

**Transcription ICANN Helsinki
Registry Stakeholder Meeting
Wednesday, 29 June 2016**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

Man: It is June 29 at 8:00 am. This is the gTLD Registry Stakeholder Group session in Veranda 1.

Paul Diaz: Okay everybody let's get this one underway.

Cherie Stubbs: We can start the recording now please. And do we have anyone on the teleconference bridge? No? All right thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Cherie. Morning everyone. It's bright and early. Thank you for joining us. This is Paul Diaz, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group, and this is our face-to-face in Helsinki. Today's the 29th of June. We put the agenda up on the screen. We circulated in advance a bunch of updates and discussions we'll have. Under any other business, anybody want to add something to the list you don't see there now? Once we get underway, if there are things that pop into mind by all means just raise your hand and we'll address them.

Might as well get right into it. The first item you see up there related to the IANA transition it's a selection of the two customer standing committee reps.

I'm pleased to report that we had four candidates put their names forward from registries. Ultimately the stakeholder group will select two, and we have a process underway, a selection process underway. We'll be coming back to the group once we've worked through that. And the we in this is the ExCom. We're not doing a vote for the two members. I see you scowling over there, Jeff.

Look folks, one of the challenges this group has, and let me insert it's not on the list, but, you know, the vote for our budget right now, good lord people this is embarrassing. We only have 26 votes. We have a membership of over 90 right now, or high 80s for voting members. You know, we've got a problem as a group that there's very few who are regularly taking the various things responsibly and an awful lot who are just floating along.

And, you know, for something like the budget it's your money and yet we can't get, after several weeks, anywhere near the simple majority minimum. So, you know, please a impassioned request to go back to the SurveyMonkey, it's a simple yes or no. And for something more complex like the selection of CSC candidates, we have a selection process, a tool that we built that the ExCom will walk folks through once we've made the decisions but this is one that we feel because we're on such a tight deadline, we're going to hold it to ourselves. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. I understand you're not, or we should all not be happy, with turnout for the budget, but I don't think that that's a reason to basically say that all decisions, or important decisions, should just be made by ExCom. I think if you don't get a quorum for a vote for the two representatives, I think the backup can be selection by the ExCom based on the people that did vote.

But this is a pretty darn important decision and I mean I trust you guys, the ExCom, but we didn't elect you for that purpose. So I would not just go the default of having the ExCom vote on this. I would hold a vote in a short period of time. If you don't get the quorum, then have the backup be the ExCom

select based on the votes that were already submitted, or taking that into consideration. But I don't agree with - I'd like to hear from everybody else, but I don't agree that it should just be a decision by the ExCom on this.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Reg?

Reg Levy: Would you suggest that we take the majority of the actual - the people who did vote, whether or not it's a quorum?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, I think I would like to hear from everybody else personally. I would say that if it's strong majority then yes. If it's pretty close, then I think there's some judgment that would need to be made.

Paul Diaz: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck speaking. You know, our charter doesn't allow that. So we're creating a problem for ourselves here. We introduced the ExCom in a not too long ago revision to the charter, but we didn't give the ExCom that kind of authority. And that was intentional because we wanted the whole membership involved. But if, like Paul said, if the membership doesn't participate we're going to have to revisit that.

Paul Diaz: Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Paul. So, Jeff, this isn't the first time that we've said this is the way we were going to do the selection process. We did, you know, we've had a number of calls where we've discussed it and we've said that the ExCom, you know, would do the selection process. And I think our intention was that we would put the candidates to the, you know, tell the membership what our proposed selection is, and if we don't get any objection then we'd move forward.

Paul Diaz: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes with all due respect, and I apologize for not catching it earlier, so, but there's always things that people don't catch. So that's my fault and I apologize for that. But then to select someone and then ask for objections. Look, most of us are pretty kind spirited and none of us want to go public and just say, "Oh you selected so and so, or you selected Jeff Neuman." There's - maybe there a couple of people that would say, "I hate him." But for the most part, people are kind spirited and they're not going to want to go public and say, "No that person's terrible." So I don't agree with that approach of having to file objections on someone.

Paul Diaz: Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. I think maybe one potential solution, if folks are willing to consider it, that might be a good middle ground would be to have the ExCom make recommendations based on its evaluation of the candidates but then still have the membership vote. And that to me I think would allow kind of the best of each scenario. Whereas the ExCom has had the time to really study the candidates, apply the criteria, and then simultaneously the membership would have the opportunity to vote. And I think it would just have to be made very clear to everyone you - there is no opportunity to extend this vote. It has to happen.

Paul Diaz: We'll come back to that. Thanks, Kristina. Jon?

Jon Nevett: I guess we have a short-term problem and a long-term problem. The short-term problem is what to do about this selection and, you know, I think maybe part of the selection process is the ExCom takes input. You announce who the four applicants are and you give the opportunity for those of us in the stakeholder group to provide input to you. Maybe there's a form or something that we could fill out, so those of us who are interested or have concerns about an applicant or really think, you know, one applicant is great and you

want to promote that person, then we have that opportunity and you can take that into account along with your own evaluations. One idea.

Two, I'm not opposed to Kristina's idea of, you know, you guys propose a slate and set up a down vote on the slate. Again, that's a short-term issue. The long-term issue is I think we've got to lower the quorum requirement. We had a debate when we went through this last time, and Chuck won. So - because of the size of the group, some of us proposed a lower quorum requirement of 25% instead of 50% for a vote.

And, you know, yes we could try to energize people but in general there are people who are just going to be apathetic about it and are willing to draft behind those of us who are spending more time on it, understand it better. And that might not be a bad thing. And there's sometimes where, you know, as long as we get a critical mass we should be able to move forward. So I would suggest one of these short-terms solutions and that as a long-term solution. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Jon. Reg?

Reg Levy: So, Jon, I think that's a great idea that we revise the quorum but I'm wondering if instead of it just being a baseline membership percentage if we want to start tracking who's attending meetings regularly, including online, whether they're taking part in the e-mail discussions, that kind of thing, because it often ends up being the people who, quote, unquote, care. But there are a number of people who are here in this room and aren't necessarily speaking up, and I think that they should count towards that.

