Vertical Integration PDP Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 22 July 2010 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Vertical Integration PDP Working Group meeting on Thursday 22 July at 1900 UTC. 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:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-vi-pdp-20100722.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Contracted Parties House
Registrars Stakeholder Group
Volker Greimann
Jean-Christophe Vignes
Michele Neylon
Jeffrey Eckhaus

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group
Brian Cute
Jeff Neuman
Ken Stubbs
Keith Drazek
Kathy Kleiman

Non Contracted Parties House
- Commercial Stakeholders Group
Berry Cob -CBUC
Mikey O'Connor – CBUC- Co-Chair
Jon Nevett   -CBUC
Ronald N. Andruff – CBUC
Kristina Rosette – IPC
Scott Austin - IPC

- Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria

Individuals
Roberto Gaetano – Individual - Co-Chair

Phil Buckingham
Richard Tindal
Steve Pinkos
Anthony van Couvering
ALAC/At Large
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Sebastien Bachellot
Alan Greenberg
Sivasubramananian Muthusamy
Staff:
Glen de Saint Gery
Mike Zupke
Margie Milam
Amy Stathos
Apologies:
Eric Brunner Williams - Core
Statton Hammock - RrSG
Paul Diaz - **RrSG**
Baudoin Schombe
Liz Gasster
Marika Konings
Ruslan Sattarov

Coordinator: I do need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. And you may begin.

Mikey O'Connor: That's (Lori). Thanks Glen. We'll - why don't we just go ahead Glen and call the roll. The agenda's so short it's not going to - it's not going to do the usual job of delaying things.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay Mikey. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Vertical Integration call on the 22nd of July. On the call we have Steve Pinkos, Kristina Rosette, Richard Tindel, Brian Cute, Ken Stubbs, Berry Cobb, Scott Austin, Sebastien Bachollet, Volker Greimann, (John Jacevenia), Jon Nevett, Kathy Kleiman, Ron Andruff - sorry, I must get my screen back up again. Something happened to that.

Kathy Kleiman, Ron Andruff, Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, Jeff Neuman, Jeff Eckhaus, Keith Drazek, Roberto Gaetano, Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor,

Ruslan Sattarov. We cannot (follow) the team unfortunately. Baudouin Schombe also gives his apologies. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And we have Siva Muthusamy. And for staff we have Mike Zupke, Margie Milam and myself Glen de Saint Géry. Let me see if anybody's joined after that. No, I think it was Kathy that came back on again. Thank you Mikey. Over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Glen. Thanks all. We have a pretty straightforward agenda today. Try and nail down these last loose ends. And hopefully trust me with the pen to get those changes driven into the draft and then we'll release tomorrow I hope. Anyway that's the goal for the call.

In the note in the middle of Adobe I've written down the list of stuff that's come up today. And I thought we would just sort of run through these and see if we can come to an agreement on each and move forward. So the list is the compliance annex issues, the SRSU annex issues, the question about signatories on proposals, references to earlier proposals. Anything else that needs to go on the list that I've somehow blanked out or missed?

Let's go with those and then if something else comes up, we can do that. First up is the compliance annex question and I think it's safe to say that (Anthony) kicked off that thread. Let me sort of summarize what I think is going on although I'm a little behind on the email I think. Maybe some other stuff has come up at the very end.

But basically the core of question is that in the compliance annex there is a detailed list of suggested facets to a compliance program. And that list is included essentially as sort of a recommendation. And I think there are sort of two or three paths.

One path would be to soften the language that says this is not a recommendation but a list that was originally framed by a subgroup and is a topic of ongoing discussion. Another would be to delete the list from the annex altogether. Those are just the two major threads that are going on.

I suppose another option is to leave it unchanged but that seems rugged. And with that, I think I'll open the queue. Let's try and do ten minutes on each of these and see how we do. If we need more time, we have two hours for the call. But I'd like to push pretty hard on these and see if we can get done. We've talked about them a lot on the list.

So as your comment thing, please try to build on the stuff that's on the list rather than restate the whole case again so that - because, you know, we've all been reading I think, so. With that, Jeffrey go ahead.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. After that whole preamble, now I feel like a silly question which is can you just be - sorry, because I'm a little lost here because on some of the - between the compliance and the other evals, it's just been very hard to follow.

At least the one that - in the annex you're discussing, sorry, that list where it says - I'm sorry, where it states hey, these are the ones we - among - where it says among elements that affect the compliance and (force) the program are the following. Is that those lists that you're talking about?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah so my thought was - is I sort of put it as my saying it's all right to keep the list in there say we think that these could be components of an effective compliance program. This isn't a list of recommendations. I think - and this is sort of what we've seen in some of the other things.

I think a disclaimer on a lot of these always seems to work saying, you know, this isn't a formal recommendation. These are elements we've put together. I don't want to say you can pick and choose from these but these are things we've thought could be successful but these are not a mandate or a recommendation or, you know, the totality of what we think a good compliance program could be. So that was my opinion on that.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jeff. Ken, go ahead. You're muted or at least your phone thinks it's muted. It's still muted. Oh dang, it's that phone again. Well Ken, we'll come back to you. Ron, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thank you and I'll accede to Ken when he joins if necessary.

Mikey O'Connor: Sure. Yeah.

Ron Andruff: I just wanted to comment. I mean there's a lot of comments going back and forth on the list and we all feel pretty strongly one way or the other on this I think. But the key element here, and everyone on the call and within the working group, I would agree that we all feel compliance is important.

Whether compliance will be the savior of us all vis-a-vis we get those kinds of things that we're looking for in place that it could then - we know then that a free trade proposal would work or a JN2 or a RACK proposal. Every one of us agrees that compliance is the most critical factor.

All that's happened here is we've put forward - we - Brian has put forward a list that is quite inclusive of all of the types of elements we'd like to see. So let's put qualifying language around that saying, you know, we're very serious about the work we've done here at the working group with regard to the compliance element and just qualify it.

It doesn't - by taking stuff out and putting lame language in there, that would be very disappointing because it is the place that we've finally found some agreement with in this group. And I think it's very important. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Ron. Ken, you want to give it another try? Still silence. Well, going once, going twice, rats. Okay. We'll come back to you. (Anthony), go ahead.

