

**ICANN  
Transcription  
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting  
Monday 24 June 2013 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTP Part D Working Group call on the Monday 24 June 2013 at 15:00 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-irtp-d-20130624-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jun>

Attendees:

James Bladel - RrSG  
Paul Diaz - RySG  
Avri Doria – NCSG  
Angie Graves - CSG  
Volker Greimann – RrSG  
Barbara Knight – RySG  
Bob Mountain – RySG  
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP  
Bartlett Morgan – NCUC  
Jill Titzer – RrSG  
Graeme Bunton - RrSG

Apologies:

Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG  
Alan Greenberg – ALAC  
Holly Raiche – ALAC  
Michele Neylon – RrSG  
Kristine Dorrain - NAF

ICANN staff:

Lars Hoffman  
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: I would like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone, and welcome to the IRPT D Working Group (unintelligible) on

Monday, 24th of June, 2013. On the call today we have James Bladel (unintelligible), Angie Graves, Volker Greimann, Barbara Knight, Bob Mountain, Mikey O'Connor, and (unintelligible).

We have apologies from Alan Greenburg, (Mona Sapatagir) and Kristine Dorrain. We also have standing apologies from Michele Neylon, Avri Doria, and (unintelligible). And from staff we have Lars Hoffman, Julia - and myself, Julia Charvolen. May I remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia. It's Mikey. I'm going to give James a little bit of a running start on this week's call, since he missed last week's call. And somewhere in mid-flight I'm going to hand it back over to him. First, we'll take a look at the agenda, which is up on the upper right and give you a chance to update your statements of interest. By the way, folks couldn't hear Julia. If you can't hear me, by all means drop a note into the chat. Anyway, any comments on the agenda or statements of interest?

Okay. What you see on the screen - and I've captured control of it, I'm going to do that for a minute just to drag your attention - is we finished up putting out little key discussion points on the rest of the public comments summary document, the review that we've done.

We sort of stumbled through that on the call last week because I was having connectivity problems. I apologize for a somewhat bumpy flight, but fortunately it was some of the less controversial items up. And I just sort of wanted to run through those really quickly for you, partly to get James back up to speed and partly for those of you that missed it.

Where we - sorry about that, mouse - where we ended is we did our charter questions E and F. And on E what we really said - let me make this a little bit bigger - the charter question was about the penalties for policy violations and

whether the existing ones are sufficient. And essentially the comments that we got from the DC and the registry said yes, they're fine.

We may want to highlight the fact that as a working group we are uncomfortable with the idea of penalties being specified at the policy level. We might want to say that out-loud, that's the highlighted part of the discussion there.

And then in terms of the comment from the registries, we pretty much like that given the changes to the RAA that has happened between when this charter question was drafted back in 1841 and now, there are (unintelligible) sense of the group that these are sufficient. And so what we wound up with is not really any difficult discussion points out of this one.

The next one, and the last charter question - let's see if this all fits in one page. It doesn't. I'll bring you through it page-by-page. Is the...

James Bladel: Mikey? Can I...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, go ahead James.

James Bladel: Oh, thanks. Just on that last one - and I wasn't here, but I'm glad to hear that the group was highlighting that bit about the including sanctions at the policy level. I think that's a very important concept and I think that I would strongly agree that the working group should state that policies should not have their own specific or individual sanctions regimen.

They should be tied to just kind of an overall compliance effort, with suspension and breach and all those other states. It sounds like you guys covered that last week and I just wanted to whole-heartedly agree that that should be mentioned in our report.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think that what we're starting to see, especially in some of these comments where there's pretty broad agreement, is sort of a hint as to what the report will look like. And so I agree. I think that second paragraph and our response to the DC comments is one that's definitely a candidate-approved quorum. And I agree with their example. That one I think we can chalk up to the 'low-hanging fruit' category, which is always good. Volker likes low-hanging fruit, too.

Okay, on to the EPP auth info discussion. And I'll do this in two chunks, because the page splits. The DC was not enthusiastic about the idea of dropping the need for standardized forms of authorization. And when we responded to that, we added that these are pretty useful in resolving disputes and forming essentially a record upon which a decision to reverse a transfer can be based. There is the issue of confusion between EPP and FOA stuff that we may want to take a look at.