Paul Diaz: Jordyn Buchanan?

Jordyn Buchanan: So I was going to start adding my own ideas about how to fix the long-term voting problem but that's probably going to mess up the agenda for today. So can I suggest that we - that you convene a little task force to figure out what

to do about the quorum problems and we move that discussion into the future as opposed to trying to fix that today as well. I'll happily participate.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Jordyn. Yes it looks like we're going to have an Evolution 4 working group in our future. Very good point that Jon makes about the threshold. That was something that was actively debated when we last updated our charter. At the time, you know, there's a lot of logic about keeping it at 50 and that's what stayed in the charter. But the arguments, given what we're seeing for the lower threshold, need to be revisited. So we will do that.

As far as the short term, the question of the vote, probably - excuse me for not being clearer, the ExCom had every intention of coming back to the group for some validation. We weren't just going to simply select. Please understand though the very tight timeline. We must identify, the Registry Stakeholder Group, who the candidates are no later than 15 July, actually the 14.

Jeff, the body language you're thinking like no problem. Okay we've got a major holiday coming in the U.S. We have one stakeholder group biweekly meeting the 13th. So there's good coincidence there. But the selection process that the ExCom set up we, because of scheduling and whatnot, could not ourselves get to it until 8th and 9th of July. So recommending putting forward, "Hey we feel these are the strongest two of the four" and some rationale, we need a little time do that.

Long and short, if we want to do any kind of vote or at least a - as long as there's no opposition to the names put forward, it's going to be very tight. It's going to be like a 48-hour ballot. So just folks understand. That's not - we're not trying to railroad in any way, it's just a function of the calendar and what we can with the time we have. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Could you tell us the deadline and put it out there? Thinking now it's going to be hard is not a reason not to do it. So I may have missed it. I haven't seen the four names but they may be out there. Is it out on our list who are the four - no? So put it out there now. I mean we - it's the 29th. Put the names out there along with any supporting materials that they submitted and supported that candidacy. Give - you said the ExCom's meeting - well give some times, set up a schedule for a vote and let's do it.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And I hear you. Let's do it people, because we do. We've communicated a lot. For the four who came forward, please understand, they never understood that their names were going to be publicized broadly, that we'd be voting. I don't think they'll have any problem with it but we didn't set it up this way. And so we moved this along on the agenda.

The next item is very, very similar and is about to get underway so we can learn from the CSC and apply it to a selection of RZERC, the root zone candidates that we need, make it a more clear, transparent, easily understood process. But, you know, we're kind of starting to make things up on the fly now, and this is all too often the norm for us. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck speaking again. And a couple things. First of all, isn't there a template of qualifications that the executive committee was going to use? Is that feasible to send that out to the group and anybody that wants could provide to the executive committee their input on that little template on the list of candidates? I'm not pushing for that but that would be one way to do it. I don't know if that's feasible or not because I haven't seen the template.

The second thing, don't we need to have some - we need to have - there's two seats but we need to have some alternatives too because the ccNSO and the GNSO have to meet and try to deal with diversity, assuming equal comparable qualifications and so forth. So we're really selecting more than two. We may have two primary but two backups. Is that correct?

Paul Diaz: That is correct, Chuck, and again we're going to lay that out. We have - Donna and I have been meeting with the ccNSO to make sure that we are in coordination. Again, the timelines are such that each of the first groups picks two, has alternates, that's correct, and there is a ratification process. In the case of the two names that we put forward that the GNSO Council, first through a selection subcommittee and then an affirmation vote by the full council, all that happens no later than mid-August. There is a timeline. I don't recall all the specific milestones on it, but there are all those steps still to come.

The selection tool template that we had that we refer to, yes we can share so that folks understand how we will be evaluating and coming up with our recommendations. And folks have thoughts on the, you know, inputs would be welcome. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. I just want to clarify. It sounds like we're heading towards publishing the names with the qualifications and taking a vote. Are we going down Kristina's route or something along those lines where the ExCom's going to in some way order that slate and make preferences? Is that where we're heading? Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Donna?

Donna Austin: Personally I think we have to because it's not just one criteria, there's a number of different criteria that the candidates responded to. And I think if we open it up to the group to do their own kind of, you know, evaluation, we're going to end up in a really difficult situation potentially. So I think the ExCom does the evaluation. We can take input from others that can, you know, help us with the discussion but I think really let's try to keep the evaluation to a small group and take input from the broader group would be my preference.

Paul Diaz: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. I'd be happy to be on that committee that looks at the criteria. I helped in the whole transition process on coming up with certain SLEs and other things that have to be looked at. And I know you guys are getting frustrated, but I think this is a bigger discussion we need to have later on as to the role of the ExCom. I don't think when any of us elected the ExCom officers we had this vision of leadership in mind in terms of the role of the ExCom. I think it's a bigger discussion.

So I know you all are frustrated but this is not the reason - we did not go into the election of the ExCom with this thought in mind that it was going to be some group that hierarchical can make certain decisions that we didn't envision. This right here is the key tenant to the whole IANA transition and to the accountability that many of us have spent a lot of time on, years' worth of work to just say this is a decision for the ExCom. This is critical, these two items.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Jeff, and I hear you. In all fairness, we the ExCom, Donna and I have been talking about CSC for a good six weeks. So this is not news to the group. And I absolutely hear you. I do not believe the ExCom should be the star chamber, making decisions without the input, active input. The simple reality is the stakeholder group has consistently not shown the level of activism. So what you're asking for is theoretical, not practical.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry. The voter turnout in the U.S. for example is 20% or even lower on certain elections. That's not a reason not to have an election. I'm sorry, that's not a good enough reason in my view. And I could be - if people disagree, please.

Paul Diaz: Okay, we shouldn't spend too much time but to Jon Nevett's point, our charter right now to make it a valid vote it's a 50% quorum. That's 42 votes where we currently stand in terms of voting members in good standing. If we have a vote, we've got to meet that level. If you don't, it's a failed vote and you've got to go back to square one. And we never have enough time to go back to

square one. So these are longer term challenges that we do have to address. Like I said, it looks like we have an Evolution 4 working group in our future and let's hash it out there.