(Anthony): Hi. I just wanted to let everyone know that I feel very strongly about this compliance section. I agree compliance is important but we really haven't discussed what those measures are. We haven't looked at what the potential harms are that we're trying to prevent. We haven't discussed costs. We haven't discussed anything about what is appropriate for ICANN to do or what is appropriate for the companies to do internally.

And I think it's illegitimate to put forward a list as a principle, which is one of the words used or an agreement, which is another one of the words used. And if this goes forward as is, I will file a minority report saying that I considered it legitimate particularly because I and others have made multiple attempts to discuss this and, you know, there hasn't been any discussion of it let alone, you know, I don't care if my particular opinion holds clay. But do care that there's discussion around this and there hasn't been.

And so I feel very strongly about this. Personally I think this is a - it looks as if we are recommending that ICANN put in all of these things or consider them. And I don't think we've agreed on that. And I certainly didn't agree on it and we didn't have any discussion of it. So I consider it illegitimate and I - if that list is not either qualified in a way or amended in some way, I will say that. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Anthony). I bet you weren't on the call when I kind of introduced this. I sort of teed this up by saying that it seems to me that we've either got the route of qualifying the language to sort of touch those spaces that you just mentioned plus others or simply deleting the list.

And before the call started Avri came up with a really great idea, which is that in general our goal should be to weasel the language rather than deleting stuff. And I've been appointed the chief weasel. And so in general I think that to the extent that we can figure out ways that are acceptable to surround these controversial topics with qualifiers but not lost the content that's useful.

But if we can't qualify it enough, then I'm open to the possibility of taking things out. But as I say, I prefer a lot to put a pretty strong qualifier around it that touches on the issues that you just raised.

Ken, you want to try again? Oh a tiny - I got one syllable. I got two syllables. Kind of cutting in and out.

Ken Stubbs: Mike, can you hear me?

Mikey O'Connor: Ah, there. Now it's coming in.

Ken Stubbs: Okay. I apologize; having problems with the line. That's why I switched to another line. First of all, I think this specific document was taken out of the main body of the report where the other exceptions is, was put into the annex with a note that these were documents for discussion.

Throughout the entire report there are discussions about things that could be done, things that should be done. In the body of the recommendations there's specific proposals as to how the things are managed. This is a discussion document reflecting a topic that has had considerable discussion over the last two months.

I don't know where (Anthony) was when this stuff was talked about both in person as well on the list. My suggestion would be that to remind you that already there's a caveat there and if you want to repeat the caveat that was put in the body as the report referring to the annex, that makes plenty of sense.

But to dilute the heck out of it at this point in time frankly I'm tired of people threatening that they're going to write reports or write letters or anything like that. We all have very strong opinions about various issues in this working group. That's just something that we're going to have to live with.

I am comfortable with Avri's proposal that there be references and I have no problem in talking about the current status of this proposal. That's fine. But to pull the proposal out would not give at all a fair reflection in the amount of work that went into it. This proposal has been out there.

Now before the final drafts there were no indications at all of concern until the 11th hour. And I just don't like the idea of using intimidation to get people to pull stuff out at the last moment. It sounds more like some these final write ups in a Congressional Committee. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Ken.

(Anthony): Mikey, I need to respond to that please.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. That's fine. Go ahead.

Man: I'll defer. Go ahead. I think I was next but go ahead (Anthony).

(Anthony): Thank you very much. Ken, I hear what you're saying. I'd like to say that I am talking about a minority report with great reluctance. I'd also like to state that this wasn't the 11th hour. I brought this up many times. I had other people second it. I was not able to discuss it on the merits. I was happy to amend that list. I don't think the list should go out completely. I mean I would like it to but I'd be happy to discuss some things about it.

But in fact I was never given a chance nor was anyone else to discuss this list on its merits. I was simply told my timing wasn't good even though I first made this point over a week ago. So, you know, I really am not happy with your characterization of how this has proceeded and I reject it. And it's not a threat. I will file that report.

So because - not because I'm unhappy with the substance of what's in there. I don't like it but that's not it. I'm unhappy with the fact that I feel that my voice

and others were ignored and that is not how a group should be conducted. Thank you.

Ken Stubbs: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Anthony). Ken, one last go and then I'm going to try and get back to the queue here.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah. I'm sorry that yeah you feel that way. It wasn't ignored by the drafters. I think that's a reflection on the way that the working group is managed and I disagree with you entirely. There have been opportunities if you had objections to this. And I think that you're - if you're going to write a minority report, I - or comments on that, that's fine (Anthony).

But from a practical standpoint, I can't see removing it because you just don't happen to like the way that the process went for you in this specific. There have been a lot of changes that have been done the last 72 hours that I could be somewhat frustrated with but it's not going to do me any good at this point in time.

And the idea that you've been rushed into a situation where you couldn't participate effectively, you're too good (Anthony). I can't buy that argument.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'm going to sort of draw the what happened to who when discussion to a close if we can. I can see some merit in (Anthony)'s point of view and would like to get us back to solving it rather than (breeding) that.

It seems to me that a fairly healthy dose of qualifying language in front of the list that describes the status of it. I've got some notes that are building in the note that's right in the middle of the screen on Adobe that I'd like to sort of flesh out.

And then I would like your permission to draft based on that note; essentially a qualifying clause that sits on top of that list so that we can kind of split the middle. Let people know that there's a very early draft of a list. That it has a lot of - it has a long way to go before it's vetted by the whole working group, et cetera, et cetera. So with that, I'd really like to zero in on qualifying language rather than debate the process.

I've also left that note scrollable by you. If you would rather have me scroll it so that my stuff that I'm working on is right in your screen, let me know. But for now keep an eye on it. Jeffrey, back to you.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. Thanks. And I think Mikey stole like some of my thunder there. I think that, you know, some of the people I think, you know, and it's like we're looking past each other. I don't think anybody's explicitly stated we wanted something pulled. I think we just wanted the qualifying language.

