

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 24 April 2009 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team teleconference 24 April 2009 at 13:00 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/gns0/gns0-cowt-20090427.mp3>
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#april>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - Work team chair - NCA
Michael Young - Work team vice chair - Registry c.
Charles Gomes - Registry c.
Rafik Dammak - NCUC
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Claudio Digangi - IPC
Tony Harris - ISP
Krista Papac - Registrar c.
SS Kshatriya - Individual

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant
Robert Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you operator. Good morning, evening, to everyone. (Julie), could you please help me make a roll call to see who's on the call?

(Julie Hedlund): I'll be happy to do that. So, we have Olga Cavalli, we have SS Kshatriya, Michael Young, Krista Papac, Claudion Digangi, Rafik Dammak, and Rob Hogarth from ICANN staff.

Have I missed anyone?

Glen Desaintgery: I'm also on the call (Julie).

(Julie Hedlund): Oh, Glen you're on the call.

Olga Cavalli: Glen, how are you?

(Julie Hedlund): I'm sorry.

Glen Desaintgery: Fine, thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you all for joining. We have a very well represented group of our working team. We have a very intense week exchanging some ideas. I have been - I woke up very early this morning because I have been traveling this week and was very busy and I could follow the (threat) but not as deeply and closely as I would like to. So, I've been reading them all this morning.

And so, I have just sent an updated version of the agenda. Sorry for sending it so close to the meeting so you had no time to review it or make any suggestions but we can do that now.

I included (S.S.) suggestion so we can talk about staff support for the group and also I included (Victoria)'s suggestion of the letter to the board.

And we have also to discuss the wording of the sub-(task) one. I have been reviewing all the changes and I realized some thing that I suggested may be wrong but I would like to ask to talk about this altogether.

Did you receive my email with the new agenda, do you like it, do you want to make any suggestions? Any change? I'm not sure if we will have time to review all these issues in one hour.

I am available for staying a little bit longer maybe half an hour, no more than that, but I'm not sure if it's fair for the group if we have agreed to work to shorten our conference calls in one hour.

So, just let me know if the agenda is fine. If you want to ask something and what we could do if we don't finish by one hour.

Any comments?

Woman: Yeah, I'd like to add something to the agenda. I'd just like to say Olga, I got your email but I didn't actually get a copy of a new agenda with that and that may...

Olga Cavalli: It's included in the email.

Woman: Oh, it's (unintelligible). Okay, fine, I'll go back to it. Look, I'd just like to add one (unintelligible) to the agenda.

SS Kshatriya: I'm not able to hear, could you speak loud please.

Woman: Oh, certainly. Oh, don't want to shout at you now. I'd like to add one issue to the agenda. Look, I think all the (talk) we've had about the wording of the workplan leads me to think that what we might like to put on the agenda is the role or stages of the workplan because we're obviously getting very bogged down in semantics here.

And so, I'm thinking it might be helpful to pull focus on that whole document and perhaps have a discussion on it.

Olga Cavalli: We'll just the first point of the agenda that I added is discuss the text of the workplan. So, I agree with you that we have to work on that. And we also think we agreed in the list that we should discuss that.

So, your suggestion is perfect and I already captured that from our email exchanges. Any other comments about the agenda?

SS Kshatriya: Yeah, Olga Cavalli, I have a request.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(S.S): Are we going to (unintelligible)? I have some technical problem so no electric supply here from my system (unintelligible) after some time.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, that's very bad.

SS Kshatriya: So, (unintelligible) if you could take (unintelligible) and then I'd like to speak on that and that will be good for me.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any comments about a said suggestion about changing the order of the agenda?

Michael Young: I'm happy with that. It's Michael.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, okay. Thank you Michael. And I think if (S.S.) you have technical problems it's fair that we give you a chance to talk about your concerns about tech support. And I'm not sure to be the one. I don't have that

much experience in ICANN - I've been involved for like three or four years in ICANN meetings and working teams to.

Maybe (Julie) or Glen or (Track) could help us in understanding which is the role of staff, what we can ask for staff, what is fair, what is too much, what is the role for the whole working team, asking, or the chair? Could you please maybe chat (Julie) or helping in us in understanding this?

SS Kshatriya: I think plus you could give me time to talk and then...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Go ahead with it.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. I sent email to Olga (unintelligible) about next conference call. I'll read out my mail.

I will need completed statements of participants (unintelligible) operating procedures followed by various constituencies in (a tabulated) summarized form from staff and also any other materials they have to support the work.

Now, I'm very clear that from support staff I wanted (in a summarized) and (tabulated) form. Now, once I ask I know that (unintelligible). I'll make two points here. That I address this mail (Tia) and (Tia) did not reply to this message.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

SS Kshatriya: Then, I demanded (please). But that also does not apply from here. (Unintelligible) they are replying on her behalf. I think this is not the procedure.

