, you know, we would actually like to be able to put in like a minority statement stating out our concerns around it. And then, you know, whatever else would go out with the public comment would be there, but we could develop a minority statement. We would be happy to circulate it among the IOT to see if there's anyone else that's part of the IOT that would like to join us or give statements of their own, but I think that's a way to frame some of the dialogue around public comment, understanding that the view of the group right now is to move forward with the no statute of repose in the next version of the rules.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Sam. David McAuley speaking again. You raised a good point, an interesting point, and that is public comment. This is a material change and so this, while I don't think the rules need to go back out for public comment, I think this particular change would need to go back out for public comment. And I'll ask Bernie to speak after Malcolm in just a minute. But I know in Work Stream II in CCWG-Accountability there's been a series of minority statements. I don't expect there would be any problem with having a minority statement. But anyway, having said that, let me ask if Malcolm would make some comments and after Malcolm, I'll turn to Bernie to see if he can shed some light for us where we are consensually.

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: Thank you. Can you hear me?

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Yes, we can hear you. Yes.

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: Thank you. Right, I mean, yes, now I think we're in the stage of just trying to write up our report, having made the decisions. The consensus, you called a consensus on this, I don't know, back in whatever it was, I think May, some time ago anyway, so now we just need to make sure that the report is clear and states the reason clearly as well as the decision clearly. I must say I'm surprised that ICANN would wish to put in a minority statement just from the point of view of the, I mean, has ICANN ever put in a minority statement on a matter in which it is actually, you know, the interested party? It seems strange as to whether that's even a thing for ICANN to do.

If it is decided that ICANN should be considered able to do that, then I think that would mean that we would need to be a little more forthcoming about the reasoning for the decision than we had talked about being. I think we would have -- if ICANN is going to argue its position that it disagrees with this, we would have to actually state the points that were raised as to why we had done this. We couldn't be silent on that and just simply state what we were doing.

But I must say, I'm -- I would think it strange and surprising and I would actually wonder about precedent and order as to whether ICANN can put in a minority statement. We are actually talking about, you know, the accountability of ICANN.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Malcolm. Is that -- are you finished?

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: Yes, I'm finished on that. I don't know how we would go about asking that question as to whether it was appropriate for ICANN to do that and who we would ask. Perhaps I could turn that to you, maybe you could get some advice on that.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you. This is David McAuley speaking. I'm going to turn to Liz in just a minute, but on the procedural question, I take your point, I hadn't thought that myself. My initial reaction to what you said, ICANN is, as Avri explained in the chat a concerned party, but there are many in the community that would probably like the idea of certainty at some point. I don't know. But I never thought that ICANN could not make such a statement as a participant in the group, I would expect they would. And even if this is a first instance of doing that, that wouldn't strike me all that unusual. But anyway, Bernie is going to comment. Bernie, if I could ask you to just hold on one moment and let Liz comment on this and then we'll go to you Bernie. So, Liz, take the floor.

>> This is Sam, I'm with Liz and I had to raise my hand before I was able to get into the room. I think, David, as you mentioned, ICANN is actually listed as a participant in this IOT group. There are many places where ICANN is not actually an active participant and designated and it was in that view of our role as a participant that we were considering making a minority statement. I thought, you know, so the reason I suggested that is, you know, I think we need to make sure that when this goes for public comment, we're not just posting a redline, there has to be some expression around why the change was made. And so, you know, I wouldn't want to ask the IOT itself to carry the water to agree on reflecting ICANN's concerns that were raised during

the discussion and to require the IOT to reflect those in a public comment document. And so the suggestion of making a minority statement was a way to allow that to come into consideration as the community is considering this very major change to the rules that could have very broad impact across the ICANN community, without trying to impose on the IOT the need to reflect ICANN's concerns in a summary that got posted for comment.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Sam. Malcolm, before I go to you, I'm going to ask Bernie to comment on this and then we'll come to you.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, David. Can you hear me?

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Yes, Bernie, we can hear you. Thanks.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. On the minority statement, I don't think there's any limitations and from the historical point of view, from the CCWG-Accountability, I don't think we've ever applied any significant limitations. If there was a major divergence of opinion, we've always strived to ensure that that gets presented. So our latest example is the point from Brazil and the jurisdiction discussion. So from that point of view, it's fairly straightforward.