And I think as far as drafting it, I think maybe I would suggest, and this is sort of how it worked when, you know, some other people didn't - weren't happy or, you know, in agreement is that maybe (Anthony) you and Mikey can work on that drafting language and it could be sent to the group. I think that would be a good start because I think that's, you know, having that qualifier I think is what everyone wants.

I don't think anybody is adamant. Maybe I'm making the assumption that we need to pull this from the annex. I don't think I had heard that stated on the list or on this call. But I think if you guys could work on that language and distribute it, I think we could probably get this out - get that issue out of the way in short order.

Ken Stubbs: I'd have no problems if Brian was included in that as well. I think if you're going to have advocates, you should have both sides working with Mike.

Jeff Eckhaus: Sorry. I was saying one person - the person could draft it and Brian would be involved as would be everyone else in this group. But I was saying as to draft it initially, it could be (Anthony) or Mikey because (Anthony) was the one that came up with the objection.

So I think - I don't want to have a sub team or another group for a qualifying language. Just have someone draft it and send it out to the group would probably be the most efficient method at this time.

Ken Stubbs: Then I'm fine with Mikey drafting it. I just think it needs a perspective that's more balanced from one side or the other. And I think that's (the both).

Mikey O'Connor: So I - this is Mikey. I'm sitting in my note and I've got a few kind of bullet items that I've started building out here that says that - something along the lines that this is subject to future discussion. Topic of that discussion include the harms that are trying to be addressed, the cost of such a program, the appropriate role for ICANN. Pulled in the caveat that I used to introduce the annexes in general.

And if I hacked on something - a premise sort of along those lines, how does that sit with people? Is that close enough? Are there major points that are missing there? Okay. Let me take that one. Unless somebody wanted to sort of go off on the side and draft something and post it into the chat. We might be able to get something yet during the meeting.

But otherwise let me take something along those lines and see how I do. I'll get it out to the list. It would be neat to burst through 4000 emails in my particular inbox on this, so that'd be cool.

Ron, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Mikey. I think that, you know, looking at the chat and hearing the comments, I think we're all on the same page here. I was just going to make

a suggestion that indeed why don't you take a crack at it and then run it by Brian and (Anthony) first. Brian because he was the pen. (Anthony) because he's the objector and then bring it to the list. Then we would all know that the actual guys who are involved in this are in agreement and I think that would move it along. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: That sounds good to me. Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah. I have no problem with qualifying it Mikey. I just want you to understand that. Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks. Yeah. It's nice to hear that. Thanks. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Brian Cute: Sorry. I'm out on the Adobe. I just wanted to say I'm okay with qualifying it as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good. Okay. That was Brian. Somebody's making an awful lot of noise on the line. (Lori) can you kind of figure out where that noise is coming from? It would be helpful. Ooh, it went away. Good. Okay. Good job people. I think we are on the right track here.

The next one that got a lot of traffic today on the list was the SRSU annex. And let me do the same sort of thing and kind of replay the bidding although I'm not maybe at the most current state because I did tip off the list for a while.

First off, an apology from me. I screwed up by pasting the wrong version into the draft, which Kristina caught, which is a good thing. And so she has submitted a second or a new version today. It's quite a bit of thread from where we are now that is quite a bit shorter in a couple of dimensions.

One dimension is the stuff that she wrote but then she also shortened up some of the BRU1 stuff that Richard suggested. And from there ensued a rollicking discussing that I think - I think we're getting to the end but I'd like to hear sort of a discussion on where we want to go with this because I couldn't quite keep up. The thread split a few times and it got pretty confusing.

So hopefully all of you, Ken, Jeff, Ron are in the queue to talk about SRSU. Kristina, do you want to - before I go to the queue, do you want to sort of replay the bidding since you're closer to this thread than I am. (Unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: Well, I don't necessarily want to do that because I'm sure I'm going to inadvertently mischaracterize somebody's comments and then we'll have a whole other discussion.

What I think would be most helpful for me is to understand from those folks who still have objections to the current text. What exactly the nature of the problem is. And frankly it would be most helpful for me if they would do that by looking at the red line that I circulated that is a red line against quote unquote my next text versus what was in the initial report. And that was attached to my email to the list named and the document name is current IR SRSU red line.

So for me that would be the most I think productive way to go about it. And I should note that Kathy has put forward language to follow on the critics of the concept, you know, leading part that I had suggested. I suggested a tweak. She's fine with that. I think we're good on that. But again, I'm frankly still not quite sure what the issue is.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I noticed - so I'm assuming Jeff, Ron - oh no, Jeff, you're probably new. Ron, are you new through this queue as well? Or is that hand left up from before?

Ron Andruff: No. I'm in this one. Thanks Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. If it's okay with you guys, I'd like to jump the queue to Kathy because I did notice that Kathy crafted some language at about - almost exactly an hour ago on the list and would like to hear her thoughts. Then I'll circle back around the Jeff and Ron and we'll see sort of where we want to wind up. Kathy, go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thank you very much. I did - I took Kristina (to) vacation. She set up the end. She had started the end of SRSU piece, which had many changes, which I appreciated it. And she said critics of the concept of an SRSU exception can tend that.

And I wrote a section that was very general summarizing a number of concerns I've heard about SRSU. People who completely oppose the exception might want to review this closely and add because I'm not sure I do completely oppose the exception.

But I haven't seen consistency of interpretation. I've seen lots of differences and so - and I know a number of people are kind of concerned about going to SRSU in the first round. And so I've summarized what I've heard as the concerns in the discussion and put that in there so that anyone reviewing all these details.

And there are a number of very interesting proposals in this SRSU text. But I thought we should have a critic's corner as well. So I put that in there. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Kathy. Jeff, go ahead. Jeff, the younger.

Jeff Neuman: The younger one?

Mikey O'Connor: The younger Jeff. Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Not the younger Jeff. It's the younger JN.

Mikey O'Connor: Ah. Okay. I get it.

Jeff Neuman: Right. There we go. So two comments. The first one is just on language, which I'm not sure how to resolve because I actually made changes to I think the previous language that you had and that was - that had found its way into the last draft.

