

**ICANN Cartagena Meeting  
PPSC Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Sunday 05 December 2010 at 0900 local**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Coordinator: Excuse me this is the conference coordinator. At this time I would like to remind parties today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect. Thank you, you may begin.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. Good morning everyone. This is Jeff Neuman, Chair of the Policy Process Steering Committee. And from now until approximately 10:00 am we have a normal session of the PPSC. It's open so anyone's welcome to listen in and contribute if you'd like.

I'm going to have - why don't I have Marika if you can just or someone can do the roll, just to see who we've got. I mean I'll say who we've got in the room here.

We've got Alan Greenberg. We've got myself. We've got Tim Ruiz. And I know on the call we've got Jay Scott and we have Marilyn Cades, all members of the PPSC.

And of course we have from staff we have (Margie) and Marika and Glen and others listening in.

So just to check should we have do we have any one year from the BC? Yes well Marilyn I think you are yes Marilyn Cade but Marilyn Cade is an individual.

We have Jay Scott from the IPC. We do not have Tony Harris or Tony Holmes from the ISPs. Do we have anyone from the non-commercials?

Right so we have apologies from Tony Holmes. Say that again, I'm sorry? Okay Avri said she's going to come but she's not here yet. We have myself from the registries we have Tim Ruiz from the registrars, no one here from the NCA and okay.

So the purpose of today's meeting really is to finalize the working group work team reports so that we can send it to the council so that the counsel can with our recommendation open up a public comment period followed by a council hopefully and approval of the working group work team report or alternatively to send it back if there's any issues or questions to clarify.

So with that said when the PPSC just to remind everyone when the PPSC got the working group work team's final report we had only a few issues that the PPSC believed needed to be clarified.

Remember the instructions to the PPSC were not to redo any of the work that the working group work team did. And if there are any questions that was really to be sent back to the working group work team.

The working group work team chaired by Jay Scott responded to all of those concerns with a revised redline draft along with explanations of each of the changes.

And the PPSC then took those changes and had just a few additional clarifications. And those are what we're here to discuss so we can finalize it.

And I think we can - we'll probably take a vote through email just to make sure we get those people that aren't attending this meeting right now so we can make sure that we have hopefully full consensus of the PPSC to send it to the council.

So with that said any questions on what we need to do here? Jay Scott anything you want to add on what we need to do here?

Jay Scott: No.

Jeff Neuman: Great. So we had a call last week on December 1st and I believe hammered out all of the substantive issues and it's now really a question of language.

I want to double check with everyone that we're on the same page with the substance. And then Jay Scott has graciously volunteered on his long plane ride out here tomorrow to draft it so that we could have the final language by tomorrow night, Monday night, approve it hopefully by email on Tuesday. And then I can then report to the council on Wednesday that we have that ready to send to them.

Man: Can Marika just for the group tell the two areas where we all going to do the additional language? I think there were only two isn't that correct Marika?

Jeff Neuman: Yes there were well we'll go over those now.

Man: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: I think you're right. I think there we're only a couple that actually needed some language.

The first issue that - there were a total of four issues that had come out by the PPSC in our discussions.

And the first one was determining level of consensus and there was some explanations in the report that didn't seem to go along with what some of our understanding was. But it was just a clarification.

And what it says here in Marika's notes was that we expressed a concern about how the wording was defined, is was it workable?

The RAA and registry contracts allow contracted parties to question claims and consensus on policies.

And the language that Jay Scott was going to draft was to replace the current language which basically - sorry I'm trying to read the notes here on the Adobe.

Do you want to - do you have something to pull a specific part up? Is there a way to pull that up on the - yes so I just want to go to that section.

Hold with us, we're going to pull up the document, put it on Adobe.

Oh and by the way if you put something in the Chat room for some reason I can't into the Chat so hopefully Marika you can let me know if someone said something on the Chat that needs to be repeated.

That's fine, if you want to just go straight to it that's fine.

Right so the first one was the paragraph that's in the middle now which is the wording says in the report based on the working group's needs and/or chair's discretion working group participants may request that their name not be associated explicitly with any consensus view position.

In cases where a group member represents a minority viewpoint their name should be explicitly linked especially in those cases where polls were taken.

Now on the call we discussed that the point really of this provision was that if there was full consensus there was no need for in the report necessarily for it to say to list each person individually but to just state that it was a full consensus.