Now, this (unintelligible) no. There has to be a few (unintelligible) probably (unintelligible). She would have to now you wont get staff support.

Second was, she would have either requested or directed staff to give support.

Third was, if she did not know that staff can support or not then she would have (unintelligible).

Next, now, I'm new to this GNSO so I do not know what support, what I thought supported staff did here. So, this is what all we have to think if your staff does not support the (type of thing) to complete this task.

Now, (unintelligible) I got the mail from (Julie). She says that in the (unintelligible). Now, (unintelligible) to making (unintelligible) complicated. Now, (unintelligible) the one part (unintelligible). This is a (unintelligible).

Then, I get a suggestion from (Chuck). He says that the (unintelligible) discuss whether I should get the support or not. I think it's not (unintelligible) some support. It's not the (unintelligible) who will decided whether he's (unintelligible) support or not.

So, my point here is that this (unintelligible) not if the staff is support or not that is to decide. If we are not support to do this work then I should

be told about it. And just know you can discuss and let me know. And in case my system fails I'll just disappear some time. Maybe I could be informed by email.

Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (S.S.). Let me first make a comment. I am also new in all these processes. So, if I make some mistakes just take my apologies. I would like, if you want, maybe just because I don't know exactly how it works to have some clarification of what we can expect from staff. So, we all as a work team, can know and use that very great support that they give us in the proper way.

And, also, I would like you to know, and it's a feeling that I have, maybe it's not from the working team but I would like to know what others think.

We have quite a small work team. So, we can bear some flexibility in requesting to the chair or to some other member of the work team can reply and can help maybe because he or she has more experience. In my position of a chair I think its fine.

I think it's very helpful and it brings more flexibility and efficiency to the group. That's my impression. And, again, my apologies if I did not capture your request and I did not (unintelligible) properly.

So, following your comments...

(Chuck): (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

(Chuck): Put me in the queue please.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): Hopefully before staff responds.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So, that's I have to say and (Chuck), I will open a queue.
(Chuck) is first and who else would like to reply to (S.S.) and myself?

Victoria McEvedy Yeah, I'd like myself to be in the queue too, (Victoria).

Olga Cavalli: It's (Victoria), it's (Chuck)...Who else?

Okay, go ahead (Chuck).

(Chuck): Okay, first of all with regards to (S.S.)'s comment about the chair responding. One of the advantages of having a vice chair is obviously our chair isn't available around the clock. So - and there's going to be times when she's very busy. So, one of the things that (Aubrey) and I do on the council is that either one of us will reply if we see it sooner. That doesn't always work but it helps some.

So, I'd just like to encourage - if Michael and Olga kind of work that way it takes the pressure off of them because there's no way they can always be real timely in their responses.

Secondly, practice within the GNSO and staff support and staff has been really great. Personal requests from work teams or working

groups or council members or whatever, staffs been really good about - if it's something that they can just answer or point somebody too. They've always been really good with that.

The issue that I was trying to deal with there is that on more significant tasks, and I viewed the tasks that (S.S.) requested as a fairly significant amount of work, that if we don't have some procedure of either the chair or vice chair or the group as a whole agreeing on more significant work, it will be totally unworkable.

Because, if each one of us gives significant tasks and expects staff to just respond to what we do it doesn't allow for prioritization and so forth and frankly staff won't have enough time to do that because they're not only working on this work team they have much more to do and so forth.

So, from a practical point of view when there are more time consuming tasks we need to be able to make decisions on those and not just each one of us individually, direct staff. Otherwise, it will be totally unworkable.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Chuck).

(Victoria)?

Victoria McEvedy I'd just like to address the substance of the issue. I mean, I have to say it's interesting because this is actually one our topics the extent of work. This is exactly the kind of request I would have expected that staff would meet.

And I think there's something of a contradiction here. It's publicly available data and it really ought to be a cut and paste job of that.

I mean, not being able to sort of gather and compile this sort of material it's, I think, both sort of exercises are very important particularly when you're dealing with new entrants to ICANN and the ICANN system. I mean, it's very difficult to find what you're looking for on the Web site. I always find it a nightmare.

So, I have to say, I myself, did not see this as a substantive request and I don't really understand why it was turned down and I don't think it should have been.

(Chuck): I didn't know that it was turned down.

Victoria McEvedy Well, it certainly was my understanding.

(Chuck): But as far as the significance of it, even though it's publicly available data there's still - there are six different charters and changing charters that have to be reviewed and comparing a table. That's not a trivial task. It may very well be one that we agree we'd like to have done. I didn't say one way or the other on that.

I just think we have to - we can't each just direct staff to do things individually when they are somewhat time consuming. It just isn't practical.

Victoria McEvedy I mean, without looking at it in detail, (unintelligible) I would have thought this is something that would probably have taken maybe two hours of staff time, two or three hours. As a staff member who was

familiar, I mean very familiar with the documents that they'd be working with and with - I mean, that's what I would have thought. I mean, I could probably do the thing myself in that time and I'm not that familiar.