But then Kristina I guess submitted these and that kind of did away with the language which changes I had recommended from the last one although they would still apply. So I'd like to try to put them back in Mikey if I can just send that back to you because again, it was in the last version. Somehow it didn't - with the changes in language it didn't end up in this one. But I think...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I have to take full credit for screwing this one up pretty badly. So so far it sounds to me like maybe what we've got is another kind of mini drafting group comprised of me, Kathy, Kristina and you to try and hammer out...

Kristina Rosette: Actually before we do that, we may not need to do that. And I would just suggest that Jeff, if you can, the email that I had sent around most recently also had a red line of what I created today versus what I had submitted to Mikey on Wednesday afternoon. So that red line may help you figure out kind of what needs to go where.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Point of order always trumps. Hang on a minute. Somebody raised point of order.

Kathy Kleiman: Kristina, could you walk through - there were three red lines I think and I'm not sure which one is which. They're all attached to the same email to the list.

Mikey O'Connor: Kristina, are you there? You may be muted.

Kristina Rosette: Sorry. On mute. Basically there was KR changes. The document that I named KR changes to the IR SRSU text. That was a clean version of my suggested revisions to what is currently in the initial report. I then provided two red lines. One against what is currently in the initial report. So you can see the specific changes I made.

And the other one - I'm sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: So what was that one called?

Kristina Rosette: That's the current IR SRSU red lines.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Then the other document which was a red line against what I had sent to Mikey on Wednesday afternoon, evening, I forget at this point - or Tuesday or whatever the deadline was earlier this week. That had - it was a red line against that. In other words, what I'd originally submitted versus what I'm suggesting now.

Mikey O'Connor: So...

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So on mine if I can go back to me here (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Go ahead Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Back to me.

Mikey O'Connor: Tell me.

Jeff Neuman: I'm in a jumpy mood. I think in the document that's called - starts with 072112010 IRSRSU red line. In that document in the second paragraph - no sorry, third paragraph it starts with still other proposals. You open that up. That's the first sentence that I wrote in there that I kind of want retained.

Although...

Mikey O'Connor: Tell you what - let me go back to my little idea which is I'm not sure that we actually want to do a detailed drafting on the call.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm wondering if the major proponents of the various sides of the argument have had a chance to weigh in. And if they have, if it's Jeff, Kathy, Kristina...

Ron Andruff: And Ron.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and - oh and Ron wants to chime in. I'd, you know, I'm thinking that what we probably need to do is get sort of the rough outlines of it a way forward. Get a general nod of approval from the group and do another round of drafting rather than actually craft it on the phone. I think that's really difficult.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks fine. I did have a second comment that was actually on Kathy's paragraph. So I suppose I could solve it in the drafting. It seems to imply in groups - the problem is that Kathy's critics is not on the concept of more on the implementation. And I think that's where it gets a little too detailed.

And in fact in Kathy's critics corner it basically says, you know, that its - it talks about rationale and...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...but it says registry registrar separation to its DAG4, RACK and JN2 proposals are dedicated. It makes it sound like JN2 doesn't support the SRSU. But it actually does as a concept. Remember we're only talking concepts here, not implementation.

So is supposed I could solve this being on the drafting team for this but I just have an issue with the way Kathy worded the - that section.

Mikey O'Connor: Let's keep - that still sounds like a drafting issue to me rather than a major point. Ron, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Mikey. I'm not sure how we're struggling with this in this regard. The issue here is whether or not the working group feels we should have such detailed language in a summary or not.

The problem I'm having with the whole thing is that we go into such amount of detail with certain people who have voiced their opinions on this when there's a whole other group of the people on the working team that are saying, you know, this needs more work. We need to give more consideration to it.

So I'm just not sure why we're going off and saying that this constituency said that and those (unintelligible) said this and here's the sensing agreements to arguments to it. We all agree that SRSU is something that we want to study further and we believe that there's a possibility of consensus. Why don't we just say that? This is an interim report.

And to go off now and do every time for every one who says I - for every proponent or every workgroup member or every constituency that feels that they should add this in, that means that every other one who doesn't necessarily agree has to add in. That's not a summary folks. That's a detailed dialog about where we all feel at this moment on this issue.

So let's come back to reality. It's an interim report. We should be saying that SRSU is something that a majority of the group believe that the work - there's a possibility for consensus and we're working on it. But for now to have all of this detail that Kristina's put in there, Jeff's added more detail and now that's forced Kathy to add more detail and now Jeff's contemplating what's not right about Kathy's stuff.

I don't think we're going to get there in the small drafting team. Certainly not if we have all the proponents of having a detailed response in there. It really needs to be a very short and simple statement. We agree on SRSU. We agree there's something that has to be done in that regard.

We don't know what it is yet and we're working towards it. At least (say) that because having such detail in there it forces every other element that has an opinion one way or the other, in the middle, on the left, on the right, somewhere high or low. It has to come in there because otherwise it's an incomplete statement and it biases the argument as to where we are with SRSU.

So it's really wholly inappropriate in my view. We really have to go for something simple, something clean like the rest of the document. We agreed that all the proposals would just be short 200-word statement. They were clean, they were intelligent and anyone can draw from them.

They was no advocacy in them. Clean. Why are we not doing the same thing on this - or in this particular element? I don't understand it.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh Ron. Wait. Wait. There's confusion here. There's essentially a one-line summary of SRSU up in the body of the report. What we're talking about here is an annex. And to Kristina's credit and my blame, the latest version is quite a bit shorter than the version that's in the report.

But in all cases we're not talking about the body of the report. That's the (Tim) super summary. And that's all that's there is basically the sense that you've outlined.

Ron Andruff: That notwithstanding, it's begging us all - every one who has some point of view and 360 degree view of this discussion to come in and have to put in some kind of a statement with that. So this is a very - going to be a very long convoluted debate within that report on this topic.

Mikey O'Connor: I don't think it's that bad but duly noted. I think the other thing we might want to consider in the drafting is a similar sort of caveat to the one that we're going to draw up around the compliance one which is to say look, this is a draft. It's under discussion, et cetera, et cetera so that we make it clear that this isn't a final position. But duly noted Ron.

Jeff Eckhaus, go ahead.