But if there were minority opinions or anyone that didn't agree with the consensus that the intent was to definitely list them out.

I think the concern was that if there was full consensus that, you know, we didn't want someone later on to agree to, you know, if they initially agreed as part of the consensus we didn't want them later on to sort of question it.

We wanted to have an accurate record of everybody that was supporting or not supporting a particular position.

The language isn't perfect on that. And Jay Scott was taking the action item to make that point clear. Is there something that Marilyn, did you have a comment on that?

Marilyn Cade: I have a clarification. I should know this but I don't. In our document does it in some place it says full consensus means blah, blah, blah yes? The full consensus does not mean unanimity. So am I right?

Jeff Neuman: Actually full consensus does mean unanimity. There's a consensus which is a level below that. It's in there. TI's on page...

Marilyn Cade: Sorry I'm rolling my eyes because we are inventing terminology that is different then...

Jay Scott: Well Marilyn this terminology was pulled from previous documentation that's been used at ICANN.

Marilyn Cade: I know that was what I was just thinking I was read - I was remembering that Jay Scott. So when you say - never mind. I think you've answered my question. It was consensus I was thinking about not...

Jay Scott: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Got it.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So when there's anyone that's got a minority opinion or doesn't agree with the consensus the intent is really to call that out in the report.

So is everyone still good with that or Alan's given me a puzzled look? No, okay. Oh sorry, okay. Everyone in this room is good with that. Okay so that's what Jay Scott is clarifying.

Jay Scott: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Just (one through five), Jay Scott. And then yes, I might just - you know what, maybe I could just - yes why don't we put that back up. Sorry, I keep changing my mind here.

So the second point was while it's getting - there it is. The second point is who may question a consensus call?

I think in the paper we got back it wasn't expressly clear but the point was that, you know, you had to draw sort of a line between someone questioning to kind of be harassing to stop the process versus, you know, legitimate questions of consensus.

And what we had decided on the call was that, you know, look everyone should be able to or I should say anyone to be able to question the consensus.

But if it's only one individual that they should make their best attempt to work with the chair to resolve those issues first. And then obviously, so what it says here, I'll just read what we wrote in the notes which is language to clarify that an individual working group member may work with the chair liaison if there's disagreement with the designation given to a position to ensure that the onus is on the chair or liaison to determine whether there's an issue instead of a working group having to recruit support from working group members.

The language that's currently in there made it sound like if someone disagreed they had to get someone else on their side before the chair or liaison would actually consider it or before there could be an appeal.

Here it's really a statement saying encouraging that person or persons to work with the chair liaison to straighten out whatever disagreement there is.

The reason it says chair or liaison is that the issue could be with the chair's designation. And, you know, going back to the chair may not be the most fruitful way to resolve the issue if that's who your issue is with.

So again it's kind of a minor change of language. It's really what was intended. It's just the language wasn't as clear as it could be. All right, Jay Scott that's on your plate as well?

Jay Scott: That's done. That's it.

Jeff Neuman: And the other two issues we actually resolved which was just to restate what they were which was we had talked about or added some provisions about liaison neutrality and made it clear that, you know, liaison is free to always say that this is my personal opinion but really when they're performing their job as a liaison they have to be neutral. And they have to do it as that liaison to the council because they do have a very specific role of informing the council objectively as to what's going on, reporting any difficulties that the

working group may be encountering and making sure the council's providing the support.

And, you know, for those of you that were around for yesterday's discussion, you know, I think the role of the council liaison is extremely important. And, you know, there's been a lot of miscommunication or lack of communication with the council these days. And in fact I don't even know who our council liaison is from the PPSC.

And so I think we had one at one point and we should have one but we don't. And I think that's caused some of the problems.

And I think the OSC may be in kind of a similar position. But, you know, that kind of causes some of the consternation between counsel and the working group.

So that's really resolved as well. And then the last one is definition of consensus. And this was an issue that the registries had raised that there was some language that was added by the working group. And if you want to pull that up which we're going to I think Marika you're going to move that to a footnote right? I don't know if you've already done that. Okay.

Okay so what the - what was added from the working group work team was on Page 15 right? Is that it?

Sorry, Page 16. I tried to do that from memory. It didn't work. So there was some language added to the consensus definition which states that a consensus is where - is a position where only a small minority disagree but most agree.