We also thought about consolidating these FOA and auth info into a single step. And I think there's a puzzler there that's found its way into the discussion stuff. And then I think something that's - most people agree with is the idea of streamlining it. I think we're starting to get some confusion in the difference between FOA, auth info and EPP that we're probably going to want to straighten out during our discussion.

And then in the response to the registries, the registries also felt that FOAs are key. They were actually quite emphatic about that. And again, note that, you know, this is documentation of the chain of events. We didn't have much to add to that, and so we didn't highlight much. But we did have some discussion points that we noted on the call last week, one being the need to clarify how FOAs actually do prevent hijacking.

That was language in some prior documents and we wanted to highlight that, mostly from the compliance clarification document. And then big end a little

bit of the process stuff, the feasibility and implications of combining auth info and FOA into a single step.

And so that was really the last two chunks of our summarizing work we did last week. You know, I think we should probably take a moment to see if there are any thoughts from people who have joined the call this week, if there's anything that people want to highlight. But then, the next couple three pieces of the agenda are sort of taking stock of this whole thing and figure out sort of what we want to do next, and then maybe zero in for a while on charter questions E and F, as there seems to be pretty broad agreement in the group on those two.

James? You want to take the helm at this point or do you want me to keep going? What say you?

James Bladel: Sure, I can jump in and then let you know if I start to - or you just kind of kick me under the electronic table here if I start to go off-track. How about that? For the transcript, this is James speaking. And I think you're right, Mikey. If we're looking at agenda item three, just taking stock of where we are, what's ahead of us, it sounds like there's really not a whole lot of controversy or, you know, debate or deliberation around those two charter questions.

It feels like the group - and granted we've had some very - we've had a number of calls but not all of them have been heavily-attended calls - but it sounds like there seems to be this emerging - I use 'consensus' with a lower-case C - opinion that these are relatively non-controversial issues and that the group has a fairly straight-forward response to them.

So my thought or proposal to the group would be to begin to draft the response and recommendations around these two and start to look at what some language might look like, understanding that once we see it in black and white that might provoke more substantial conversation than what we've had reviewing the public comments.

But let's see what we get when we get there. And that would be my proposal. I don't know if anyone has any thoughts about a different way that we could approach that. I got a green checkmark from my co-chair and silence across the - oh, there's Bob. Thanks, Bob.

So let me maybe position that to staff, if we have enough material to start fleshing out what the responses and recommendations for charter questions E and F might look like. And then we can start to draft those with the idea that we would continue to review those as we go forward and as we discuss some of the more meatier questions. Lars?

Lars Hoffman: Yes, this is Lars. Yes, I would be very happy to if you wanted to take the lead and put together a draft and then circulate it on the list of later to do this week if you wanted to.

James Bladel: Yes, that would be fantastic. And anything that we can do to get some more visibility to the folks who have been having conflicting appointments and standing apologies so we can make sure that we have their support on these issues as well. So that brings us then to the other four questions, A through D. And I think that A is probably - of the four, A is probably the one that would also fall into the 'low-hanging fruit' category.

Unless I'm misremembering some bit of controversy, I think all of the - or both of the groups that weighed in on this issue felt that uniform reporting requirements or including these in the registry monthly reports would be beneficial. And then perhaps developing reporting requirements for the second-level providers might also be a benefit.

The other three, B through D, will probably be a little bit more involved. But - oh I'm sorry, Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that you're absolutely right. But one of the issues in the key discussion points - and by the way, I've given you all control of the document again - one of the things that came up in this discussion I think is pretty substantive. And that's the idea that might want to take a look at the layers in the process. More specifically, the idea of maybe removing the registry layer from the TRP and having TRPs go directly to what are now second-level dispute providers.

It came up in this charter question. So although I think that the answer to the charter question is pretty straight-forward, I think we've got a related discussion that probably does have some meat to it and will want to certainly ask people - I was thinking especially in Durbin.

One of the nice things about these key discussion points is that these are good questions to ask the people who are at the meeting there to weigh in on a bit so we can get a sense of the audience. But then I think that's, you know, there's a fair amount of substance to them for us too.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Mikey. Yeah, I think that we need to - I think this was one of your points is reconcile any recommendations or synchronize any recommendations we might have on Charter Question A with the idea that, you know, it doesn't make any sense to impose new obligations for registry reports if we're going to remove the function from the Registries, right?