Jeff Eckhaus: I'm actually - okay I think - (Anthony) was going to say - I saw him on the chat is what I was thinking is that - and this is - I think he just said it in there so I'll just repeat it because he said he's lowering his hand is that what Ron's principles, what he just said, which I do agree too. That those shouldn't be applied across the board including the compliance section.

So I think, you know, we can't pick and choose which ones we want to, you know, work on on the annex. We just have to be consistent throughout on the principles. Maybe one person favors one or another or, you know, because people might feel differently about each one of those annexes. I think that's the pro of annex.

But to just say - just to be consistent throughout and apply the same methodology throughout these and that's it.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Thanks Jeff. Kristina, go ahead.

Kristina Rosette: You know, Jeff said, I disagree. I mean I still disagree frankly to having all this stuff in the annex because, you know, this is all an issue that we obviously care very much about. Otherwise, we would not have spent nearly as much time on it as we have.

But as a practical matter, you know, everyone else is going to be reading this report and potentially considering whether to enter public comments in. I just think we need to make it - if we really want people to come and I personally do, I think we need to make it easy for them to do that.

And if we just have one sentence without any kind of guideposts anywhere that says here's generally what has been proposed so far in terms of types of exceptions, people are going to get lost and they're not going to comment and then we're not going to be anywhere further along than we were when we put this out.

I mean I personally want to know. Do people think this concept is good? Are there particular iterations of it that they think are more workable? Are there other iterations that frankly they think will never work? That's important information for us to do. And if we don't make it easier for people to comment, we're never going to get it.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. That seems to exhaust the queue. I'm sticking to my guns on the drafting sub team. I think that's the only way we're going to get this figured out. It's too hard to do it on the call.

I don't think that we're that far away from getting a draft that's at least reasonably close. So I'm pretty optimistic about this one and still setting the goal of today for getting it done up to the list quickly approved and back. But I don't want to - I don't want to hit it on the list or on the call.

The next one on my little punch list. Siva triggered a conversation that went all over the place on the list about signatories on proposals and things triggered by the RACK Plus which has a list on the bottom and none of the other ones do.

I have absolutely no preference on this one. But I do think that it should either be one way or the other. I think we should either have them all with a list of some sort. We can argue out what kind of list or we should not. But one with a list and everyone - all the other ones without a list does strike me as a little out of balance.

So let's have a little debate about that. Go ahead Ken. Ken, go ahead. Oh - there we go.

Ken Stubbs: Mike, yeah. First of all, I pointed out in an email that was sent out to the list the RACK proposals have signatories on the list from day one, all the way back into May. Nobody's every said anything about any of this. There are proposals in the - other proposals that point out people who are involved in drafting and preparation and so forth.

I have no objections to anybody putting supports on the list or whatever you're talking about doing especially the working group members and I just don't see any reason to move it. It's just doesn't make any sense at this point in time. It's not like this was some subversive attempt at the 11th hour to squeeze something in that had never been there before.

You go all the way back into May, you're going to find the names on that list. And Mike, I don't have any problem. I support what you just said. But don't make the RACK people or the IPC or Avri and Milton and Michael or anybody pay for the fact that other people did not elect in their proposals to indicate this.

But it's like it's a huge surprise that this would be on there. That is our proposal. It has been our proposal all along. The people who were involved in that were involved in the crafting of the proposal. We didn't just go out and ask for support.

You could talk to anybody who's name's on that list and they're going to tell you that they've seen stuff there long before it got out to the list and that they weren't solicited after the proposal for their support but rather had been - had opportunities all along to craft. And that includes people that normally participate in a big way in the call. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Thanks Ken. Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. What does any of that matter? Seriously. That is the fact that you got people to sign a piece of paper before it was circulated. There's no - we did a poll and if you want a list - if you want to list people as to which proposal they supported based on a poll, I guess we could talk about that.

But the fact is that just because RACK had found people to sign a piece of paper as I said in my email, just the fact that RACK got people to sign a piece of paper versus getting votes, there's no difference. Either you list everybody that supports it judging from a poll or wherever each proposal or you leave it out for everybody.

It's one or the other.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Let me finish because I think it's still my turn. It's clearly prejudicial that to have it in the RACK proposal. You guys want to advocate that it's more diverse, you're going to do it anyway regardless of whether there's people that sign it or not.

But do one way or the other. Where everybody that supports a proposal is below each proposal and that may include people that could live with it if they want their names on there. Or you don't do any of it. But to only have it on one and not the other is just complete prejudice.

Brian Cute: This is Brian.

Mikey O'Connor: Brian, go...

Brian Cute: Yeah. I'm sorry. I'm not on the Adobe just - thank you. It matters to this caller's support when these people put their names to it and that's what it is. That's why it matters.

You know, there's different formats to the proposals. Some of the proposals chose to answer Mikey's question that had a number of emails and have a certain form. JAN2 has a certain form. RACK Plus has a certain form. These people put their names to it. They've confirmed that they want to keep their names to it. It's support. It's the form of the proposal. We don't have a required format of the proposals. This is RACK Plus. That's why it matters. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Let's see. Ron, I think you're next.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Thank you Mikey. The issue here is again about transparency. And I think the key here is not so much the supporters who are on there or people who might have joined after the fact. It's really about who are the proponents of the original document.

So I think it's important to note JN2 is Jon Nevett and Jeff Neuman. And RACK was, you know, Andruff who is and so forth. IPC came from whomever it came from. Free Trade came from Siva and Berry was involved. And so I think it's critical that people understand that these were the proponents of those documents and leave it at that.

It's not about adding supporters. It's not about adding, you know, I could live with it. All that's ridiculous. Let's get back to the key of transparency. It's only about transparency; begins there, ends there and it's the one's who wrote it. People should understand where it came from. We'll stop. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Ron. Kathy, go ahead. Oh, you're muted Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: (Sorry, it)'s on mute.

Mikey O'Connor: There you go.

Kathy Kleiman: You won't be surprised to find that I agree with Ron on this and I think that there are lots of ways that the various proposals know who drafted them and who supported them and some of the initial rounds. And I think it's in perfect - in all the proposal, IPC and (Tim) and JN2 and RACK.

