

**ICANN Transcription**  
**IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP WG**  
**Thursday, 08 December 2016 at 1700 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group call on the Thursday, 08 December 2016 at 17:00 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. Attendance may be also found at:

<mailto:https://community.icann.org/x/jpnDAw>

The audio is also available at:

[mailto: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-crp-access-08dec16-en.mp3](mailto:http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-crp-access-08dec16-en.mp3)

**Attendees:**

David Maher – RySG  
George Kirikos – Individual  
Jay Chapman – Individual  
Paul Tattersfield – Individual  
Petter Rindforth - IPC  
Phil Corwin – BC

**Apologies:**

Mason Cole – RySG  
Osvaldo Novoa - ISPCP

**ICANN staff:**

Mary Wong  
Dennis Chang  
Steve Chan  
Berry Cobb  
Michelle DeSmyter

Operator: Recording has started.

Michelle Desmyter: Great thanks so much, appreciate it. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Right Protection Mechanisms Working Group call on the 8th of December at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today we do have Petter Rindforth, Jay Chapman, George Kirikos, David Maher, Paul Tattersfield and Phil Corwin. We do have apologies from Mason Cole and Osvaldo Novoa

From staff we have Steve Chan, Dennis Chang, Berry Cobb and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And I'll turn the call back over to Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: Thank you, Petter here. First, are there any statements of interest? I see no hands up. Before we continue with the first real topic on the agenda I just wanted to make a note on I think it was (Josh) (Unintelligible) sent an email regarding the (unintelligible) done last week of (800,000) malicious domain names worldwide. Were taken on by the US Department of Justice (unintelligible) other international authorities.

And you'll note that I don't know whether it's too obvious to put into a report but perhaps we might reiterate that the (UDRP) (URS) compliments and replays of existing potential legal actions including criminal investigations, charges by authority. Not just civil actions brought by complainants.

A great idea certainly avenues to pursue (unintelligible) and (UDRP) (URS) the only weapons in their arsenal. And I think actually it's a good idea to make some maybe somewhere initially in our report just a short general

notice to remind without any specific identifications of these other legal - possible legal actions. But to remind what we are discussing here is one of two possibilities through (UDRP) and the (URS). And there are maybe especially when it comes to organizations like (IGS) that there are possibilities for other legal actions. (Unintelligible) point to make in the report.

I - yes I see from the chatroom that it's - there is no specific objections to that. So I don't have prepared any specific description of how that (unintelligible) should be put in. But we can think about it and maybe I'll have some suggestions from the staff where and how it should be mentioned.

Okay so thanks for that. Then we go over to point two, review of discussions as - at ICANN (57) and the (GAC) communicate and working group session. I - I'm not 100% sure what we are supposed to decide on this point. As far as I remember we noted what (GAC) said at the ICANN meeting and we have replied and we have actually we have consider the protections in the more - even the more broader way than they have suggested. But I don't know if Phil has anything to add to that from the discussion as the council on this topic.

Phil Corwin: Yes thank you Petter, Phil for the record. I think we've pretty much on a prior call covered - well certainly discussed that and that's been incorporated in part of the report as well. So I'm not sure if there's - I'm open if other members in the working group want to bring up anything further on the (hydro bad) discussion or the result in (GAC) communicate. But I think we've pretty well covered that.

Petter Rindforth: Yes that was I also noted. So okay so can we whereby leave that point? I think we are finished with that and proceed with comments on the initial draft report and here is we'll start with section six. If we can have the latest version up. Thanks let's see if I can make it a little bit bigger on my screen or my perhaps open it separately. I'll scroll up.

What I have here is the updated, December 7, and I'll scroll it down to see if there's anything we need to especially discuss here. Yes, Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes Petter I was just wondering, I know (unintelligible) sent in some comments on this, I sent in some minor final tweaks earlier this week. Can staff just inform us whether all the input received from working group members is reflected in the draft we have on screen?