Donna, you first.

Donna Austin: Yes, I think my frustration, Jeff, is that we've had this, you know, as Paul said, it's actually not been six weeks that we've had this agenda, it's a number of times that we've had the discussion and here we are, you know, at the last minute you're saying, you know, I don't like where you are. I mean I think you were on most of these calls. So, you know, that's my frustration. You know, it's not the first time we've raised it, and we're trying to get something done here. So, you know, apologies at being frustrated but it is pretty annoying.

Paul Diaz: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: It seems to me like there's a pragmatic solution. I mean Jeff's got some valid sort of fundamental concerns that he's articulated well but that shouldn't stop us sorting out this issue. And it feels to me like we can navigate through it by the ExCom putting forward a sequence slate. Put it to the vote. And here's perhaps what is controversial. If the vote doesn't make the quorum, I mean we probably have to proceed with the top two anyway. So we say ideally we'll put it to the vote but our fallback position is that we agree to proceed with the top two on the slate in any event. So the vote could overrule the ExCom but it can't nullify the choice.

Paul Diaz: Pam?

Pam Little: Yes. Regardless of how we decide on selection, I really would like to know who those candidates are. I think our default position should always be transparency first.

Paul Diaz: Okay we hear you all. Let's move through this. I think Jonathan summed it up. It's Kristina's idea. That makes the most sense to us. We will get the template and the candidates' names out. The ExCom is going through the process. You're all welcome to do it on your own and share any inputs you have. We will come back with recommendations, who the top two we feel should be, and we'll set up a call for a vote, which will be, just so everybody's aware, in that week, week of the 11th. We'll have an opportunity if we need to on the 13th on our next biweekly call to discuss further.

And I think to Jonathan's point, whether we can reach the threshold or not, in this case we have to put two names forward. So unless there's violent opposition to the recommended names, we'll stick to the timeline and get it down. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Could we just (unintelligible) name by those two with the words like the majority of the active participants or something?

Paul Diaz: Let's just see how it goes when we get there. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Real quick question. You're going to not only tell us the top two but who the alternates would be as well, right?

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you.

Paul Diaz: Indeed. Okay folks. A lot of time, important issues, especially the longer term view about voting thresholds. We'll address them. The second point up there I won't go into so much detail but is a similar process coming out of the transition. We need to identify a Registry Stakeholder Group appointed member of the RZERC root zone. Sorry for all the acronyms; it's too early in the morning, but RZERC is very similar. This is an uber geek. This is somebody who's got very substantial tech background.

So like we - when we had the call for CSC colleagues names to be put forward, most likely there's nobody in this room right now who would be the qualified candidate for RZERC, but we certainly have colleagues back in our home organizations. We will set it up, we will use the same selection tool. And if people want to be - have this a more active group evaluation engagement from the start, we can look at that. We have a bit more time identifying the RZERC candidates so we can set it up that way. Or if we find, hey, warts and all the way we're moving forward on CSC with an ExCom evaluation and input and ratification by the membership, if that works, we'll go with that as well. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Paul. Do we have any -- I'm trying to remember now the role of the RZERC -- but do we have any conflicts rules in terms of candidates that may also operate a zone or, sorry I'm not speaking well either, do we have any conflicts rules? Have we established any? So if someone operates a root zone, having them as a candidate may not be a good idea.

Paul Diaz: Understood. Let me come back to it. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. First of all it's Root Zone Evolution Review Committee, okay, is what it stands for. And that's replacing a role that NTIA plays right now if there are major architectural or technical changes to the root zone and the architecture that supports that. That's why Paul's right, we need a pretty technical person for this.

With regard to the conflicts issue, let me be right up front, VeriSign as the root zone maintainer will have a member on that. So absolutely it shouldn't be someone from VeriSign, okay, because we have a seat on that as the root zone maintainer. Okay? So just - I wanted to make clear on that. And it does have to be somebody technical that understands the, very well, the root zone architecture and so forth that supports that.

Because what would - what this group will do is provide advice to the - to ICANN if they - if changes are proposed. Or they could even propose possible changes to the architecture or something like that. In the past, NTIA has kind of been the approver of that. That's what this committee is for.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Chuck. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. And I didn't - Chuck, I wasn't just singling out VeriSign. There are a couple either -- I believe -- a couple other organizations that may have copies of a zone or have done other services or things that would also fit under those conflicts rules. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Yes understood. The rules - the tool that we have, we have a working template right now with the requirements that are there. More specificity about any conflicts, we will research that before we share it with everybody, make sure that we don't have any surprises. My sense right now, and I've not focused on this really specifically, but we have not received an awful lot of guidance, so maybe this is good that we're - we start discussing consulting at least amongst ourselves we can establish our own criteria if there's a strong sense about potential conflicts and whatnot, work that into our evaluation selection process. We do have some time. We'll come back to everyone on this one.

All right, with that why don't we keep moving along? We don't have a lot of time today. The next issue that's up there is about ICANN accountability and specifically the Work Stream 2 issues and their request for volunteers. Keith has put into the chat what the key subgroups are. There's quite a few. Keith, do you want to add anything more?

Keith Drazek: Sure, Paul. Is Becky in the room?

Becky Burr: I am on the mic here.

Keith Drazek: I would defer to you if you have any comments on accountability or Work Stream 2, but just a note that the CCWG Accountability Group met on Sunday just prior to this - the official start of the meeting. It was focused almost entirely on initiating or kicking off the Work Stream 2 effort. So there are multiple subgroups. As Paul noted, I put into the Adobe chat and I'll forward to the list a reminder of the list of the Work Stream 2 issues.

Anybody who wants to participate, anyone who has a particular interest in any of these categories, there is an opportunity for you to volunteer. The group is currently going through the identification process for the (rapators) or the leaders of these various sub teams. And, you know, some of these have potential impacts on us as contracted parties as we look forward.

And I know that there's been some frustration, you know, expressed on previous calls and on the list about some of the costs associated with Work Stream 1 already and concerns about the expenses forecast for Work Stream 2. So anybody that has concerns, you know, this is an opportunity for you to participate in the process. I'll stop there and see if (Becky) has anything else, or any questions.