So I would advocate going forward but making it two columns so it doesn't take up a whole page. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Never mind. I was agreeing with Ron and now Kathy.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes. Just something that turned up on the chat for a second. Maybe it's too late to do that but I thought it was a good idea to maybe anonymize the proposals. I mean on the one hand, it's very interesting to know who it was. But on the other hand, it makes the proposal look a bit more neutral and let's the facts stand on the own and set up influencing people from when they read the proposal - oh, this was prepared by those people so we know what angle they're hiding.

Maybe it might be a good idea to do it for the initial report and blank out the names. It's a bit late on but that really struck me as a good - as a good - as a good one. Yeah. Thanks it.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, I think that's at the heart of the disagreement unfortunately. I think if we blank the names then we've just heard from a bunch of people who don't want to do that. So yeah. I don't know that that's really an option.

The anonymizing of the proposals is something that Roberto and I have talked a lot about, which is sort of water over the bridge at this point. Let's see. Jeffrey. I think you're next.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. Yes. And I...

Mikey O'Connor: Wait a minute Jeffrey. I'm sorry. I'm going to interrupt you. Roberto's got his hand up.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Roberto.

Roberto Gaetano: Yes. Can you hear me?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Roberto Gaetano: Yeah. I think that we took sort of a decision on that. When we decided to have the 150, 200 words somebody in a standardized format. That will give the lot of playing field with objective facts and a similar (forecast) for everybody.

Then we said we put the original proposals in the annex. And in the annex there's three formats. There's a - you can use advocacy; you can use all the things that were prohibited in the summary.

That (proves) in my opinion the list of original supports or supporters if you want to - if you want to have them in particular because it's not something that we had at the last minute.

And I'm a bit (unintelligible) because there's nothing that prevents the other proponents - the proponents of the other proposals they could have also put down the list of people that we're supporting it or of proponents of (unintelligible).

But I really don't understand why now we should (unintelligible) from one proposal in part of it because the others didn't do the same. Well, if we do this I fear that at that point we reopen the discussion about advocacy and so on and we'll have other people that will say well, in that proposal that's this sentence that is not true. You have to remove it and so on and so forth.

My personal belief is that the proposals are free formats. They contain what they contain. The public will based on their understanding of the contents and that's it. We shouldn't go and cut (unintelligible) if the proponents don't (promise). Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Roberto. Now Jeffrey. Your turn.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay. So, you know, I agree with Roberto on, you know, like it's, you know, that that in principle that that's how it should be. And if anybody wants to, you know, add signatures or do whatever they want, that's fine.

You know, the only - and I just want to - I think I brought this up on the list and what I had said was that they'll have people, you know, if you support multiple ones then is there going to be - and I think it's just going to - what

this will end up there'll be like another, you know, race towards the poll, you know, how we had with the poll and I think we would repeat it.

That's why I suggested - and I thought a few people agreed. We said hey, how about just the original proponents on there. Put it on there which I think, you know, I think that's what Ron had said and about RACK and I was okay with that, you know, that it was, you know, that - who the original proponents of RACK were and then who of JN2 and who of Free Trade.

And I'm fine with that. I think that works. But I think we start getting into a mode of going back to the poll and a popularity contest. And, you know, I - there's three proposals I support. And one I could live with. Do we put all that on there?

And I think it would sort of be a lot cleaner if we just had the proponents and we left out this sort of battle for, you know, popularity contests of signed support onto my list or onto mine at the end. I don't think it will make a difference and I think it will just - it'll confuse the annex but that's just my opinion. So my vote's for the original proponents and leave out the supporters.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jeff. Neuman, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. So I'll agree with Jeff - the other Jeff on the call. And what Ron had said in the chat is a lot different than Ken and Brian and Kathy were saying which is I'm fine if RACK wants to put Ron as whoever the RACK are but I don't want to see the nine signatories or ten signatories or whatever they got. And I'm fine with JN2 is myself and Nevett.

But to start putting the people who've signed on as signatories just is asking for a battle. And if Ron Andruff's proposal is just RACK, those four people, then that's fine.

Mikey O'Connor: Let's see. (JC). Go ahead.

(JC): Yeah. I will. Jeff Neuman said it pretty well. I think we should focus on proponents and that supports would be laughing, sorry, doing polls up to here. We know who supports what and who thinks what about everything now. So drawing a list of supporters if we do it in RAC you go into the issue where okay, all the other proposal needs to know who the supporters are and we waste a significant amount of time doing just that.

So we can only use the word (unintelligible). I think let's try to outgrow the issue and move on really.

Mikey O'Connor: Ken, you're next.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah. A couple of - a couple of things. First of all, I understand Jeff's concern. The only issue is Jeff that the people who are - find out that the RAC are people that have been involved in the process all the way down the line have reviewed and in almost every single case been involved in crafting and making changes.

If you're going to...

Jeff Neuman: Can I do a point of order? Point of order on Ken.

Mikey O'Connor: Point of order trumps. Go ahead Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Please don't make assumptions about what other (unintelligible) did or did not do. It's okay to say that yours involve people but don't make the assumption that others did not. Thank you.

Ken Stubbs: I never did Jeff. I never did. I was pointing out the fact that you can't use RACK because if you try to use RACK, RACK was a name given to a proposal to try to make it easy to understand. And you're going to have to tell

Alan Greenberg and Cheryl that their contributions to the proposal don't matter because their name wasn't listed on the initials that were put on the proposal.

And I think that from a practical standpoint it just doesn't make any sense. I think Roberto's point is well taken. Jeff has no problem at all if you want to write a copy out to your proposal as to how it was managed and how - that's perfectly acceptable to me. I've not problems with that at all. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. I guess you have about first of all (unintelligible) before me is (Anthony) going to (unintelligible) asking for I guess.

Mikey O'Connor: (Anthony), are you doing a point of order or are you commenting?

(Anthony): I'm just noticing what a wonderful acronym it is.

Mikey O'Connor: Sebastien, I think you've got the floor.

Sebastien Bachollet: Sorry. Yeah. I am not saying too much in this group but I think this time I don't want anybody from this group telling me where my name can be put. It's my choice. And sorry if you disagree but I do have to leave me put my name where I wish.