And then there was a sentence that was added to the end of that which it says this is sometimes just referred to as rough or near consensus.

And the registries had an issue with that because, you know, that's a term that's not very familiar in the ICANN world and there was a concern with the contracted parties that something less - that using the term rough consensus actually implied something less than consensus.

And so what we're going to do because that is a term of art in other groups is to drop that second sentence into a footnote which explains for those that may be new to the ICANN world but may come from other areas where these terms are used to really just explain in a footnote that to some people this may mean the same thing but it's not intended in the ICANN world to lower the standard of what constitutes consensus.

Looking around the room to see if there's any questions on that. Anyone on the phone any questions on that?

That's really it. Those are the four issues that we had. It seems like all of them are resolved subject to language.

And I want to just go around the room now because I really want to make sure that once the language comes unless there's some, you know, specific issue with the drafting I want to make sure that we're not going to get any substantive issues with the working group report so we can send it on.

Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can just comment on the process of getting that done because I know you really want to move it fast and then maybe have it, you know, for the council on Wednesday.

But I think we need a little bit more time especially some members of the PPSC are not here. And I don't either right now, I don't expect most discussion may be on the language that Jay Scott puts out. But I think people should get a couple of days to look at the language that Jay Scott circulated.

If there are no comments I'll go ahead and integrate at all. And then I think we still need to put out the whole document to the whole PPSC and saying look here's the whole document. This is your last chance.

You get one week and, you know, if we don't hear from you we assume you're happy with it and we submit it to the council to make sure that everyone has opportunity as several members actually not here I think.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I think that's fine. And if anyone does have the chance to review it before the council meeting and wants to vote in favor of it that would be helpful.

Either way I'm going to report the status to the council and hopefully give a good indication that this is coming to them in the next week or so, that the full report will be coming to them and that we can - I'm not going to say we're going to disband the working group work team because remember it is possible that the council could send some things back in their review.

So the working group work team will still stay in place until such time that the council finally approves the reports or sends - well if they send it back then obviously we're still here.

But hopefully knock on wood - and I'm counting on hopefully - so tomorrow - wait, weight no today's Sunday. On Tuesday's Constituency Stakeholder Day so I'm hoping each of you all each of you can reserve five, ten minutes or more at your sessions to go over this, get your stakeholder group and constituencies on board with this so that there shouldn't be any surprises for the council.

I think there were enough surprises with the OSC work although it really shouldn't have been a surprise. But there were enough surprises. But hopefully we can try to avoid that.

I think we've been through enough cycles on this. And I really - we really do believe it's an important report that should be decided on by the council because it does give some really good pointers and guidelines for working groups in the future.

And especially with some potential new working groups being established at the council on registration abuse and others that may emerge in the next month or so this'll be very good to have in place. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika and just to mention because Jay Scott did give an overview yesterday to the GNSO council, there's some slides with that. So everyone - if anyone wants those slides they're on the Web or you can just ask me and I'm happy to send them as well because they provide a good overview of what is in there and what is still outstanding.

Jeff Neuman: Yes Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: My question is not about this but it's about the discussion that happened yesterday. So tell me...

Jeff Neuman: Well let's just see if there's any questions on the report.

Okay and then let me just throw in, so just remember the next item after we get this to the council, the next item that we are currently slated to do at some point probably second quarter I would say next year hopefully will - we will as a steering committee unless the council changes this which is what Marilyn's going to get into I think, but at least currently we're slated to receive that PDP Work Team Report. And that's going to be very extensive.

There's, you know, the first initial report that came out was 150 pages. The final report will - most of those page - a lot of those pages will be in appendices. We're shortening it for those of you who haven't seen the reports on the wiki so it'll be shorter.

But the important thing to note is that there will be specific text that we're recommending for bylaws, specific text that we are recommending for what we're currently calling a PDP manual or guidebook.

And so they'll be distinctions of what will be in each one. So it's really critical that as long as the council keeps this team together and that's - we'll get into a discussion of what happened yesterday.

But it's very critical that you all pay attention and please, please, please make sure that your representatives, some of you may be the same, but your representatives show up to the PDP work team so that we can get that moving forward.