Becky Burr: Yes so just on the cost issue, we are creating a fairly detailed cost management and budgeting process for Work Stream 2. So I think the chairs of the GNSO will have received an invitation to participate in some discussions about that and I'll be reporting back. But there is a considerable effort focused on sort of reining in the costs, which is largely outside counsel.

I think that for purposes of Work Stream 2 the need for outside counsel is largely going to actually be related to phase two of the IRP, which is actually not Work Stream 2 but Work Stream 1 continued, and that is the operating rules for the independent review process which obviously will need outside counsel and is fairly important to get it right.

One issue that I would just call to folks' attention, in terms of jurisdiction, Work Stream 1 did confirm ICANN as a California not-for-profit corporation. There are - it's in the articles of incorporation. So it would require a fairly elaborate community support to change that. But there is a jurisdictional work stream, and it largely relates to the issue of what kind of choice of law appears in agreements with contracted parties. So for those of you who are outside of the United States and think ICANN should be providing some alternatives to California law in terms of contract interpretation, that's where the discussion will be taking place.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Becky. Thank you, Keith. Again those subgroups have been noted in the chat. Keith had shared an e-mail. We can resend that to put it at the top of everybody's list. There's a whole range of issues. So some may be things that you want to just kind of keep tabs on. Others may be - have pretty strong views, actively participate.

One thing that we would ask just from the ExCom level or the stakeholder group level, if you do volunteer, can you please let Cherie or I know just so we have a sense of who's involved. Sometimes getting the list of members of the various sub teams is unnecessarily difficult getting it from staff. So if you just tell us so we're aware, we'll have some sense of do we have gaps, do we have coverage across the various issues.

All right. Moving - continuing to move through. We've got next on our list the new TLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group. What we're getting at here specifically there's a series of questions that that working group has shared with us seeking input, sort of initial public comments, if you will. We've posted that to the list. We've actually reached out directly to the folks in our group that are actively or volunteer to be part of that list. We started drafting responses to it. We will share that more broadly as soon as we have inputs.

They'd asked for our input no later than the 25th of July. So we have time, but if you have thoughts, concerns, et cetera, please look because it's pretty

substantial number - it's five questions but they all have subparts, so there's a lot of things, perspectives that the working group's looking for. And since they're fairly early in the process, it's an opportunity for us to help inform and potentially guide those discussions, those deliberations. So it's important.

Let's do this. Take advantage of the opportunity we have to weigh in early and, you know, call to anybody, even if you're not actively involved. When you look at those questions, you probably have certain immediate reactions. Share your views.

Okay. No other questions about that. And we have our RAA amendment process. Jon Nevett provided a - did another session here, if folks were aware. There still remain some questions from the community. It remains to be seen if they turn into public comments. We have - Freida has graciously offered to keep tabs on comments that are submitted so that we can be aware, be prepared if necessary to weigh in.

The thought to date, as far as a stakeholder group comment on the process, was more high level, more, you know, thanking the participants for the process that we support and we want them to move forward. Of course we'll be prepared if we need to to respond to any substantive issues that were raised by a member of the community, something that we can see on the list.

The way the process right now is envisioned working is that when that comment period ends in mid-July, I think it's the 13th, a summary report - staff will produce a summary report. I think they've given themselves like four weeks to do that. So none of this is going to happen at Internet speed. But once it does, the negotiating team will get back together with the ICANN staff.

We'll discuss issues raised. Any of them that are considered substantive, there'll be a decision made whether they can be incorporated into the agreement or not. And I guess we'll just have to wait. If it's like a typical comment period, most of the meatier issues will probably be raised right at

the end. So we'll just keep tabs on it and keep everybody updated as we move forward, move towards that date in mid-July. Jon Nevett?

Jon Nevett: Thanks, Paul. Yes one thing to add. One issue that we learned about in the webinar and ICANN talked about again yesterday is that they plan on publishing the amendment to the extent we reach agreement and it gets approved by both sides in an amendment form. So we would have all our agreements on our site and then there'll be an amendment amending certain provisions of those agreements. So the actual agreements that are published on our site won't be necessarily accurate because you'll have to cross-reference to the amendment.

So for example, there's an amendment to 7.5. They'll have the old language to 7.5 and then have an amendment that we'd all have to look at to see that. So we have pushed back on that. I think that it might be something that we want to put in our comments and say for the ease of everyone other than maybe ICANN staff because it's an administrative burden to do what's called an amended and restated agreement, we should encourage them to do that.

Because it's just, if you click on the site where it says where your agreement is and it's not accurate, I think that's a problem. And so I think we should strongly encourage them to work towards -- it doesn't have to be done immediately -- but work towards having amended and restated agreements published on the ICANN site. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Jon, a really important point. Agreed. Kristina Rosette.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. I completely support what Jon just said and I actually think this might be an opportunity to reach out to some of the other stakeholder groups and constituencies to identify for them the difficulty that they are going to have in making reference to those agreements. And I think the broader the support we can get from the community, the more likely we'll be successful.

Paul Diaz: Good thought, Kristina. Reg?

Reg Levy: Thanks. I know that you're specifically talking about for like each TLD the one that's posted, but are they also going to do that for the standard one at the very top where they list, you know, PDF, HTML, redline, et cetera?

Jon Nevett: Those will be in the correct version I'm sure. Yes. I think that (Krista) mentioned that yesterday.

Paul Diaz: Sam?

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Paul. I really agree with you on this one, Jon. And I didn't really accept the rationale when it was like oh it will be a lot of work. I mean we all do a lot of work every day. So I'm wondering if maybe a letter that we draft, as the Registry Stakeholder Group, and put that together and, to follow on Kristina's idea, seek some support, maybe co-signs from other stakeholder group and constituency chairs is one option.

Paul Diaz: Jon what are your thoughts?

Jon Nevett: Yes I think a letter or comments are fine. The only - as soon as Kristina mentioned it, I said yes that's a great idea. But I don't also want to encourage necessarily them to like, "Oh once we're filing comments on the registry agreement" - yes. So maybe we do it after the fact or something like that.