And the second point it's a very different thing that (unintelligible) to one proposal and (unintelligible) to a poll. In the poll I try, maybe I didn't succeed to answer the question without having in mind that my proposal is the (reckless) one but it's just to try to figure out how we can find consensus.

It's a way that the chair offers to work with. But it's not the same thing. The (unintelligible) to writing a proposal, even supporting a proposal and (unintelligible) to who and saying yes, no or plus minus something.

Then I really think that it was done in this proposal. Maybe it could have been done in the other. And maybe it could still be done. But don't mix that in everything. Thank you.

Brian Cute: This is Brian. Can I jump in?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure. Go ahead.

Brian Cute: Yeah. I just want to amplify something Roberto said and something that I probably didn't say well enough in my comments in picking up on Sebastien's point. There was no mandated format to our proposals. These were created by the people who put them together, who worked on putting them together. This is the format that we chose. The RACK Plus people chose.

I had a discussion with you Mikey about your email where you had a number of questions listed and whether the question and whether we should all format our proposals according to those questions. We argue one did. We argue two did. JN2 did not. Others did not.

There's no mandated format to these proposals. And in echoing Roberto's point about no format mandated and Sebastien's point about signature appearing what they want, this is what the RACK Plus proposers put forward period. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I guess I want to support what Sebastien and Brian just said. Those signatures have been there for a long time and someone noticed them about two hours or three hours ago. There have been early drafts out for ages. Other people could have modified their draft or at least commented on this ahead of time.

I think this is a last minute discussion that is really inappropriate. I think I'm one of the first people who put out a public not on list saying I supported RACK and, you know, I think that's part of the overall process we've gone through. To change at this point without any prior notice I think is inappropriate. I have no objection if other people want to go list whoever they have as their supporters or proposers. But I think it's a bit too late to be doing this.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Alan. I was - let's see. (JC), I assume you're hand is left up from before. Neuman, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. So if you all remember what happened and how this came about, there was an initial poll that was done within a couple days after the proposal's initial came out. I'm not talking about this last poll.

So what - the reason why John and I when we talked about this did not get people to sign the bottom is because we would know a day or two later when people actually did the poll who support it.

So to say now that well this is the way - it just doesn't make any sense but if we - if we're throwing it out there to say why don't we just list who favored proposals in the last poll and then we could be done with it because those are the same people that signed the RACK Plus. That should be all those people.

And then you could just put the people who supported JN2, the people who supported Free Trade. Just put it all out there. I think that's - if you want to tell the accurate true story, that's the way to do it. And I feel so childish arguing this but it's ridiculous that - it's like people trying to gain some sort of leverage. Let people read what they want into the report.

Brian Cute: This is Brian.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Brian Cute: Can I reply?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure.

Brian Cute: I'm sorry Mikey. I'll make it quick. Jeff, you just said it. You guys made a choice. You put together your proposal and you made a choice how to format it. Live with you choice. We made a choice too and the people who put the signature on are telling you they want their signatures there. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm desperately trying to see the end of this conversation. Ron, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Mikey. I have to disagree with what Jeff said too. This is not about trying to get names onto a list to try to sway and buy us something. This is about those that proposed something, put their names on it and the proposal went out. So those that made proposals all had names. (Cam), there's no question where that came from.

There were three people. That's how they - you know, they arrived at their name with that originally. So and the same thing with RACK. That was - been four peoples names and so forth. Others signed as Ken pointed out earlier in this call. Others were part of that group that developed that thing. They put their names there.

So it became more than just - rather than putting - we actually had a joke. It was almost the entire alphabet. You know, we said okay, just call it RACK Plus. And that's when it came to the list.

So the point here is that it's about proponents. Only proponents for transparency, nothing else. It's not about trying to slide a bunch of names on right now because it'll buy us and show how much support somebody got. We've already got charts in there to show what the support was.

So let's be clear about this folks. It's, you know, we're beating a dead horse. No question about it. But at the end of the day it really comes down to the fact that who proposed what. The readers have a right to know that. We have a responsibility to tell them. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Can I just draw a line under this conversation folks? I mean I - we are frustrating everybody on the call. You can read the chat. I think we have beaten this one to death.

Here's my thought. Anybody who wants to send me another list to tack on the bottom of theirs in the next not 24 hours because I want to get this thing out quicker than that but send it to me tonight of proponents, not proponents and supporters. Not from the poll but actual people who actually were proponents. I'll tack it on the bottom.

But I'm with Roberto. I mean we are running dangerously close to opening up and editing proposals that have been out there for quite a while. And had I known that this was going to be such a (kerfluffle), I probably would have skipped this topic. I think we just have to move on people. So I'm going to ignore the queue. Sorry Sebastien. It's just we got to draw a line on this thing.

And I'm also going to have - the last thing is another Siva point and my suggestion on this is Siva asked that a reference be made to his original Free Trade proposal in the report. And my suggested solution to that is that I make a reference to the page that has all of the original proposals on it.

I'm not going to single out a single one. Very uncomfortable with that. But I will put a point in the body of the report that gives the link to the Wiki page where all of the prior proposals - in fact all of the proposals are and leave it at that because I really don't want to get into the discussion of which prior proposal gets in and so on. We've already been down that road once and I don't really want to go there again.

So here's where we're at. We've got two drafts that have to get brought out. I noticed on the chat that I've lost - I think Kristina's the one who had to drop off before. So the logistics of getting those drafts done is going to get a little tricky.

But I will endeavor to get those done tonight and out to the list soon. My preference would be that they basically get done and stuck in the report and then we launch the report. I want to get us into the group as to whether we can go ahead and push the report over the wall tomorrow morning so that we can get the public comment period over because we are running into some date trouble.

And if we continue to slip like this, we basically never get out of the starting block. So is there anybody that has an overwhelming objection to letting me lead a couple of drafting teams to get some revisions into those two annexes plus drive a few editing changes that have come up, spelling and the like and then push the thing out in the morning?