And making sure, I guess, that's almost like a compatibility check between the various - the various charter questions and anything that - any outcomes from those.

I'm going to scroll back up here real quickly here and take a look at one of the things that I think would benefit from a longer discussion from the group are the differences between Charter Question C and Charter Question D. And one of the things I was thinking of here - and maybe - perhaps I'm reading it

wrong, Mikey, but it just kind of occurred to me but I have, as I mentioned, very tired eyes right now.

It seems like, one, well it seems like both these charter questions are not necessarily referring to TDRP as it exists today. Is that correct? We're thinking that these charter questions could refer to some hypothetical new policy or new mechanism for disputes? Was that - did anyone else come away with that impression? Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I didn't read it that way. I can be convinced to do that. But I read them a little narrowly and I'd have to cogitate about that. I think it's certainly a good topic for conversation when we get to these. And what I think this is bringing up is that our conversation has sort of taken us, you know, we've got some larger issues that we may want to tackle first before we tackle the charter questions because once the larger issues are resolved that will give us a better sense as to how we fall on the charter questions.

And the larger issue that you're raising is a lot like the one that I raised on the last one which is, you know, who does what, you know, what is the IRTP/TDRP process look like? And should it be streamlined? And before we make detailed recommendations about what that streamlined process ought to do we probably ought to have that conversation.

James Bladel: Yeah. Yeah, thanks, Mikey. I agree. I think that we want to make sure that we're not self-limiting by thinking about (unintelligible). Oops. Got an echo. We want to make sure that we're not limiting ourselves by thinking about TDRP so much that we're missing a larger discussion of whether or not other dispute mechanisms would be more appropriate and what those would look like and those will be much larger questions.

But, yeah, I think you're correct. We should fold that into a large discussion of what does the current process look like and where some of the opportunities to optimize that.



Okay well I'm starting to wonder where we go from here as far as tackling these larger questions. Do we want to begin a discussion looking at the key discussion points in Charter Question A? And start moving these iteratively? It looks like we have about 40 minutes left in our call. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. You know, I wish I'd thought of this about three hours ago so that I could have pulled out those larger questions in a list. It's certainly an action that I would be happy to take away. I'm not sure that it's worth tying everybody up trying to develop it. But I think it would be good to have that list really soon and definitely in time for Durban so that we could throw those up in the conversation there.

And this is the sort of thing that I don't do well on the fly; I do a lot better when I'm able to just sit and stare at a document and scroll around and mumble and draft and revise and so on. But, you know, I'd be happy to do that soon like within the next day and maybe, you know, sort of in the same timeframe that Lars takes for his first draft of our response to the Charter Questions E and F.

Sorry to not be able to do it...

James Bladel: Mikey, you know, I think that that is actually the kind of conversation this, you know, brainstorming exercise - it lends itself very well to a call like this. And I was thinking that, you know, if you'd rather not take that on alone I think it would be, you know, a really good use of the next 30 minutes to maybe just have Lars put a blank note here in front of us that we can start firing off ideas and culling the list and building an outline of what those larger existential questions might be.

I don't think that's something that you, you know, should feel like, you know, that you're on the hook to go out and do for us. I think that there's a lot of folks quietly and patiently sitting on the phone here that would probably love

to, you know, help out in that regard. So I'm fine with going that route if you are.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I am too. I would also, now that I have normal Internet connectivity, I'd be happy to just throw that mind map up on the screen and be the scribe again and let - go that way if that works for people. Why don't we do that and then I'll...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yeah, why don't we queue that up for the folks that are - for the folks that are catching up on email and, you know, reading about, you know, the sports headlines. What we're going to do the remainder of the call is put the mind map back up and we're going to look at some of the questions that have come up more existential questions over and above or outside of our charter questions regarding the TDRP and just transfer disputes in general.

And I think what we're looking for from the group is more of a brainstorming session about the missing dispute mechanisms, who's using them, how they're structured, do they work. If not, why don't they work?

And, you know, some of those overarching questions I think that have been the undercurrent for a lot of these - a lot of these discussions. So Mikey, just holler when you're ready and we'll dive in.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm ready. I think...