Petter Rindforth: I think, yes maybe George, your note on page nine just came out on email. I don't think that's included. And off of what you sent, Phil, today may not...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Yes what I sent out last night my time, I guess early this morning your time was some rather extensive additions and modifications of section four which I wouldn't expect to be incorporated yet. But I didn't think we were going to finish section four today. But the stuff I submitted on section six was two or three days ago.

Petter Rindforth: Oh yes.

Phil Corwin: It wasn't much in terms of - it was just less than a dozen very fine tune tweaks adding a word, changing some grammar you know. So I don't know if that's reflected but I just want to know if staff can inform us if all the proposed revisions of section six received from working group members are reflected in the draft before us right now.

Petter Rindforth: Yes Mary Wong just arrived and she's typing - yes all are reflected except Phil's latest.

Phil Corwin: And Mary Wong when you say my latest on section four which I submitted last night my time? Or I submitted some section six changes two, three days ago.

Petter Rindforth: If I understand Mary Wong correctly it's what you sent out last night that's not included.

Phil Corwin: Okay yes okay. Okay so this document before us is - contains all proposed revisions from working group members. So if we can agree to them it can be the final section six.

Petter Rindforth: Yes. So okay if I go for the first page, we have the working groups (unintelligible) questions are. We have comments here, if we look at what the questions were that statement's - it's misleading, the first question out of (faulty) primary stat ideas and (unintelligible) don't already have access to the (UDRP) and the (URS). It's clear that as a working group that we are provided evidence that (unintelligible) already do have process to the (UDRP) and (URS).

The real (PDP) was about possible expansion on that access and or adjusting the playing field in favor of one side or the other. And Mary Wong had noted that the questions were taken directly from the working group chapter. So suggesting - retaining the current language.

And I think it's - we need to keep that language as it was originally priced at. And I also think that our text and our explanations and our - what we have computed prove that there is in fact a way for - especially for idea but also for (INDO)'s to use these and dispute resolution systems. Can we keep it that way George? Hands up.

George Kirikos: Sorry I was muted, George Kirikos here for the transcript. Is it possible we might be able to put something in a footnote instead of modifying the main text? Because the question did have a false premise so if somebody read that just saying the preliminary answer is no you know they might not read the entire report, they might just see that and say look you know I can't not address the concerns, so I was a little bit worried about that.

That people might take that one sentence out of context without reading the rest of the report. So the fact that they did have access to the (UDRP) and (URS) already you know I think is an important point to make somewhere. And that might be the best place because you know the questions that were in the charter you know definitely have premise.

Petter Rindforth: Yes and thanks. Adding that to what Phil just - also said in the chatroom I believe that elsewhere in the report we point out that we found evidence that (unintelligible) have used the (UDRP) which is correct. Maybe we can have that note and referring to that fact and say something. Because I think even if I don't have the full text in my head right now I think that we are also noting that in full report somewhere later on. So we can make a note stating that they actually have that possibility which is also further described in the report and some reference to where that is.

And we'll see just - Mary Wong's typing. Based on actual questions that we were asked by the council. Yes, but can we use it that way to have the initial question as it is and with some kind of footnote referring to that we have - well that they actually have (unintelligible) further described the (unintelligible) that they have the possibility to use and that they have used the systems.

I'm still waiting for the chatroom, let's see. I think a footnote that references the finding (unintelligible) is sufficient, yes. And again I don't have a full final suggestion for that footnote but if we can just decide to add one. And Mary Wong confirmed that we will make necessary adjustments. Thanks, good.

I don't go into details the small additions here for instance point three extremely limited instances are probability of a scenario. Having (unintelligible) (UDRP) (URS) complaint from which a respondent appeals. Nothing to add or change to that.

And then we come to the next page, the working group's attention for the recommendation and point five, recommendation and preservation or long standing legal right to appeal to a court or (unintelligible) authority to deny judicial access. And then we have the sentence for (IGO)'s to concluded rather early on deliberations that these organizations have the ability to file - have filed (UDRP) and (URS) complaints by virtue of having national trade (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) stand in the same (unintelligible) position as other private parties.