I think as Sam has pointed out, ICANN and council are typically members of this group, but I don't think beyond presenting the views and participating in discussion that they don't get involved in actually establishing quorum on decisions. So if you look at that, then, you know, the sum of our meetings of this group, if we applied the same rule that we would apply to other Work Stream II subgroups, is that technically we need five, if you will, full participants to have a valid reading of a recommendation. The second rule that has permeated through most of the Work Stream II stuff from Work Stream I is there has to be two readings to ensure that people get a chance to join in if they could not for any reason join on one meeting, they should be there upon the second meeting.

And the other point is that in between two readings, there should be a clear presentation of the issue on the list and who should accept comments on the list as also having a weight in expressing consent.

So I think if we go through all of that, I've been going through a bit of the history, you know, there hasn't been beyond ICANN, I think, any significant disagreement with the Malcolm point of view, but we have been rather shy on if we're trying to keep to the quorum rule that we've had. I hope that's sufficient.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: That's helpful, Bernie. David McAuley speaking again. Malcolm -- oops. Malcolm's hand is down. I see Malcolm's comment in the chat where he says, I share Sam's view that we should not merely post a redline, but should give explanation of why the change was made. I don't quarrel with that. Based on what Bernie said, my way forward is to confirm the consensus on the list and to do that, I would come up with a statement of the issue and then I would pass it amongst myself, Malcolm, and Sam, I think, to try to make sure we get to crisp and accurate statement that we would put to the list and say we have come to consensus.

Malcolm, your hand is back up. Yes, go ahead.

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: That sounds like you are reopening the question at hand. You had already declared that a consensus had been reached. You did so -- I'm checking my e-mail now, I believe it was the 11th of June, was it not?

>> DAVID MCAULEY: I don't remember the date. I think that you're accurate in what you're saying, but I think I was probably not taking account of the attendance. In other words, I'm not sure that the group has had a chance to weigh in on this. And as I listened to Bernie --

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: Well --

>> DAVID MCAULEY: -- as I listened to Bernie's comments, this idea of confirming consensus struck me as consistent with what Bernie was saying.

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: Basically [indiscernible] a meeting that was given proper notice, we held a meeting, we posted to the list several days before the second meeting was held, and in that post we made a very clear statement of what was the issue before us, the language that was scheduled for approval, and invited people's comments and then we held with due and adequate notice a second meeting that was held to be [indiscernible] and at that fact you said we now had second reading.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Are you done, Malcolm?

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: I'm done.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Bernie, did I misinterpret anything that you said in -- well, I guess it's hard for you to know that. To read my mind. Do you have anything to add to this, Bernie?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: As I said, you know, I can just give you references as to what is common practice in Work Stream II and it's really for the group. And so what I will say is, you know, if there is a critical -- this may be useful, if there is a critical timing issue, the CCWG-Accountability has gathered the Plenary, you know, where there is usually sufficient attendance and dealt with things quickly. There has been a history of if there is something that is dicey on the quorum side to ask the Plenary's view of that, but the IOT is a bit of a different creature, as we know.

The reason I raised my hand, originally, was to note that if the decision is made to go ahead with the proposal on timing, that this would represent a major change and according to our basic rules would require going back to public comment. Thank you.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Bernie. I don't disagree on the public comment aspect of it.

I think what I'm going to do is yet again go back to the record and examine exactly what Malcolm is saying happened for myself, again, and I'll come back on the list and say what I believe the case is. Malcolm, I'll be at you in just one second. But I feel, I mean, I have done this and this will be another step back into it, I don't mind doing that, but I don't feel comfortable in making a decision on this on the fly right here. And I think what I'll do along the way, as I said, is keep the major proponents of the two sides involved in this rather than the entire list, unless anyone would object to that. That doesn't mean that we would keep anything from the list, it

simply means we would be doing some of the background work in the background and then come to the list and explain what happened. So I'm tempted to operate in that manner.

Malcolm's hand was up first and then Sam. I'll turn to Malcolm.

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: Thank you, David. I would like to be clear, I'm not in anyway arguing with Bernie about the procedure. I'm simply saying that I believe the procedure was, as Bernie laid out, has been fully complied with. I have just this moment forwarded for your convenience a copy of the message that was sent after the first reading meeting and before the second reading meeting, which you will see sets the issue out clearly and gives a week's notice of the second reading and inviting people to comment on the list or to attend that second reading meeting. That second reading meeting was then held. It was considered [indiscernible] and it went through without further demurrals.