Maybe - let's do check marks if you think it's okay to do it that way. You know, what I would really essentially like to get is approval to push the report tomorrow morning after the drafting teams have had a chance to do their work.

And I'm looking...

Woman: Whole lot of green up there Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: There's a whole lot of green. There's some gaps. I'd like to see pretty much all green. I'd like people to sort of step up and say this is close enough with those two revisions and then move ahead.

Man: Or if they disagree, put an X up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. If you disagree, put an X up.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. If you disagree, put an X up and then I'll kill you. I'll kill you. Because I have sniffed a lot of glue and I'm ready to do almost anything.

Woman: He only wants to see green. Just follow the man's instructions.

Mikey O'Connor: I just want green here. Okay? Dang nab it. Okay. I'm calling that a green board. Alan has put his - okay. I'm driving to Canada. I'm going to dig out my (six) gun and I'm going to blow you away.

Woman: Alan (unintelligible) a good mood.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. Couldn't resist.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Yeah. You rascal. Okay. I commend us all for all of the pain and all of the trouble and all of the (kerfluffle) at the end. I do want to take just a minute and say thanks because we've done something pretty incredible.

We've taken a process that normally runs anywhere from 15 months to ten years depending on which PDP you're talking about and crashed it down into an incredibly short period of time with an amazing number of contributors and emails and work.

And so I just want to take a moment and say thanks and that it's been an honor and a delight to work with you all even if I do have to sniff a little glue every once in a while.

The plan is like this. I would like to have a call next Monday. I don't want to have one next Thursday because Thursday is the day that I go out on my

boat. I haven't been able to get out on my boat for a month. So I'd like a vacation, thank you very much.

On Monday's call what I would like to do is spend the call figuring out how much we think we can get done and which pieces we want to focus on for the final report. I don't want to actually do any of that work. I just want to plan the work a little bit to see how much we can shoehorn into what is going to be a very short period of time. I don't want to do it now because we're pooped.

Woman: Some of us are falling apart.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Some of us need more glue. So that's the plan. We'll do a call on Monday. It'll be an hour and a half. It won't be two hours. It'll be at the normal time. And we will not have a call on Thursday. We'll take a break and we'll see thereafter whether we have to go into intense mode or not. But let's give ourselves a breather. We've done a lot of work. We've done a great job.

Man: TIR is offering to buy the gas if you let us come along.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh. That'd be great. The only problem is the boat's only 13 feet long. You know, 75 people in a 13-foot boat.

Woman: (Unintelligible) very friendly.

Mikey O'Connor: It would be very cozy. It would be stink like a stone. No. This is a boat ride with my sweetie and me dag nab it.

Woman: Well it could be very, very friendly.

Mikey O'Connor: It's going to be very cozy. So with that, I'm going to draw the call to a close.

Kathy Kleiman: Mikey, can I point out one more thing. I'm sorry. It's Kathy.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I was going to queue up and one question.

Mikey O'Connor: Gads. The gang never quits. Go ahead. Kathy then Jeff. Wait a minute. Wait
                 a minute. Okay. I'm ready.

Kathy Kleiman: BRU2 came out in the annex without the compliance and enforcement
                 section - the expanded compliance and enforcement section. So I just wanted
                 to point that out.

Mikey O'Connor: Say that again.

Kathy Kleiman: The BRU2 had the short compliance and enforcement section rather than the
                 expanded compliance and enforcement section that...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

Kathy Kleiman: ...had been agreed to. So I just thought I'd present it on the call and let
                 everyone know I'm advocating for the full version that was polled.

Woman: Here, here.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. That's a drafting error on my part. Kathy, could you send me the drop
                 in replacement?

Kathy Kleiman: Did that. I'll send it again. Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Send it again. Yeah. Send it again.

Kathy Kleiman: Cool. Will do.

Mikey O'Connor: Several thousand emails (of the queue).

Kathy Kleiman: Will do.

Mikey O'Connor: Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Sorry Mikey. Can you just - on just the timelines because you said like morning or evening? I think you're in Minnesota but can you just say sort of like the timeline on it and with times because I just want to make sure is because if there are any deliverables or when it's going to be out or just something like that with some specific times either GMT or whichever time you want to use as a reference point please.

Mikey O'Connor: Let's say 1400 GMT. Just when I just push it. So for me that's mid morning. For Cheryl that's (unintelligible). For Europe it's middle of the afternoon. Is when I'd like to draw this to a close. So my goal is to get new drafts out, you know, probably 0200 GMT today.

Glen de Saint Géry: Mikey, this is Glen.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Glen de Saint Géry: Do you want that report posted somewhere on that draft page?

Mikey O'Connor: Say that again. I didn't quite follow. It's like your phone's cutting in and out.

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: There you go.

Glen de Saint Géry: Do you want (unintelligible) posted on the draft documents page on the GNSO site or is the Wiki just sufficient?

Mikey O'Connor: Eventually we're going to go to public comment. The goal is to get the report buttoned up and ready to submit for public comment tomorrow by 1400 GMT.

And then after that it goes whatever the normal place is that reports for public comment should go.

Glen de Saint Géry: That's - thanks. That's fine.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. All right then. I think with that we'll draw to a close a little bit early. And let's see. Drafting teams, could you guys hang on the call for just a second so we can work out logistics with how we're going to do what. And then we'll - I guess we're done at least for this week. Thanks gang.

Woman: Well thanks to you and Roberto. I know people keep saying it but whilst we are a difficult group to wrangle at times, you guys really have done a absolutely amazing job. And I don't think because we're not all going to be gathered together at 2:00 pm GMT when you push the button or 0200 or whatever it is that, you know.

It should be (lost) for the record that each and every one of us are hugely appreciative of the work that's gone into helping us make this happen. So stand up and applause should be imagined I think.

Mikey O'Connor: Great. Agree a lot. Thanks a lot. It's been - you know, this is kind of the way that these things often happen for me is that I do a lot of lifting and then I have a really good time. So that's great.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You know, when I get tired, I just sniff a little more glue and it's all good. I can hardly wait for the transcript of this call to come out, you know.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...recorded.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Okay.

Woman: Thanks so much Mikey. Thanks Roberto. Thanks all. Bye.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

END