Phil okay?

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: Sorry I missed that, yes.

Phil Corwin: Oh most of these the little inserts you've been reading all came from either our just final edits just to make things a little tighter and clearer.

Petter Rindforth: Yes good because I'm actually looking at a Word document and I presume you confirm that it's your - you sent out enough that I'm reading from. So if you have - just raise your hand if you have a specific...

Phil Corwin: Yes I'll just respond if anybody thinks any of them are incorrect or confusing but I just wanted to claim the credit or the blame that most of these come from that final edit I turned in a few days ago.

Petter Rindforth: Yes it's - and also just a small (unintelligible) following (unintelligible) conclusion that (UDRP) and (URS) do not need to be amended in order, yes.

Well page three frankly I think so that we don't miss so much time I just scroll it down to see where we have more extended for just amendment comments and you can raise your hand if there is anything. And of course by having said that this came to the page four where if Mary Wong has deleted

(unintelligible) data publication, etcetera, etcetera. I'm not sure why it's deleted but I see no hands up so we accept that.

And then we go further to very clean page, five, page six, nothing there, I guess page eight is the next major - okay, let's see. So page eight and change...

George Kirikos: George Kirikos here, maybe I can help.

Petter Rindforth: Yes the recommendation for (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

George Kirikos: The point, George Kirikos for the transcript, I was - the point I was trying to make is that one of the important reasons we allow the appeals to the court is to ensure that you know the (UDRP) and the (URS) don't diverge from the national laws. That the national laws are ultimately the (unintelligible) of these disputes. If there was never any appeal allowed to the courts than what would happen is that the arbitration systems would develop in a parallel manner and could deviate immensely from the national court and there'd be no national court to act as a safeguard to ensure that you know that they don't diverge from each other.

So that was the point I was trying to make. And we know that for a fact that you know multiple three party, unanimous decisions in the (UDRP) system have been overturned in the courts and overturned where the winner in (UDRP) was forced to pay the costs like a loser in the (UDRP). Like it was 180 degree different decision. So I mean that was the point I was trying to make. And so if we eliminated, sorry if we force mandatory arbitration with appeals to the court then that's a risk to the entire system.

Petter Rindforth: Okay are we talking about page eight?



George Kirikos: That's the comment in the side - to the side. I don't know if you're looking at the screen on the Adobe Connect but it's the comment that Mary Wong wrote in the right hand column of the - so it's not reflected in the document yet. Oh sorry, I guess is it on page nine?

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Yes Steve, this is Phil, Steve Sheng, can you unlock, until the page is unlocked I cannot move the page over to read the comment, okay thank you now I can read it.

Okay Phil again, George this is a long comment, did you have specific - it's probably too long to insert it. Did you have specific language to suggest insert to make the point about the (UDRP) and (URS) and you know ultimately taking a backseat to national law?

Petter Rindforth: It would be good to have it in one sentence.

George Kirikos: I can maybe work on something. But do people agree that the point should be made? If people disagree that the point should be made then you know that off beats the - I mean I don't need to add a sentence. But do people agree the point is important, or have thoughts on that?

Petter Rindforth: See (unintelligible) as well but I have no problem in adding that but as I said if you can make it to one or two sentences it may also be more clear for the reader what we want to state there.

George Kirikos: Okay maybe...

Phil Corwin: Yes...

George Kirikos: Go ahead.

Petter Rindforth: Yes?

George Kirikos: I think Phil was about to speak.

Petter Rindforth: Yes Phil?

Phil Corwin: Oh Phil, George we don't expect you to write that sentence now. We can - you can submit it after the call. But I think the point we want to make is that one, (UDRP) and (URS) are an alternative to but they don't replace. And they ultimately are secondary to existing legal rights. And also that just as we're ultimately allowing the option of letting national courts determine the merits of the case we're also letting them determine the merits of an (IGO)'s claim to jurisdiction.