If you are to say now that meeting that was in quorum, apart from the fact that I think doing so at this late stage is probably wrong, it would also invalidate anything else that was done at that meeting. I think we have complied with the procedures fully. We are where we are. And the next stage is to complete the write-up so we can go to public comment. I'm not disagreeing with any public comment on this issue.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Malcolm. And what I'm saying now is I'm not disagreeing with you, I'm not saying you're misstating anything, I just need to go back and look at this myself, that's all.

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: [Indiscernible].

>> DAVID MCAULEY: I'm sorry?

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: I said, that's fine.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Liz's hand is u

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: I'm done.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Okay, thank you. Liz's hand was up, but now down. So what I'm going to do is move on. I will go back and look at that procedural matter again. The last time I went back was looking more at the substance of the timing issue. This time I'll look more at the procedural side.

So what I'd like to do is move on to the third item on the agenda which is the review of the public comments document, our draft, unless anyone has anything else to say on this. Seeing no hands, let's move on to -- Brenda, if you could bring up on the screen the revised document that deals with our treatment of the public comments. On this document we went through the greater part of it on the last call and I don't recall any specific requests for changes in it.

In this latest draft you'll see that there are, in track changes format, there are some additional language insertions, but they're pretty nominal in a sense. Many of them simply go through sections where we say, no change is recommended, or, see the recommendations regarding

[indiscernible]. So you have scroll scroll, I believe, on this document. Let me just go through briefly at a very high level.

What this has is an introduction. The introduction is basically the way that we've worked. Near the bottom of page 1, prior to the language that is shaded in red, there's red text. Do we need actually revisions drafted by Sidley for this report or can we proceed in this manner? I take it from the way we have been treating this document is the answer is the latter. We can proceed in this manner. We are going to give instructions to Sidley and vet our instructions to make sure they receive the instructions and move forward from that point. So unless anyone thinks that's an incorrect assessment of where we are in dealing with Sidley, please speak up now. Raise your hand or make a comment.

The next thing I would mention is you will see there's some shade I had language at the bottom of page 1 going over to the next page that added a paragraph that says, by the way in the public comment exercise, a number of people commented on things that have nothing to do with the actual rules. One example I'll give is the ALAC's comment that there should be on-going monitoring of IRP process overall. And that's an issue that Avri took the lead on for us and it simply happens that whatever we do with that comment doesn't show up in the rules. It won't have language reflected in the rule to deal with it. So this shaded paragraph says, to the reader of this report, with respect to those kinds of comments we will come out with another document telling you what we've done, if anything, with respect to those comments. Does anybody object? I think there may have been concern on some part that this kind of paragraph may get us into trouble or might lead to questions that are not necessarily productive. We don't need to have a paragraph like this, I just thought it would be useful to tell folks, there were comments, we haven't ignored them, if we think they will make a difference, we will come up and say so. And for instance, continuing on with Avri's example, the example rather of on-going monitoring, I think we will make a recommendation that there be on-going monitoring of the IRP process, consistent with the bylaws. IRP is mentioned in one of the five year reviews.

Avri, your hand is up, why don't you take the floor?

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks, this is Avri. I just wanted to ask a question about the timing of this separate document. I mean, can this separate -- I mean, does it come out at the same time? Does it come out much, much later? Can things be attached? Like annexes of other issues discussed or something? So I have no problem with the paragraph, I'm just wondering does the timing require it? Thanks.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Avri. David McAuley speaking again. With respect to timing, it would be following this document on the rules and it would -- I would come up with a draft, I would pass it around the group and we could see if we could issue it. My expectation is it wouldn't necessarily need to take a lot of time, but you never know. Something might grab somebody's attention and we could get bogged down on it. So it would be subsequent to this document that's in front of us. Hopefully not too much past that. Much, a much briefer document than the one that's in front of us now that we're working on. Those are my thoughts about it.

Any other comments? Okay.

But then you'll see that I've basically filled in the rest of the document, taking out comments like, in process, with the exception for the time for filing issue, and saying where changes are recommendations or where they're not. And so I will, I believe, frankly, that the document that we have in front of us dealing with our report to the community on our treatment of public comments is, with the exception of the time for filing issue, is basically close to down. So what I'm going to do is put this back on the list and say, look, we have finished with this now, you know, this is essentially the first reading and a week later the second reading on this document and asking people if they have any objection or anything like that to please state it with specific language suggested as an alternative, and I'll reserve the time for filing issue consistent with what we do on that as per our prior discussion just a few moments ago.