Reg Levy: Yes I mean, I should have been clear. I was thinking more along the lines of something that (Samantha) was suggesting, kind of a letter from the stakeholder group with perhaps signatures from the co-chairs.

Samantha Demetriou: Yes I mean - sorry to interrupt. It's more of like a post-comment implementation kind of thing. I don't think we should tie it to the comments.

Paul Diaz: Okay thanks for that clarification. Martin?

Martin Sutton : Well
I'm just thinking get a statement that everybody can use in their own
comments so that everybody can submit it.

Paul Diaz: Nodding heads, so yes maybe that's the way to go too. Anyone else? Okay.
And as always, Jon Nevett, thank you for all the efforts on this long, long
process. All right, then moving on, next issue from Monday and Tuesday's
session, issues, actions, things that come out. While this policy forum, this
meeting B schedule has tried to minimize scheduling conflicts, necessarily
some things happen at the same time, can't be in two places at once. Just
wanted to spend a little time here, offer opportunity, anybody who's been in
sessions, heard things that they just want to make sure that everybody's
aware of, any real surprises or important developments? Kristina, thanks.

Kristina Rosette: Neither -- Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry -- neither surprise nor a
definitive development. I guess the question is really for Jonathan Robinson.
When I was sitting in the CWG on Auction Proceeds Drafting Team charter
meeting, I think I've characterized that correctly, I kept having flashbacks of
our last Registry Stakeholder Group call and Ken Stubbs' concerns about the
outside fees and costs associated so far with the CCWG accountability.

And to me, the auction proceeds effort I think has the potential to end up
costing a lot in terms of outside counsel fees, costs, et cetera. Is that
something that you all have discussed at all? Has there been any kind of
thought about something that could be put into the charter or something?
Because it would be really unfortunate if those outside costs ended eating up
25% of the available proceeds.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Kristina. It's ringing a bell that we have done something. I can't - I
can come back to the group even on list and let you know if there is
something, but I take your point. I'm - it's actually not something that's

concerning me particularly, not that I'm not concerned about the cost, but I - it doesn't feel to me like it's going to be an issue but I take your point. It is, you know, there's a big chunk of money there and it could very easily be that the structures could be argued to be set up in such a way that could incur quite significant costs. So I can see the concern, and it's useful to flag it.

It could be something that could be captured in the charter and try to contain it. I was more concerned in some ways about this - the conflict of interest provisions and I was tempted to raise my hand and introduce that because that's really the, in a sense, the elephant in the room as far as that group's concerned. But you - and that's not to say your point isn't valid and possibly of equal concern, but that certainly bothers me as well, just to flag it with the group.

I mean in essence, in the sort of - from my experience, most if not all working groups have - allow free participation providing you disclose your interests. There's quite a strong lobby with respect to the - or set of views with respect to the auction funds work that the conflict of interest provision should be substantial. And it's not substantial at the point of allocation of funds, it's substantial at the point of earlier up in the process. Because essentially the process, you've got the drafting team, the working group, and the ultimate mechanism for allocation of funds.

And the push, with some good reason, is to move that conflict of interest provision much further up the chain. The concern of course is by putting that in place you exclude potentially many participants. And Jon Nevett made a very good point in the meeting yesterday about focusing in on the difference between direct and indirect conflicts. But nevertheless that's - there's quite a sort of nexus of discussion in and around that.

So if anyone's interested in that or indeed has experience of that, it could be useful to have input at some point on that. But thanks, Kristina. It's a good

point and I'll - I've got something specific I'll forward it to you and/or the group, and it's useful to flag it anyway.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Jonathan and Kristina. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Just a stupid question. At this stage it looks like hiring permanently a few good lawyers could cost - be less, even with pensions provided like by the (unintelligible). Because having another 50 million bucks paid to some offsite company, were there (unintelligible) or something?

Paul Diaz: I'm not sure I have the answer, Maxim. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul. And I agree with the concern about the expenses, but in this particular case I mean I sort of expect that ICANN Legal will provide, you know, guidance and advice or input to this particular process. You know, the outside counsel for the accountability process was needed - or deemed necessary because of the potential conflict or challenge, you know, and the community feeling like it needed its own independent council. I think for the auction proceeds process, I think that concern will probably be a little bit less, at least I would hope so, especially with the new accountability mechanisms. So thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Keith. Becky?

Becky Burr: So I also totally understand the concerns about the outside council. Just bear in mind that for the purposes of the accountability review, there were some very, very particular specialized requirements that couldn't be met by sort of ordinary staff and it would probably have been inefficient. And also the accountability CCWG felt pretty strongly that we needed a counsel that was actually independent from ICANN, so. The same is not going to be the case when it comes to the auction proceeds. There's just different issues at stake there.

Paul Diaz: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: I suppose two. One for the general point more or less in response to Becky and others on that point. I mean I think the issue is less, to my mind, about the specialism and the independent and more about management. And I think there's some - my opinion is there's been some lessons learned about more effective management, and in fact there are already some processes put in place, as (Becky) and others will note. So I think that, you know, it's clearly the quantum of the cost of a per-hour basis and how that's managed, as well as the expertise and independence.

I don't know at this stage whether - what will be required, but just to Kristina's point, there are a few mentions already in the charter about costs and cost control. But they, on quick review with your point in mind and our experience in mind, we could look at strengthening some of those.

Paul Diaz: Thank you all. Other issues you want to raise from -- or Maxim, further?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes just a small clarification. As I understand, those companies they charge almost three prices. So this amount of money spent it could be some negotiations or something. Because in the United States they have thousands of more companies. Why this particular company?

Paul Diaz: I'm not sure how the selection process for the outside counsel was made. Again, certain expertise is needed so certain firms (unintelligible). Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: I mean I was around at the selection process to some extent, and there was a pretty thorough check of expertise and it was done in conjunction with ICANN. I suppose one of the other issues took place -- and I don't really want to open up a can of worms or a debate on that -- but there were two firms selected. It may be that it was, with hindsight that wasn't necessary. I can't really comment on that. But that certainly would have contributed to costs.

Paul Diaz: Becky and then I have Jian and Jeff.