Petter Rindforth: Yes okay, I agree if you sent out if possible before - well at the end of tomorrow some short revision.

George Kirikos: Okay I'll do that.

Petter Rindforth: That we have agreed to add that. Good, nothing more that page. If - was it - let's see alright page ten.

Phil Corwin: Yes Petter, Phil, I have my hand up regarding page nine.

Petter Rindforth: Yes okay yes.

Phil Corwin: At the bottom of page nine under further discussion of option two the first bullet point, I'm fine with the general bullet point. I'd like to propose that it be one potential disadvantage. The amount to which it - to some extent you know on that precisely arbitration ERDP and (URS) are a form of non-judicial determination of rights and remedies. And it also depends on sophistication of the registrant if they're a commercial sophisticated commercial party they

might have a lot of familiarity with arbitration procedures and commercial disputes.

So I would like to just temper that by saying one potential disadvantage just that tweak of the first bullet point if that's acceptable to the rest of the working group. Thank you.

Petter Rindforth: (Unintelligible), good. Okay yes page ten I think, I'm not sure if there is any added points or more. Just point out in a more readable way the points and stuff, however similarly. I don't think it's anything that's added.

(Jay Chapman): Petter this is (Jay) if I may?

Petter Rindforth: Yes?

(Jay Chapman): This is (Jay Chapman) for the transcript. I just wanted to acknowledge George had made a point I believe this is where he had mentioned that between I guess if we're on page ten, one, two, three bullet points up from the last bullet point that starts with however, he made mention that we might put an or there where it says or leaving a registrant - they made that correction as well. So of leaving a registrant with no or limited choices. And I think that's a good addition and it kind of makes everything make sense, thanks.

Petter Rindforth: Yes thanks for that, I agree.

Phil Corwin: Phil here, I was about to make the same grammatical point so (Jay)'s taken care of it.

Petter Rindforth: Good. Okay I'm scrolling down, page 11, 12 - be that what I have here page 13, when gets added the working group presume given the state of the (unintelligible) to have access to characterized protections at no or

exceedingly low cost that (unintelligible) approach whether they set objections from them. I think that is something new we can leave that way.

And - oh thank you, page 14, not much. Page 15, the working group believes that (unintelligible) publically available information review by the working group. It appears that no further action was taken on (unintelligible) in light of the fact that it has been over a decade since that proposal was scoped and given that the working group's recent research really is that some (unintelligible) do in fact weigh their (unintelligible) and submit a new jurisdiction clause in bringing a (unintelligible) action with note 15 there.

The present (unintelligible) do not justify (unintelligible) (UDRP) and (URS) in order to provide idea but broad immunity protection. That's the (unintelligible). It looks like it's in the action items on the report. That's what - something else I think.

Okay scrolling down. The last note on page 16. Question for the group - should the discussion and table from section four be highlighted or even moved to section six (unintelligible). The table inspection for comparing the recommendations perhaps be moved to after section six to make sense chronically, (unintelligible) analyzed, contrasted (unintelligible) group proposed after our recommendation.

And what it means is that we should put it separately to note that that work is not specific part of a working group but we have considered - yes Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes as I recall that's a comparison of what the (IGO) small group as for versus what we wound up doing on those issues. And while I think it could be argued either way I think it makes a little more sense to have that table in the section four which discusses our deliberations on the small group proposal rather than in this section six which says that our final recommendations.

I understand the arguments for moving it here but I think it works better if when people are reading our discussion of how we analyzed and reacted to the small group proposal that they can see in table form right there where things wound up and they can still go to section six and read this full - which is separate, it's the full recommendations of which the small group proposal was a portion of our deliberation but it wasn't - it was just a part that led to the final recommendation. So I guess I'm coming down in favor of leaving it where it is.

Petter Rindforth: Okay I was going to say see Mary Wong's comments in the chat room that's why we didn't include it based on section six as the recommendations for the working group at this time on small group proposal. So - and I suggest that we keep it as it is and Steve?