If anybody has any other approach or concerns, just let me know. Hearing none and seeing none, let me move to the next agenda item. And that is called types of hearing discussion. And I sent a separate e-mail about this. And what prompted me to send the separate e-mail is among all of the issues on our sign-up sheet and public comments, this is the one I think had the least discussion. So I wanted to ask amongst this group, or give us a chance to speak up on the types of hearing. And you've seen my e-mail. I'm going to ask Brenda if she could put up the types of hearing e-mail and give scroll control on it. But it was basically an e-mail that pointed to comments to people like .music that argued for in-persons hearing in cases as being fairly standard. And what we did in the draft supplementary procedures, in paragraph five, is we basically said that the panel can conduct proceedings electronically to the extent feasible and if there needed to be telephonic or video conferences they should be limited to where necessary. And we went on to say in-person hearing that would be a presumption against them, but they could be overcome, the presumption could be overcome in extraordinary circumstances as described in USP 5. So some of the community said that wasn't a good idea. I put that out in my e-mail. You have scroll control on that. And I made a recommendation as a participant that no change struck me being needed to the rule we had drafted. I said it allows the panel to have video or telephonic conferences where necessary and made in-person hearing preSUFMRMively not to be held, but they could be in extraordinary circumstances, and it left discretion in the panel, which is going to be in the best position to do this, consistent with the idea of fundamental fairness, due process, and expeditious IP hearing. This is an arbitration system that is designed by ICANN to be expeditious. People have the ability to go to court if they wish for some other venue so that's why I made the recommendation that I did.

I'm going to open this to the floor and see if anybody has other thoughts on it. Malcolm, you have the floor. If you are speaking, Malcolm, we can't hear you.

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: I think I was muted.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: There you go.

>> MALCOLM HUTTY: Thank you, David. You raised this point in an e-mail to the list on the 2nd of January and I replied in some detail the following day, the 3rd of January. When you raised it, you said that you thought that if we were -- if people wanted to make comments for changes they should offer text, not merely commentary. So I did that. I attached a suggestion for



what rule 5 could look like in a way that slightly broadened this out, while giving more discretion to the panel to decide when an in-person hearing should be allowed, but nonetheless emphasizing the critical importance that matters are decided expeditiously and at low cost. As a standard to apply when exercising its discretion.

Now I'm not going to walk you through the full text of my e-mail or the proposal that I made now, it would take too long, but I would like to direct, if you are asking for our comments on this issue, I'd like to direct your attention to that reply.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Malcolm. I'll take that under advisement. I did lose sight of that, my apologies. That's exactly what I'm looking for, so I'll go find it and go through it and come back on the list.

Is there anyone else that would like to comment on the types of hearing subject hearing? Liz your hand is up. Liz or Sam, you have the floor.

>> Hi, David, it's Liz. I just wanted to raise the issue that we did discuss this issue during the January call. I don't think Malcolm was present during that call, but we did discuss this and stated ICANN's position, which is that we are in agreement with the position that you set forth as a participant. In that, this is an issue that has been debated and worked through prior to the publication of the draft that went out for public comment. And we agree with your position that it should remain as drafted.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Liz. And, again, I went back on this and went back to the record, obviously I missed that portion of the January hearing where we discussed this. My apologies to this group for doing that. I'm going to go back and look again, as I said to Malcolm, and come back to the list. I appreciate the points you made and Malcolm list, I appreciate the discussion, I'll go through that and come back to the list. I'm glad to hear it. I'm glad there was discussion.

Does anybody else want to make a point about this? Not seeing any hands or hearing any, let's move on to agenda item number five which talks about next steps. First with respect to the Report on Public Comments, I just mentioned that, but I also wanted to -- and I also mentioned about the public comments on non-rules matters. So we actually discussed those briefly.

I want to just at this time make a point that there's something I would suggest that we address and what it is is under the rule, under the bylaws 4.3N talks about us constructing rules of procedure and 4.3N4C talks about us coming up with description of written statements, including -- let me see if I can find the language. Bear with me just one second. Including -- to come up with rules governing written submissions, including required elements of a claim. The one thing I don't believe we have laid out is the required elements of a claim.

Now the -- I think it would be good if I came out on list and suggested that we do this. And we could perhaps include this in the item for public comment, although it's probably not a major thing. But I only think it's just a point for sort of cleaning up and making sure that it's dressed with respect to the IRP as opposed to arbitration under ICDR rules. ICDR rules do cover what is -- what's required in a notice of arbitration, as they call it. And basically they ask not only for a

copy of the arbitration clause, but a description of the claim, in fact, supporting it. So my question to us is, do we want to just list the elements of a claim as being things like the name of the party, the capacity that they are filing in, are they an individual, a registrant, a Registrar, whatever? To describe the action or inaction by ICANN with some particularity as to what that action was, when it was, describe the effect on the Claimant and specifically call out the Article or bylaw they allege was violated? We haven't discussed this. It's a suggestion that I could come up with some draft language fairly quickly and I was wondering if anybody had any thoughts on this as to the wisdom of doing something like this or simply leaving this unstated and as it's treated under the ICDR rules.