If the council passes the current resolution, there are a couple resolutions pending with the council right now. Part of one which I think should or may pass is at least it's delivery of a timeline and milestones from the PDP Work Team as to whether we can complete the report or at least the steps that we need to take with temporary or I would say, our best guess as to delivery dates for all of this.

So that's the next item. Please be on the lookout for that. Please pay attention to the list and Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Because the PDP Work Team is not - they're having a working team session but they're not having a workshop or a presentation of the status.

But we did prepare a slide presentation and we've encouraged all the work team members to take it back to the stakeholder groups and constituencies to really go over it and so that people are aware which issues are in there.

Because as Jeff said this is, you know, quite important because it is going to propose bylaw changes and whole section that will go into the GNSO Rules of Procedure.

So (we would) everyone really like to focus on that and be prepared when that report comes out that we get public comments and make sure to take this into account at this level and not wait until we're indeed at the PPSC or the GNSO council level.

So and again I'm happy as well to come to any stakeholder group or constituency to give that presentation if needed. So you can just come and talk to me and I'll be happy to give you the slide deck or provide more information.

Jeff Neuman: Yes Tim?

Tim Ruiz: When you send out the email or the request for approval whatever to the PPSC steering committee team members -- yes that's right -- include the alternates. I don't know if that would be automatic or not.

But I - just looking at the list of members I'm just concerned some may not, you know, really pay attention or I think one's gone actually so...

Marika Konings: Well we did actually recent ask all of the constituencies and stakeholder groups to confirm that these people were still their representatives. And then, you know, we did get feedback these are still the ones we want to have on there.

You know, we didn't hear anything and further. Because I'll check with Glen as well to see on the list if there's indeed anyone that has left or is no longer involved and to double check whether indeed someone else should get added.

But we did recently do that exercise. And I think everyone is on the mailing list so you should normally get the - but maybe you want to - yes Jeff, you want to highlight as well that if the primary cannot respond or review that the alternate should take on that role that at least one of the two has that responsibility.

And I don't know either if you want to, just what Jay Scott has done on the working group work team is more to call like if no one objects by this date we presume you agree.

I don't know if you're to take the same approach or whether you're expecting everyone to affirmatively, you know, know that they agree or...

Jeff Neuman: Well ideally I want everyone affirmatively to agree. And we'll be - I will personally be following up with any group that doesn't.

So hopefully I'll pester them enough to get them to agree. On that...

Jay Scott: Yes but I'm...

Jeff Neuman: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Jay Scott: I'm happy to take on some of that administrative task of contacting people while as vice chair of the PPSC if you need some help...

Jeff Neuman: Great.

Jay Scott: ...that encourage people to participate. Because we need to make sure the roles stay active and the people stay engaged.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Jeff I'll reserve my other question for later. This is a question relevant to this topic if I might. Marilyn Cade for the record.

Can I just probe a little bit further on this issue of whether the approach we're presently taking in order to move our work forward is going to serve us in the future when we get this next document, the PDP?

I'm not a - I'm there in observer capacity. And I'm rarely there and I'm certainly aware of that but I am trying to follow the rules.

But I noticed that I do think we may have some change or need to have some change in participants if - in order to do that next stage of work.

Because it's very difficult to design a PDP process if you actually don't have experience in working within the PDP process.

So maybe we should also talk about which we had considered once before, the idea of a face to face or a more prolonged work period one or two times where we slogged through more of the work than trying to do the frequent conference call.

Jeff Neuman: Anyone have any thoughts on that? You know - Alan?

Alan Greenberg: In terms of a face to face meeting we were beat up pretty bad last time. I'm not sure I want to go through that again unless we have some belief that it's going to be supported.

Jeff Neuman: And (Margie)?

(Margie): Just to follow-up. This is (Margie). When we couldn't do the face to face we did schedule a long conference call on the PDP group and didn't get a lot of participation in that either did we?

Jeff Neuman: No. It was - there just the normal attendance. And actually I want to kind of get - let me get to that for a second and just figure out the participants because I will say - and I know this is being recorded and I generally don't like to call people out but I guess I will.

You know, we've had some attendance, the registrars have been great I will say, you know, between on the PDP work team we've had James and Paul Diaz for every meeting and at least one of them if not both usually for every meeting. What's that? And (Tatianna), sorry. And she's been paying attention as well. She's been there.