Becky Burr: So there was a need for a very, very particular kind of legal expertise, which was California non-for-profit law. We couldn't have done that work, and there was one law firm that was brought in to do that. Then there was more general work that that firm which really does essentially nothing but non-profit law wasn't equipped to do.

I do think that the interplay between the two firms was not as well managed as it could have been, but there was a vetting process. There was a pretty elaborate vetting process. Several law firms were looked at. They were interviewed. ICANN vetted them. Then the CCWG team looked at it as well. So it wasn't just - I mean I think Jonathan's absolutely right. There are clear lessons learned and there are clear controls being put into place.

But it's easy for us to say, you know, it's a really big number. I think, you know, you have to look at sort of what the specialized expertise that was needed. We really could not have done the work without that. But could it have been managed better? Absolutely.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Becky. Jian?

Jian Zhang: Jian Zhang from Knet. I actually have a question for Jeff Neuman. Last - yesterday afternoon I was in the GAC. You were talking about the new gTLD subsequent procedure. It seemed to me that there was a strong preference to the brand, new gTLD and the geographic and new gTLD, but it seemed they didn't like the sensitive string. Is that correct? Or is that some individual members' ideas or GAC as a whole?

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman. I think there was some opinions expressed but I don't think that any of the opinions were any kind of consensus. I think it was just thoughts that were expressed. I was going to say on that session, you know, Jordyn Buchanan raised a comment that he's raised here several times about

trying to move ahead more quickly on subsequent - well I guess Jordyn Buchanan would say an ongoing process, the continual process.

I do think that if we are serious about that, we will need to as a group come up with our own plan, not just make those kinds of statements, but come up with a plan, pick out the things that we think do not need a policy process to move forward, and then actually propose the way forward on some of the implementation fixes.

One example could be, if we think -- and I know there were some differing views at the GDD Summit -- but if we think accreditation of backend providers is a good idea, then we can actually, being the most knowledgeable in that subject, could draft that criteria and all of that kind of stuff. So it's just an example, but I think if we're serious about it, we need to actually take the steps ourselves and draft what needs to be drafted and not rely on ICANN staff to do that kind of thing.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Jeff. Jordyn Buchanan?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes thanks for raising that, Jeff. I was trying to figure out the right place in the agenda to talk about this. You know, I - just looking at the presentations yesterday, which in an hour and a half we didn't even have time to get through all of the work streams that the PDP is working on, it's just - I mean I think 2020 is a really optimistic date for a next round, just looking at the amount of - I mean just, even if we get the PDP done at the end of 2017 seems impossible to me.

And, you know, the years of implementation that are going to need to come on top of the level of policy changes that are envisioned by the current work streams just strikes me as, you know, this is like a decade-long process or something like that. And, you know, I started off thinking that there, you know, there's some things that happened as part of the last round that probably made sense to clean up. But at this point I'm just like it was good enough.

Like there's - we weren't happy with some things, other folks from the community weren't happy with some things, but none of it's so broken that it needs the amount of time and effort that it's going to take to really tack to relatively small changes and outcomes if we think about it.

I think there's some things that can be done totally independently of the policy process about like how do we get - especially if we were in a continuous mode on a first come, first serve basis, how do we get communities to apply. That's really about encouraging communities to come in at that point as opposed to giving them a specialty contention mechanism. How do we get underserved regions to come in. You know, it's really about encouraging them and giving them incentives and dealing with price issues and so on. It doesn't need to be part of a policy process.

And so I think just getting back into like just saying like, "Hey we've got a policy. We even have an implementation of it, let's go" strikes me as a much more likely path forward and much more likely to actually serve - like people were talking yesterday about how the community process didn't work. I agree, the community process didn't work. The waiting eight years before there's new TLDs isn't going to help any communities. It just means that they don't get TLDs forever instead of sometime soon.

And so I totally agree with you, Jeff. We should take proactive, constructive steps. But I just think the process has gotten totally away from us, and I know that you've been working really hard to try to make it go as quickly as possible. But I just don't think with the amount of content that you guys are dealing with that there's any way to make it go at a reasonable pace just based on how ICANN works.

Paul Diaz: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes it certainly is a lot to tackle, but again to the extent that we can actually put pen to paper and draft things and then present them to - some of the

things that have to go through the PDP, to present it to them and say, "Here's the strawman, let's go. Let's spend a week, attack it, two weeks attack it, fix it up, put it out for comment or whatever we have to do." I think we can speed it up tremendously.

But to the extent that we just complain about it and, you know, and I'm not saying you're doing that, I'm just saying a lot of people at the GDD Summit are upset about the timeline but then that's three months ago and nobody's taking any steps to actually do something about it, or maybe it was only a month ago. It seems like three months ago.

So I think if we take the proactive steps, draft the strawman, come up with things that we think don't need to go through the policy process, present fixes, even go and do things like change the actual wording in the guidebook as to what we would recommend, putting that in front of people tends to speed things along and actually gives the group something to look at tangible as opposed to throwing out these questions, which today is going to be another session of throwing out these overarching questions at 10:45 and then the next session after that we'll be diving into the work streams. But it's going to be a lot more of the same until we take some responsibility ourselves and do it.

Paul Diaz: Jordyn Buchanan?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes so thanks, Jeff. I know I - that was a small part of what I said, and I totally agree we need to do that. I totally agree with you. I actually think it would be helpful to the extent people have time to try to get people that are interested in this path forward to just spend some time thinking about what that would like while we're here all together. And so I'm happy to try to drive that.

So I'll send a note out to the list or something like that and we can see if we can choose a time when people have a little bit of space available on

calendars to maybe spend an hour or two just sort of working through what that framework might look like.

Paul Diaz: Go ahead, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's actually great. Sorry, Jeff Neuman. But I also think what worries me too are the CCT Review Team worries me too in the sense that when Jonathan Zuck's up there and he says, "We need to find out not just, you know, the problems that people did apply, we need to find out why people didn't apply at all. And so we need to get out there." That kind of stuff seems to me to be so like how do you find people and we'll spend lots of money and time trying to do this.