Steve Sheng: Thanks Petter this is Steve from staff. And I want to note that we put some work into the initial report as you all know. And the new template for the initial and final reports the recommendations actually take place in the chronology of the report before any deliberations. I think that might actually help address George's point, thanks.

Petter Rindforth: Okay thanks Steve. Phil did you want to say anything else at this point? No, okay. So then we are ready with this six and if there are any further comments we can actually also discuss the section four draft. Where I see a lot of comments - yes?

Phil Corwin: Petter, Phil here, while we're waiting for staff to put up a revised section four I just want to note that other than the language that George will submit that we'll look at next week we've just essentially finished our consideration and have a final recommendations section except for that sentence or two he's going to propose that we'll look at next week. So we have just completed the most important section of the report with that one caveat and I think that's a great achievement.

Petter Rindforth: Yes excellent. Good so then we have section four which is the deliberations of the (unintelligible) working group. And I'm scrolling down here as well. I'll skip the very small additions on page two. We have (unintelligible) we have some (unintelligible) but I presume that's nothing - it's just divide. So we proceed further to page three, Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes thank you Petter, Phil for the record. I just want to note for the working group members that in the revision I submitted last evening my time, on page one on section 4-1 after the partial list of the significant documents and materials I actually have proposed insert a page and a half of language that basically gives a one paragraph summation of the most important points of those historic documents which I thought was important for both explaining how we got to our final recommendations and also frankly you know anticipating some potential allegations that we didn't take them properly into account. So I thought it was important to have a little summary of this most salient point that each one of those - was it seven documents?

So that's not before us today, it will be before us over the next week and on the call but I just wanted to note that for the - those working group members who hadn't looked at what I sent out last night.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks Phil, I don't have it in front of me but I presume it's - is it short enough we can just briefly say it by phone?

Phil Corwin: It's up to you whether you want to go through the full report first and then look at my proposals or - since we're not incorporating it. Or jump to that, I defer to you; you're Chair on the call.

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: (Unintelligible) added on page one, something initially. But could be good for us to hear what you proposed.

Phil Corwin: Well I'll leave it to the working group. You want to look at those summaries now that's fine. Or they can be merged into the document and highlighted as changes and reviewed during the coming week by working group members and finalized on the next call. I'm okay with either approach.

Petter Rindforth: See no other further comments on that. Okay let's proceed with the document we have in front of us.

Phil Corwin: Yes I think that's probably best.

Petter Rindforth: Yes I think so. So I think (unintelligible) so we all have anything - we have it in front of us when we decide and discuss about it.

Okay I will scroll down to page four, down there on the left page I think (unintelligible) working group knows the potential particularly on (unintelligible) ideas in the initial request to (unintelligible) on their names in the top of second level of the domain system. In which they stated the names and acronyms, all ideas protected within the scope of (unintelligible) for the protections of industry property. (Unintelligible) contracting parties as referred in article 16 on (unintelligible) agreement, related aspects on (unintelligible). And note we have to read that more. Okay.

(Unintelligible) said perhaps next week will be the last call for edits (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) active on this get in their final reviews. And (unintelligible) separate the updated draft along with a full draft report to the list before the next meeting, the next week's meeting. Yes that's what we need.

I'm scrolling down. I see not specific (unintelligible) changes. Perhaps the first sentence of page six, working group thinks I can start providing, (unintelligible) staff resources and this financial support (unintelligible) that request. Now, yes here. We have recommendation number four in section six below. We need to provide the entirety of the (unintelligible) start of this

preliminary report and the cross reference that text here. If that's something that will be provided by staff or is it something that we should decide on here? I presume it's more just to site some minor part of that text.

And point 4.4, some of the text here might change or be moved depending on the extent that the other section ended up (unintelligible) previous (unintelligible). Note that the different section to (unintelligible) will list the (unintelligible). It might be appropriate to list the relevant (GAC) advise concerning ideas in that section rather than here. So that's something we will see, I presume, when we have the report more computed by next week.