On the registry side I've been there. There could be some better attendance from the other registry rep but, you know, I've been there.

From the non-commercials we've had good attendance from (Alex). And Avri has been to a bunch of the meetings recently.

From the ISPs (Wolf) has shown up for a bunch of but meetings for a good amount. Then from the commercial stakeholder group, the other two, from the BC and from the IPC the attendance has been abysmal to say a good word, yes.

So my concern is -- and Jay Scott you're on the line -- there's been a lot of work that's been going on. And I, you know, the goal at least in a workflow with the working group work team was not to have the PPSC review the substantive recommendations unless there was need for clarity or some really outstanding questions. But it wasn't to revisit the topics that were discussed for such a long period of time. And I'd like to follow that approach again with the PPSC for the PDP work team.

My fear is that because the lack of attendance from those two constituencies within the commercial stakeholder group, my fear is that there will be

substantive questions raised during that time period. And that's really something I want to avoid.

So while we still have some outstanding work left and still enough time to get the concerns in on the PDP I really, really strongly please, beg you to go to your groups and get your representatives to attend.

And if they can't attend please appoint someone that can. And when you do appoint someone that can as Marilyn kind of alluded to, please appoint someone that's familiar with PDP processes.

To start someone completely new on this that hasn't been exposed would be very difficult. And so if you could go back and do that we'd greatly appreciate it.

I - sorry I neglected to mention that Alan of course participates regularly from the ALAC and so definitely appreciate that and sorry to leave you out of that explanation.

So that's the next thing...

Alan Greenberg: I'm used to being ignored.

Jeff Neuman: No Alan you've been a very valuable participant to this group and I for one extremely appreciated. Tim yes?

Tim Ruiz: Is the PDP work team looking at - going to be looking at the specific bylaw changes that might need to be made right? Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And we've had assistance from staff and with the general counsel's office at staff to help us draft language that hopefully reflects what we've come up with as a team. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Based on the discussions of the work team that were in the initial reports (Margie) and I worked with our general counsel's office to develop a first draft of the proposed bylaw changes as well as the, what we call the PDP manual that would go into the rules of procedure.

So that's actually current - in the current draft. And it's out on the wikis so, you know, for anyone to have a look into see what's in there.

I mean we're still discussing and going through it. So I'm sure more changes might be made because already some issues we've identified were, you know, working field that certain part of certain provisions should be in the bylaws and certain parts should be in the operating rules.

So there's still work to be done but it's - would give you a general idea of where it's moving towards because it's really moving towards taking most of the detail of the bylaws and moving that into the rules of procedure I think was one of the BCG recommendations and I think most of the counsel have express some of their opinions so that's the direction it's (headed).

Jeff Neuman: Right it's a real delicate balance between, you know, the - obviously the contracted parties have to - the outcome of a PDP may be a consensus policy.

And so contracted parties obviously are very sensitive to make sure that while we understand their needs to be flexibility there also needs to be some certainty as they do affect those contracts.

And I think so far the PDP work team has struck a pretty good balance as to maintaining the flexibility but also given the contracted parties the certainty they need in order to do their business.

So I think very key decisions are being made. And I hope that most of the work is being done at the PDP work team level and it doesn't break out into a huge uproar next year at the council level.

So the best thing to make sure that that happens is make sure that your reps show up and that they're keeping you all up to date as to what's going on.

We are getting towards knock on wood, we're getting towards that final completion.

So just to spend a few minutes on something that Marilyn had brought up. At the council session - take a step back.

The charter for the PPSC is renewed annually. So this will be the second time that it comes up for renewal. And at this meeting if there's no motion to extend the life of the PPSC the group will expire.

I'm not sure what that really means. You know, nothing will really prevent us from meeting but technically the charter will expire.

And if that - you know, obviously none of us want that to happen. So there was a motion introduced by Chuck Gomes that was seconded that really just extends the charter out for another year.

There was a motion then that was - and (Wendy)'s here so I'll let (Wendy) - (Wendy) then introduced a second motion which I'll let her if she wants to just describe or basically the - and I'll try to paraphrase it (Wendy) and you can let me know if I do a horrible job.

But (Wendy)'s motion was basically to thank everyone for the hard work on - and again this apply to both the PPSC in the OSC. So it's both steering committees.