We need to rein that in as well and make sure that - anyone who talks to Jonathan Zuck about the timeline of the CCT Review Team he says he doesn't believe personally that there's any chance of meeting that. And I've heard some of the discussions and I was on - I think you were in one group and then (Larine) -- is that her name? -- was in another group and she's going on about things that she wants to look at, which I think are very valuable, but I think a lot of those could take a substantial amount longer than the timeline that's in there. So how can we help you on that?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes thanks, Jeff. I actually think Jonathan - like I know he's - he's pessimistic about the current, the official schedule of getting done by the end of this year, but I think the published schedule which has us sort of wrapping up by next April, I think he's pretty committed to. And I think essentially what the CCT is going to do is just triage work out that can't be - like we're just going to say, "We can't get to these things that we can't do within that timeline."

I think we could still make the case - I think this will be a harder case for us to make, but I think we could still make the case we don't even need the CCT to complete before we move on to new allocations. But in reality, if we're going

to touch the guidebook at all, it's going to take about that amount of time anyway. And it could certainly be done in parallel.

I think the only thing we're really waiting for from the CCT that's fundamental to whether we proceed or not is the cost benefit analysis as to whether the benefits of the program exceeded the cost. And I think probably the community is waiting to at least see the answer to that question before anyone's going to be willing to say like, "Yes let's do more of them."

Paul Diaz: Jeff, can you remind me the questions that you, as one of the vice chairs, put forward for the group? Does it - do the questions give us a clear opportunity to weigh in with any input that Jordyn Buchanan and other interested parties may want to know? Or they - I think they were a little different. So how do you guys recommend whatever we come up with to try and move things forward more expeditiously? How best procedurally do we get that done?

Jeff Neuman: So I think there's one set of questions that asks about how TLDs should move in the future, whether it should be rounds or something else. That provides a little bit of an avenue to make the sort of statement we want. But I do think it might be a supplemental - I think at the end there's this overarching question is there anything we missed or anything you want to add, and I think that's really the area where we hit home on some of these other points and saying that we as a Registry Stakeholder Group will volunteer to lead implementation efforts and to ensure that we do not go through the same thing of, you know, taking years to finalize the policy and then, only then starting to draft a new guidebook or whatever we end up calling up.

That we believe there should be an ongoing process and as issues are resolved, they should - implementation on those issues should start right away, or at least the drafting of the implementation measures should start right away. So I think that's more kind of at the end in that last miscellaneous question.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you. Anymore on this issue? Statton?

Statton Hammock: Statton Hammock with Rightside. No I was just going to mention one other item under issues and actions, and we can table it for some other time if you want to if we want to talk to ICANN staff. But at the IPC-Registry Stakeholder Group meet up, we decided - the action item was to come up with a small task force of representatives from each group to sit and talk about interpretation or understanding around some of our obligations, particularly Section 3.a. And there was an arbitrary cap of seven representatives from each put forward. So I don't know if we want to do that now but - or on the list at some point, but I just tag it and flag it for discussion.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Statton. And you beat me to it. I was going to insert that. I will push to the list a call for volunteers. For anybody who couldn't be in yesterday's session, honestly, sorry, you missed a good one. It was a good debate and - but just an opening round. And one of the things that came out and actually helped refine the thinking rather than just keep going on and on about that particular issue -- it's an important one but I think there are more -- both groups agreed to have a call for volunteers.

We chose the number seven arbitrarily. But it's just to craft or create the list, what are the various issues that we want to discuss. Spec 11, 3.a, sure that's the first, but there's plenty more that's in there. That's what this group will do. So put a call out. A couple have already raised their hands, but we'll post it on the list for anybody who missed or hasn't thought or isn't with us today. And we'll look to convene a conference call on the second half of July to keep the ball rolling.

And as we identify issues and get agreement around it, there will be a call subsequently for folks who want to participate in whatever that particular issue area is. And, you know, we'll kind of always feedback into the full group updates on what's going on, what's being said. An opportunity to engage more directly with IPC is probably a very good thing for our stakeholder

group, given the relative important or weight that they have within the ICANN community, and very importantly the nature of the issues that they're raising with us. Pam?

Pam Little: Pam Little from Zodiac. Just a thought. I understand, or I know, the IPC also met with Registrar Stakeholder Group and I was just wondering whether that discussion should happen between registry, registrar and IPC rather than they also have a subgroup talking about maybe some common issue, for example anti-abuse measures and all that. I think that might be more effective or efficient way to do it. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Agreed. Some of the issues definitely overlap. So let's identify the issues. I wouldn't be surprised if they had their own seven-member working groups. And then we'll compare the lists. Those that clearly benefit from a combined contracted parties, we will do that combined. There's no point in duplicating effort. Reg?

Reg Levy: Thanks. I was in the Registrar IPC meeting as well and it was surprising to me that the issues that they brought up were not the ones that they brought up with us in terms of things relating to content, things relating to - it was just - there seems to be a complete disconnect about what they think we're in charge of and what they think the registrars are in charge of. So I think it would be really helpful for the registries and registrars to, if there is such a task force, have sort of a united front on this. Because I think we are united and it definitely feels like the IPC is not certain what's going on.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Reg. Okay so we will be coming back. Look for that call and since we have seven heads, that's what we agreed to, if we get more than that we'll figure out some way -- maybe somebody, you know, agrees to step aside -- however many we have. Yes. If we get less, we get less. I mean let's wait and see what we get. And we do - we will coordinate certainly with the registrars, and administratively they are in the process.

Something I want to add, just a quick reminder, as far as elections go, the registrars are currently - have their annual elections underway. Michele's stepping down. He's term limited. Graeme Bunton is the presumptive next chair. He's running unopposed. There will be a change in leadership there. We have excellent relations with all those folks, so the registries and registrars will continue to work very well together.

For ourselves, just a sort of tickler for people, this is an election year for us as well. So this fall the Chair, Vice Chair of Policy and both Donna and Keith as Councilors we're all up for election. We're all eligible to run again. What we'll be doing is shortly after the Labor Day holiday we'll issue the call for volunteers and secondings and all of that. We usually have our elections in early October and then the election results are announced at the end of the annual general meeting. If there's any change or those newly elected folks take their office then in India.