Sam, you had your hand up. Go ahead.

>> Thank you, David. I think the concept is stating what does it mean to raise a claim? And what are the points needed to raise a claim? You know, it's definitely worth considering. I think we have to go back to the language that's actually within the bylaws that specifies what a claim is and that might be the biggest guidance. I think some of your suggestions about referencing which section of the bylaws or the articles is alleged to be violated, et cetera, that was missing that and it could make it very difficult for people to actually state their claim. I think, currently I know we have a, I'm not sure how specific the ICDR form is around the filing of an IRP and I'm here with Liz and she is shaking her head going, no, no, it's not really specific anyway, so it's not actually handled within the IRP filing form. So I think you raise a point, you know, we need to make sure things are there and stated. Is it something we need to reflect in the rules of procedure? I'm not sure. I think it could go either way. I think we should also look at the ICDR procedures themselves because they might tether it to whatever basis is there. I don't know if this is a place we would be recreating work we don't necessarily do, but I wouldn't be opposed to taking an initial -- to seeing an initial draft on if you want to do as you proposed.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Sam. Excuse me. It's David McAuley speaking again. I think I may come out to the list with a suggestion. It's not a make or break issue, obviously, because the ICDR rules are in the background and the bylaws require what they require. Since that rule 4.3N4C, I think it was, spoke about elements of the claim, I thought I'd mention it. It's something that we have neglected. Probably I should have raised it sooner, but I didn't really notice it until lately.

So I will probably suggest something and we can discuss whether it's -- the idea is merited or not. I don't think we'll disagree. I mean, the elements are going to be fairly straightforward and factually based. So thank you. Thank you for that.

Excuse me. I had another point under next steps discussion with respect to future non-rules work. And simply here I'll just remind this group that the SOs and ACs are embarking on the effort to establish a standing panel. And those of us here, and I'll probably say something about this on list, those in our group are constituents in these groups. And so I would encourage us to offer our services to our constituent bodies, help them, they're going to need help. It's not very well described in the bylaws what they have to do. They have to sort of establish a standing

panel and there's not that much guidance. I'm hoping that we as a team, if asked, can help them, and we as individuals in our constituencies can help them, too. Please be attentive, too.

Sam, is that an old hand or new hand?

>> It's an old hand, but I'll just call attention to what I just posted in the chat that we have just received confirmation a couple days ago that we have a formal time on the schedule, Wednesday at 17:00 Puerto Rico time local for that community discussion to continue. We'll circulate that more broadly to the IOT list as well.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you. And then I'd also simply remind our group that in addition to that work, there are other things we need to do. I can't remember all of them, but they involved coming up with process for can cooperative engagement group. That group in CCWG-Accountability went away and we have to come up that effort. And in our public comments we got for non-appeal, but regular IRP appeal, we got a couple of people saying on appeal, the cost should go to the losing party or an appellant that loses. Excuse me. And things of that nature. And we could be requested by PTI customers to come up with PTI claims. So there's more for us to do before this group is disbanded or whatever. So look for -- I think we're close. If we can figure out the time for filing where we are on that, I think we're close to getting a report out. And so I encourage us to stay involved and I hope to get a chance to chat with a number of you in Puerto Rico. All that being said, I'm going to ask if anybody has any comments, thoughts, insights or suggestion for work we have in the future. For the dynamics of the team, we need to encourage more folks to jump on the call and I've been doing that, but probably not all that successfully, and to get more involved on the list. I look forward to continuing those efforts.

And if there are no further comments, I think we can call this to a close. I'll go back to the notes and start work for time for filing issue tomorrow or over the weekend to try to sort out where we are. That said, if no one has any other suggestions or comments, we can wrap this up.

Malcolm, I see you are typing. If you have a comment you want to mention, feel free to go ahead and do so. Okay, thank you. You're welcome. That will be a wrap then. I think we can close the recording and I'll simply say thanks, everybody. Thank you so much for being here. And we shall move forward and we're getting close to getting the rules done, so my thanks to all. And goodbye.

>> Thank you, David. Thank you.

>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you.

[Meeting concluded]

CART Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.