Thank everyone for their hard work and then just let the term expire I guess was the first motion. Essentially that was what is said. And (Wendy)'s shaking her head yes.

Jay Scott: Yes.

(Wendy): Thanks Jeff. My motion was instigated primarily by concern that the council wasn't doing its job of keeping up with the work of these steering committees and was being too lax a delegator of work and that particularly from the OSC side we were seeing things back that we were unhappy with when we tried to apply them but then couldn't engage enough in the process to get done in a, you know, (fashion) that we were more satisfied with.

And so I was hoping to reboot things from the council side of the equation to get counselors more engaged in the monitoring of the work that having processes that have been going on for very long time makes it difficult for new members to get involved because new members to a group are told that they have to go back through all of the archives and come up to speed on everything before they're a full-fledged participant. And that can be a real barrier to involvement.

So I think we have to strike a better balance between not reinventing wheels and also inviting new participation and new pushes to conclusion of work and (look) forward to the chance to talk with PPSC and others about how we can make that work.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and just to go on, the other part of the motion I believe called for delivery of - or giving to the council deliverable dates as to what it would take to wind of the work that we're currently doing and I think with a goal of finalizing work by the San Francisco meeting I think was kind of the other part of that motion.

We had a discussion yesterday at the council level of, you know, with the working group work team report that's going to be up at the council hopefully this week so that's great. That's one of the two work teams of the PPSC.

The PDP work team we've just been discussing here for a little bit which has some work yet to go. And I think there is - the problem with the motion was that if you cut off the PPSC you also cut off work team under it.

And the current resolution didn't really address that, so some work needs to be done on the motion if that's the intent.

And so Marilyn let me let you ask your question and then we can talk a little bit more about this.

Marilyn Cade: Well I was either amused or disheartened by the conversation that took place yesterday. Regardless of what the motivation is about proposing to close the work initiative like this down there's probably nothing that's more important to formed policymaking then effect - then completing this PDP work, the council's primary product policy.

And so listening to counselors debating whether or not they're happy with the work approach taken by one groups that they're supposed to be supporting would have been what I expected.

As a manager or as an executive when a team reports in and they tell you the progress they're making on the product they're building for you and they clearly are struggling with resources I think the appropriate approach from a council that is managing the process is to have a dialogue about other resources, additional information new forms of working instead of closing it down. So, you know, that was a disheartening part.

I thought you did an excellent job in trying to educate the counselors who demonstrated a lack of familiarity with the importance of the - this adjacent work that is on their plate that was given to them by the restructuring.

But I will say that the teams who are trying to complete the work on the structuring and structural improvements, I hope all of us can communicate properly with the counselors that the importance of the council actually thinking of themselves as the managers of the process and thinking about it in terms of additional resources.

And I don't mean just additional people because there is probably nothing right now that is as important to the council as having a PDP process in place.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I agree with that. And I think, you know, it was definitely an interesting discussion yesterday.

And, you know, at least with respect to, you know, there was some discussion, the third part of the - of a motion that I didn't raise was basically the creation of a new standing committee which I'm not really sure how that would work or what that would do and why you would just take out a steering committee and replace it with a standing committee. It just to me it's hard to grasp.

And what I asked - basically one of the things I asked at yesterday's meeting was to bifurcate the motions.

Let's - at this meeting we obviously need to do something that's the - to make sure that the work of the PDP work team continues because I don't think anyone has an interest in having that work stop.

And if we want to create a standing committee at some point, you know, let's table that part of the motion and discuss that separately as to whether that's a

good idea, bad idea or how to structure that. But let's separate it out so that we can make sure that nothing stops us work going forward.

So I'm sure there'll be more discussion on the council's meeting on Wednesday on this topic on the motions that are currently before it. But I just wanted to give you all kind of an idea of what was going on.

Any other questions on that because I know we have a few minutes before the next session starts and will give everyone a few minutes to get settled in if that's - anybody else? Jay Scott anything from California?

I'll take that as we put him to sleep. Well Jay Scott if you can still hear me have a great flight out here and we look forward to seeing you tomorrow night or Tuesday.

Jay Scott: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: All right with that - thanks Jay Scott. With that I think we can close this session down. I think the council starts up in ten minutes - oh we got 40 minutes. So everybody take some fruit and have some - wake up. Thanks.

Jay Scott: Thanks guys.

Bye.

END