And then there's also a note on page seven that the reference to (NDPC). But it implies that (NDPC) is part of the small group and I don't think that is correct rather than the (unintelligible) currently in discussions with a small group of (GAC) and representatives.

Phil Corwin: Petter, Petter, Phil here, and there's others in the chat room. The document we're looking at doesn't have any of these changes marked.

Petter Rindforth: Okay.

Phil Corwin: So I'm not sure which document you're looking at but those of us in the chat room looking at what's on display...

Petter Rindforth: Okay that's - I presume it's, I'm looking at the one that was sent out by (unintelligible). So I presume that these changes are actually...

Phil Corwin: Yes I think all those changes have already been accepted.

Petter Rindforth: Yes good.

Phil Corwin: And are no longer highlighted in the document on display.



Petter Rindforth: Excellent.

Phil Corwin: So we can go a (unintelligible) and just point out which page and which paragraph we're looking at.

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

Phil Corwin: I think that would help us all follow, thanks.

Petter Rindforth: I'm now on page nine. I haven't seen any significant changes in the other pages on the paragraph two there.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos here.

Petter Rindforth: Yes?

George Kirikos: Are you looking at the Adobe document or are you looking at a document on your own computer because they might not be the same. Like the one in the Adobe was updated December 7.

Petter Rindforth: I have to make it a little bit bigger here because that's my...

George Kirikos: Yes you have to - if you click on the icon that says...

((Crosstalk))

George Kirikos: It makes it a little bit bigger and then make the window as dark as possible.

Petter Rindforth: Here we are.

Phil Corwin: Yes Phil here, I just want to note that starting on page nine all of the proposed modifications of the chart are ones that I submitted earlier this week. So I'll take the credit or blame for anyone who likes them or differs with

them. But they're all just to provide a little more clarification and precision in this chart.

Petter Rindforth: Yes I think it's - okay I also made a few edits in the charts. I see no objections to that.

And then we go to page ten. Anyone that's...

Phil Corwin: Petter, Phil. There's one change I recommend which hasn't been done yet and it's on the bottom of page ten and the top of page 11. It's that last paragraph in the middle column regarding policy guidance document developed and issued clarifying that (IGO)'s have the option of follow-through and assigning licensee or agent. It's in the section on rapid release but that's a recommendation we made for both (UDRP) and (URS). So I had suggested that it either, that it be broken out and it's really not something that the (IGO)'s had proposed. So that it just being a separate box where there was no corresponding small group proposal, this is what we propose for both the (UDRP) and (URS). It's just not in the right place right now.

It looks like it's just - the way it's in the chart it looks like it's just for record for (URS) when our recommendation is that that option of filing through the third party is available for both the (UDRP) and the (URS). So I still want to point that out and suggest that it be moved to its own box where there's a blank for the small group proposal, where there's that language in the middle and then there's the paragraph that explains it over there. So it's basically just breaking it out from under the rapid release because leaving it there could lead to a misunderstanding by people reading the report and relying on the chart that it would solely be for (URS) but not for (UDRP). So I just wanted to point that out.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks for reminding me about that, I saw that in your email earlier and my initial conclusion was it's a good idea to make it more clear visually. That is to separate it. Let's, let's do that.

Okay now I'm on page ten. Nothing there. Very small changes. Same on page 11 and page 12. So it seems that with the small proposed changes we can also accept this part. It's good.

Okay - we, yes?

Phil Corwin: Yes, Phil here. Yes I'm fine with provisional acceptance of this part subject to that part about filing through third party, being broken out of the chart and also subject to review next week of the new language I submitted last night. Particularly that extensive synopsis of the key historic documents that would be in the first section. I don't know - with four minutes left we probably don't want to try to get into reviewing that now.

Petter Rindforth: No I think as I said this is always better to have it written so all can see it clear and decide from that. But it's - we also make it clear that before the call next week we have all the final proposals and can make the decisions next week.