So it's coming. I'm not going to go into any detail right now. Just be aware. Anybody who may be interested in running, I'm happy to talk about any of the positions, the qualifications, requirements, things like that. There will be more to come, but just kind of a tickler for folks. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Paul, before you run those elections, I suggest we run a referendum as to whether or not we break away from ICANN.

Paul Diaz: Who's got a good acronym? Brexit or ICANN exit?

Cyrus Namazi: I think we should have ICANN run away from you.

Paul Diaz: Don't they already? Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I think just as a tickler as well we should probably start talking about to avoid the whole GNSO Council chair thing that happened the last time, we should probably prepare ourselves in advance to figure out what our going in

position is and what we're going to do or if there's any discussions. I don't know, Donna, at the council level I know it's early it would still be good to avoid what happened the last time.

Paul Diaz: Yes it may be a little early for that but a good point, Jeff. Let's avoid it if we can. It kind of dovetails what we have on the agenda, jumping - we've already talked about the budget. Please those of you who haven't voted, you know who you are, cast your fucking vote. Cherie?

Cherie Stubbs: We're up to 30.

Paul Diaz: Woo-hoo. Thank you to four of you this morning. The other issue for our councilors who are here, I know council's already had their sessions, but anything to share with the group? Anything that's come up this week or in your near term you want to raise before our next call on the 13th? I don't know if there's any issues? Donna?

Donna Austin: Yes thanks, Paul. Donna Austin. Mason's still here. We had an interesting discussion with the board about the resolution of the outstanding stuff with the temporary reservations for Red Cross associated names, whatever, and also IGO acronyms. And there's a little bit of a misunderstanding of process I think. I get the sense that the board is trying to not put themselves in a position of rejecting GAC advice or rejecting PDP recommendations. So they're trying to do a workaround, and that workaround is going around and around.

Mason and I have actually well kind of butted in to some extent. Chris Disspain has had a kind of working group with IGOs for some period of time. I think it's been going on for about two years, and they're going to make tomorrow -- and Mason and I are going to join that conversation. We've had no visibility into that for two years, so.

I understand that Chris is trying to come up with something that might work or be reasonable for the IGOs but we don't have a sense of what that is. So Mason and I will be part of that conversation. But it still doesn't really address the potential problem that we think they either have to - the board has to reject the GAC advice or reject the PDP recommendations. I don't know where the workaround comes in. So I think that's still something that has to be sorted through. Chuck, you might have - I know you had some discussion about that with Whois yesterday. You might have some insight into that. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Please, Chuck. And then Jeff.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I was disturbed listening to that session with the board, as you know. It's really pretty simple. The - except that the board's not taken advantage of the simplicity. And I think everybody on the GNSO Council recognizes this. The board's not a policy development body, neither is the GNSO Council. So the board has either to accept or reject or to send it back to the council. And the council can send it back to the working group. Now this is a really old working group. It's one that I was on in fact. But that's really the options if there are significant changes being made to the recommendations.

And I think, and it's not my place to tell the board this, but the council may want to communicate this, it seems to me as long - that the GAC's expectations are that the board can overrule policy and accommodate their - what they want. And if they would set the record straight on that that they don't develop policy, it'd be a lot easier for them. So anyway, I know you understand that so I'm talking to the choir. But until the GAC's expectations are changed, they're going to keep having this problem and will have it with the proxy privacy issues, which is coming up now as well.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Chuck. Jeff and we've got like two minutes folks.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry. So Jeff Neuman. We need to just tell the board to vote. I know that Chris Disspain basically his view is well you don't want us to reject the GNSO, and actually I do. Because then there are certain things that get triggered. I do think that in fact the bylaws do prescribe a timeframe in which they're supposed to vote, and they've totally ignored those. They have to vote both on the GAC advice and ours, and we should make a clear statement to the board that we are not afraid of how you come out of it.

We have our own accountability measures to deal with that if you vote the GNSO down. But there is some view that the board keeps saying, and I've heard it from several, "Well you don't want us to vote it down." Actually I do. I want you to vote, and they don't want to vote. They don't want to create the controversy.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks, Jeff. I agree. I think what they're trying to do is make a non-decision and put it on somebody else. But that's just not an option. I would actually think in this case that if the GAC advice is inconsistent with the GNSO recommendations, the board is actually in a pretty solid position to reject that GAC advice and go with the PDP recommendations. But, you know, they don't want to trigger that process because it would take too long to get through it. But we're two years down the road now.

Paul Diaz: Okay all.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, Jeff Neuman. Just to quote, the bylaws say, "The board will meet to discuss the recommendation as soon as feasible, preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the board report." And then it talks about the vote. So we're at how many years after now?

Paul Diaz: Understood. Kristina, a quick thought?

Kristina Rosette: Just following up on this, I realize we're way beyond the possibility of a GNSO Council motion on this, but it would seem to me that it might worth

teeing up for the next council meeting, you know, perhaps a motion by the council calling on the board to act expeditiously and referring both them and GAC to the relevant provision of the bylaw. I mean, you know, the other solution is you just make a copy of the PDP section of the bylaws and put it on the chair of every GAC member, but I don't think that's going to get you very far.

Donna Austin: I think from a council perspective, we have some follow up as a result of the discussion we had with the board and we're - I think we're going to draft a letter to send it back and say, "These are your options." And this is our process. We can't do a workaround, so. I think that's the intent.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you all. There's another meeting that will be setting up so we have to end this session today. We had a very full agenda. You'll note GDD staff's with us. We didn't have a direct exchange because of our full agenda. We're on a regular schedule so our next biweekly call will be on the 13th, so two weeks from now. Issues that folks wanted to raise with staff, I'd ask please get them into us. We'd like provide staff a head's up of what those items may be a week in advance. So a week from today, anything you want to raise on the next call on the 13th.

With that, thank you for coming out early and good session. We'll see you all around.

Cherie Stubbs: For those who did come into the room late, there is - there's a fair amount of food left so if you want to grab a snack on the way out feel free. And we can stop the recording now, please. Thank you everyone.

END