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...if people want the screen a little bigger, just shout it out and I'll make it bigger but it looks like the font's about the same size as everything else so let's go for it.

James Bladel: Okay. So I think we can call this just, you know, yeah, you're got their larger questions. And I think the first one is, you know, is - are the current mechanisms adequate? You - yeah. Deliberately trying to revoke - provoke a response from our audience - the participants here. Hopefully some of these will touch on a nerve. Ooh. Here comes a queue. All right.

So are they sufficient? Are they - who is using them? We'll go to Bob Mountain. Bob. What do you got for us?

Bob Mountain: Yeah. This is Bob. So my understanding in the discussions that we've had so far as well as, you know, other offline discussions is that the primary approach for the resolving these disputes is informal and formal. And that the formal dispute mechanisms are more by - of a fail over or unresponsive situations. Is that - am I more or less stating - am I stating the obvious or am I capturing it correctly?

James Bladel: I think you're capturing it correctly. I think you're pointing out that there are more attractive alternatives to the formal dispute mechanisms. And people go there first. Right?

Bob Mountain: Right. Yeah. Yeah. Exactly. So I think the, you know, the existing dispute mechanisms are almost available as a last resort when the ones that everyone uses, you know, which are based on, you know, informal relationships through contacts, network, what have you.

You know, based on the failure of those and we fail over to those. It seems to me that those - based on the data that those mechanisms are rarely used. And so it seems to be the strong exception when those existing formal mechanisms are actually put to use. So I guess the question is is the reason they are rarely used, is that because they are not effective or not necessary or both?

And I think having - I would probably want to discuss that a bit before we then, you know, decide what, you know - that would be the question I would ask is, you know, are they sufficient and why, you know, what is happening now and why aren't they being used before I know - before I think we could as a consensus say whether they are sufficient or not. Right. Does that make sense?

James Bladel: It certainly does. And I think it harkens to a number of conversations we've had were it's, you know, it's not like that we're - it's not like we're short - there is a shortage of disputes about transfers, right. Those are - I think we've understood those to be very, very common. And here's this mechanism and it's got dust and cobwebs all over it, you know.

So understanding that disconnect and I think that what we all recognize is there's - it's informal mechanism that sits in between that's used much more commonly.

So does the formal mechanism need to look more like that that we need to put some structure around that informal mechanism? Do we need to find out why that's the preferred option? I think all those are good questions.

Bob Mountain: Yeah. This is Bob again. Just a follow on. I mean it might help - I know we did this in prior, you know, iterations of the IRTTP but to do a, you know, to do some use cases. You know, the fact that I brought it up means I'll probably have to volunteer to do it, which I don't mind if it helps.

But, you know, if that helps to go through and just really to highlight how this is being used, then, you know, perhaps that's the way to look forward as well. So I'll just throw that out there as well.

James Bladel: Yeah. Well that's the curse of coming up with these good ideas. Usually you're saddled with making it come to light. So we'll circle back to that one but I think that's a good approach. Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Thank you James. This is Barbara. So I think, you know, the question really is is, you know, are these still sufficient but I mean instead of that is are they still appropriate given the changes that we've already seen both in the industry and the policy.

So, you know, now we all recognize that the informal process where, you know, registrants are going to the registrars to resolve their disputes is probably the preferred method. And early on to this particular working group we had some conversations as to, you know, whether or not, you know, there really even needs to be a transfer dispute process.

I think that there does because in all cases we've seen that not all registrars are agreeable to resolving disputes or, you know, responses I should say when a dispute arises.

So yeah, I do think that they're necessary but I think that, you know, in light of the fact that we now have the (TIAC) that was put in place in one of the previous working groups' work as a result of that as well as, you know, the fact that we are going to have a lot more registry operators out there.

I think that there probably, you know, are some changes. So I think that the question really is, you know, is the current mechanism still appropriate or does it need to be modified?

James Bladel: Yeah, thanks Barbara. And I think that's, you know, that's the heart of the question as well is does this still need to exist. I think it does. I think you're right there. But it's - do we want to recognize that it's not the first stop for someone who is seeking to address or mitigate a transfer dispute?

I see Mikey's diligently capturing all of the questions here. In fact I'm a little impressed at how quickly he's going here. It's kind of hypnotic to watch him do that.