So then we go to the internet date of publication, of initial report and other milestones. I'll leave it to Mary Wong to update us on that.

Mary Wong: I Petter, Phil and everyone. This is Mary Wong from staff and I'm also hoping that Steve can chime in because he's been very invaluable in this effort. All initial thought as Petter and Phil know is that we will try to get a full version of the entire draft initial report to the working group by early next week if not before that will incorporate the changes that were discussed today.

So I guess one question we have for everyone is whether there is a need to have a meeting next week? Or if people would prefer to use the time to review the entire report plus the updated text from these sections four and six and provide feedback on the list with the view to having a potentially final call on the subject on the 22nd.

And then we would have time to update the document and aim as - and George has now noted in the Adobe chat to publish the initial report in early January.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks Mary Wong. Maybe if we don't each time need to spend a full hour but I think it's good to still have a call next week on the agenda to get us updated on what has been discussed and decided today and also with Phil's draft. And if we don't spend the full hour that's perfectly okay. But it's I think it's worthwhile to keep the call as we are in the final phase so that we can all discuss whatever possible additions and amendments that will come up.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Phil chiming in, I tend to agree. As I - but I think we also may be able to do it at a full hour next week. As I understand it by early next week we will have a draft of a full report with all the sections in which section six is already complete and accepted other than the sentence or two that George is going to get to us the next couple of days. And we can quickly dispose of that.

Section four is accepted subject to moving that part in the chart about filing through third party and incorporating the additional changes I submitted last night. But we can all look at that by mail. So if everyone reviews that in advance we could very quickly accept those additional changes on the call.

And then the other sections we haven't seen yet which are more as I understand it they're not like these and being highly subsidy they're more boiler plate, the charter, the full text of the memo, things like that. So if we get those early in the week and people review them before the call we could rather quickly I would say in less than 30 minutes identify anything that needs to be discussed and just accept the rest of it.

Am I correct in what we're going to have? And does that sound like a sound way to proceed?

Petter Rindforth: I agree. I don't know if Mary Wong for example has other conclusions. But I said even if we don't meet a full hour it's still good to collect and have a quick chat and make some final decisions. Yes Mary Wong?

Mary Wong: Thanks Petter and Phil. And as I noted in Adobe yes that's right Phil. So Steve and I have just been chatting and we do have actually a lot of the rest of the report done in draft form. So what we will do is integrate the discussion from today including your recent edits and take a quick look through those and basically try to send a single document integrating all of the latest discussion with the sections that you folks have not seen but do it as a single document to everyone by early next week.

Phil Corwin: Thanks Mary Wong and - Phil speaking. Yes and some of those new parts like the (unintelligible) memo we're just putting it as text. The charter, we're just putting in the text. So a lot of it is going to require little or no review by members of the working group where I think it you know have a short call next week, we may not even need a call on the 22nd. We may be essentially done at the end of next week. We'll just see where we wind up.

Petter Rindforth: Yes I agree, that sounds like a good way to work this out. And well I presume that there are no - any other business?

George Kirikos: George Kirikos here.

Petter Rindforth: Yes George sorry.

George Kirikos: Yes (unintelligible) we might want to go back to the member's list and make sure that you know the people who have been members may not have attended - may not have attended the last few meetings get a last chance to submit their comments. Like I know (Jim) Bikoff had attended a lot of meetings, Kathy Kleinman, (Laurie) (unintelligible), I'm not sure if they've all read the latest draft but we probably want to get as many people as possible to be in agreement with the document.

Petter Rindforth: Yes I hear a lot of loud in the background but I heard what you said and when we're sending out the invitation for the call next week it's good to indicate that this may be the last meeting to discuss the draft. And remember all members to come up with auto written suggestions and or to participate in that meeting.

Okay so that's all for today. Thank you and we'll see each other again for second minutes next week and then we will have more or less the final document to view. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Bye all, great work.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, again the meeting has been adjourned, Operator please stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines.

END