I would put out, and I don't know if I'm speaking maybe just in a registrar capacity here, but I would put out that we should talk a little bit about who is aware of these, who is using these. Are they - are these processes getting in front of the right people?

Are - (injured) or registrants who are involved in a dispute are they aware that these processes exist? If so, you know, how did they become aware of it or are they being informed by their registrar? If not, should they be? You know, so I think some of those questions also is worthwhile in understanding.

You know, do people not use these because they just don't know about them or is it more likely that they're just too slow, too difficult, too expensive and everything else that goes along with that?

I see our queue is clear. Anyone else want to weigh in on this topic here? Mikey is just - looks like a goalkeeper here for an NHL team. He's just catching everything that's flying in his direction. I don't see anything Mikey. Do you have any thoughts?

Mikey O'Connor: I think this is a great start. I think, you know, why don't we wrap this one up and see if there are other - well, I'm not going to do that. One of the ones that I want to work in here - and maybe I'll kind of pre- stage Barbara on this one. I think one of the one of the questions is could the - who should be involved to deliver this so we could, you know, we could pack into this point that Barbara raised in comments.

You know, should registries be removed from the process? We could pack it all into one or we could separate that as a thing. But I'm going to put it in sort of down here right now and say who (unintelligible) like that. (Unintelligible). I'd kind of call that a first try. I think it's pretty good. Barbara.

James Bladel: I had one - oh, I'm sorry. I had one addition here, which would be the changes since we were last chartered. There was - in addition to (TIAC), there were a couple of other working groups, most notably IRTPC, which hasn't been adopted yet. Talks a little bit about changes of registrant.

So, you know, I think we should put that one in there because usually a transfer dispute, not always but usually a transfer dispute is also attached to a dispute on who the legitimate registrant is. Obviously if you can establish who a legitimate registrant is, that person or entity has the authority to reverse a transfer without invoking a dispute mechanism or necessarily invoking a dispute mechanism. So I think that's a part of it as well. Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Thank you. So this is Barbara. I think under the formal process we probably also need to call out the like second level dispute resolution providers like (NAS) and the others. Is that what comprehensive picture that, you know, currently registries the first level and then the I guess ICANN approved second level dispute providers?

James Bladel: Okay. And we're calling them second level providers but one of the questions on the table is whether they remain second level providers.

Barbara Knight: (Okay).

James Bladel: Okay. Great. The queue is empty. Anyone else want to weigh in on these overarching questions here? Hopefully we save Mikey a few hours of work and gave him an evening back so that he can walk around with (Margie) and identify the various wildlife on his little fish area out there.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sure (Marcie) would approve.

James Bladel: I'm sorry. It's (Marcie). I said (Margie).

Mikey O'Connor: No worries. She's very cool.

James Bladel: I had - I actually had an...

Mikey O'Connor: Better than (Bill).

James Bladel: ...ICANN person - I actually had another ICANN person on my mind because I also wanted an email on the RAA.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

James Bladel: Okay. So well, that was about as exciting as it gets in IRTP PDPs folks. But that was a good exercise. And I thought that it was worthwhile. Worthwhile use of our time.

Can we - I know (Graham) you're kind of new to these PDPs so, you know, hopefully we didn't just like blow your mind there with the fun and excitement. But taking a look then at where we stand. Wanted to sort of take stock again about where we are relative to our calendar, our work plan and Durban.

And I think that we - and Mikey, maybe you covered this in the last meeting because I noticed that you and (Lars) were passing around the - some slide decks as far as an update to Council.

And I think that the structure of that has changed slightly in that GNSO Council would prefer that those updates be short and sweet without necessarily revisiting the whole history of the PDP. I think they just want to focus on what are the issues, what are you talking about, when are, you know, what's your work schedule, when are you going to be done.

And I think that we're ready for that type of an update. Is that correct or would you agree with that Mikey, (Lars).



Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. That's certainly the goal. You're right. James and I have been exchanging slide decks getting ready for that. But I was thinking of that deck as sort of a dual purpose deck where we would use it with the Council and skip through fast and then also use it as an introduction to our public session.

So mostly what's on it is just the charter questions with the thought that during the panel James and I and anybody else who's there on Saturday or Sunday and wants to join in, we'd basically just throw those charter questions up on the wall and then summarize them - summarize some of the talking points and informally tell people sort of where we think we're at. Ooh, look at that. It's all up on the screen. So - got little buttons to push. Way cool.

So I don't think I want to take us through the deck. It also looks like people can flip through it on their own...

James Bladel: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: ...on sort of learning how. Okay, here we go.

James Bladel: And sort of...

Mikey O'Connor: So it's...

James Bladel: ...most - go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: So anyway I was thinking of this as no, we wouldn't necessarily read those charter questions to people but James and I would be prepared with a notated version of this that could highlight sort of a place where the working group is likely to be focusing its conversation and also highlight some of the places where we're in pretty strong agreement already but not actually put that in the deck. That's all I - that's all I got.

James Bladel: Yeah. I think that for folks - most of the folks on this group and on this call this isn't their first trip to the circus and they know how these updates go. And usually it's kept short and sweet unless a controversial topic in the Council has lots and lots of questions, which has to my knowledge never really been the case for IRTP PDP but there's a first time for everything. So we should always be prepared.

Okay. Well then let's see. We've got based on the calendar here, we've got look like one more call, perhaps two more calls before the meeting in Durban. So my question to the group would be looking at the calendar, July 1 is next week and there's usually a - it's a holiday week for the U.S. but it's the holiday falls a little later in the week so I'm assuming that we should not have necessarily too much of an issue with U.S. attendance on Monday.

I wouldn't say that if this group met let's say on Wednesdays or Thursdays. But I think we should be okay for next week. And then the following week, July 8, is probably - I mean given the transit routes that I'm seeing from folks on some of the flight itineraries from North America, it seems like we're getting close to the point where people start to if not get on planes, they're at least getting their luggage situated.

So one of the things we might pose to the group between now and the next call is how we want to use our next two weeks. That's Monday, July 1 and Monday, July 8.

I'm sort of tending Mikey to having a call next week and then perhaps taking a pass on the 8th so the folks can come to Durban prepared not only for the Council update but also for an in person session.

So that's just kind of my off the cuff thinking but we can put that question to this group or actually I think probably might make more sense to put it to the list. What do you think?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah I agree. I think that's a good approach. We're sort of in a natural break in the work. You know, we've finished a pretty substantive document. We've got a pretty good sense of where we're headed. It's, you know, we're not going to get a whole lot done between now and Durban anyway.

And so I wouldn't even be terribly averse to canceling next week's call even though the logistics are okay. You know, we're going to learn a bunch in Durban both from the Council and from our session there. And so one way to do it is just hang it up, take a week off. That's what - I just did the same thing in the Whois. We got an initial report out and canceled all the rest of the calls till Durban. So I'd be okay even just canceling next week as well.

James Bladel: Okay. Well let's put out a doodle poll. Let's just - how about we just kind of agree that we will not meet on July 8, which is the Monday before the Durban meeting.

And we'll put a doodle poll out to - on July 1 but with a strong - I don't want to say strong prejudice to the idea that we won't meet because we have, as you mentioned, hit this natural watershed in our work where we've got a good chunk of effort behind us. We've got another chunk of effort in front of us. And not sure that it makes a whole lot of sense to dive into that when we only have a couple of - a couple of meetings (or meeting).

But then we could come out of Durban I think and everyone - we can revisit our work plan. But I think we can come out of Durban with a shared understanding that our next milestone is an initial report.

And that we would be then driving our efforts particularly on these last four charter questions and those existential questions that we define those larger questions who would be driving towards our initial report with a targeted date.

I think we'd have to take a look at the work plan. But I think the target for that was some time in August give or take. Late August maybe, which we'll all

have its own challenges, right, because a lot of folks tend to disappear between July 31 and Labor Day.

So let's go - let's proceed that. Let's just focus on the July 1 call whether we should have it or not. If there's compelling reason to have it, we'll see. And we'll put out a doodle poll on that. Otherwise if not, please monitor the list. We'll adjourn a little bit early today and watch for that doodle poll and if we do end up canceling next week's call, then we'll see everyone in Durban.

Man: Thanks James. Thanks Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks James.

Man: Great job.

Mike O'Connor: See you all soon.

Woman: (Unintelligible). Thank you James. Thanks Mikey.

Man: Thank you.

Man: James.

END