So, I mean that's kind of, I would have thought, something the staff could correct us. But that's what I would have thought would have been involved in this. Basically pasting stuff onto the table from the online documents.

Olga Cavalli: Is someone else going to talk? I would like myself in the queue.

Robert Hoggarth: This is Rob as well. I'd like to be in the queue.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, Rob, go ahead and then I'll go after you.

Robert Hoggarth: Certainly. Thank you.

Referring back to your work team chart or, Section 5, references staff support. It's a short sentence. The ICANN staff assigned to the work team will fully support the work of the team as directed by the chair including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when appropriate.

From a staff perspective we are delighted within the constraints in time and space to help you guys with respect to any request. But I do note that I think your discussions is a combination of process and substance.

I think you guys, as (Chuck) suggested, have operated very effectively to date. We're delighted to support you all as we do with the other work teams, council, working groups and the rest.

The process that seems to work best is to have that discussion as your having it now and then have the chair make that determination. For some of you who don't have the insights we're currently managing 16 separate work teams, task forces and draft teams.

We are more than happy, like I said, to crank any request into the work day and if you guys agree to it we will give you feedback in terms of our workload and try to get to everything as fast as we can.

So, I just wanted to make clear from the discussion perspective that as staff were ready to do whatever directed.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Robert and I would like to make a comment that it's something (unintelligible) staff report. I think staff is great and (Julie) and Rob have been extremely helpful and this happens the same in GNSO.

What I think that they are not supposed to do is (unintelligible). We have to deal with the content. And they have - they are always able to provide us links and documents but I am not sure that we have - this is something that the work team has to do.

They should not be involved in deciding what to cut and what to past and how to do that because this is our job. And this is why we volunteered for being in this group.

And I know it takes some time, maybe two hours, three hours but this is why I wanted to be a chair and you agreed to be in the group. And, if not, we could come to the point that we just don't agree how they cutted and pasted it and then we go into discussion and the list in the conference call that the staff decided about the content that we don't agree.

And this is not their mission. Their mission is to help us and to bring us information that we have to deal with and we have to prepare on knowledge base and recommendation.

This is my view and this is how we also work in GNSO which is my main source of experience. I don't know what do other think about this.

Man: Could I respond to that Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, please.

(Chuck): I think it's okay if staff does even cut and pasting if that's something that we ask them to do in particular that the chair confirms, yeah, could you...A good approach is just - could you give us an estimate how long that will take to do?

So that we have a general area of understanding about how much effort the task will and when it's a little bit more significant, whether it's two hours or three hours or whatever. It gives us a feels so that if we have them doing that we realize that that's going to take away from doing other things.

I'm not opposed to that task being done at all. It could be a very useful task even if it is mostly cut and pasting. All I'm suggesting is let's just work together so that we make this thing workable.

(Julie Hedlund): Olga this is (Julie).

Olga Cavalli: Yeah?

Woman: Can I get in the queue please?

Olga Cavalli: Who is this (Julie)?

(Julie Hedlund): (Julie).

Olga Cavalli: Okay, go ahead (Julie).

(Julie Hedlund): Yes, for myself this is a very helpful discussion and I just wanted to clarify one thing that perhaps wasn't clear in my email. What I was hoping to get, and I think I have gotten this from this call, was simply an understanding of how, perhaps, I could provide some support to all of the work teams, the sub-teams I should say, for task 1.

It really, at one time - I guess what I'm saying is that I agree with (Chuck).

I think that this is a task that staff can do to look at the various charters and to pull out information and to put it in a tabulated format. My point was just that each of the sub-teams here will need similar information from staff.

Meaning that rather than simply going into the charters and pulling just the information for (S.S.)'s sub-team of task 1 it would be, I think, more efficient to look at what each of the sub-teams needs. Look at all of the constituency charters and pull all of this information into one tabulated document.

So, I think what I was trying to suggest was that if we could discuss this as a team I could more efficiently address all of your needs, perhaps, in one project which I think could be done probably in a matter of hours.

But, it's until I'm actually doing the task I should say that it might be a little bit difficult for me to say how long it would take. But, yes, it's certainly doable.

Michael Young: Olga, can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Who is this, Michael?

Michael Young: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, go ahead Michael.

Michael Young: I think these are very good comments. I think that the reality is that exactly what's been said before is if we are, as our charter states, if we're having the chair and support the chair if they're not available, the vice chair, to help facilitate our centralized requests of staff.

We're going to get efficiencies and staff is going to sometimes be able to combine requests and work items and maybe just extending things

further so that they're (unintelligible) leaving. The work they do could possibly could even be more useful than just beyond the cost.

It could spread to other teams and other working groups working on issues that could benefit from a consolidated document, for example.

I do think that your point about us being willing to do our own work is very valid, Olga. I think it's a judgment call in each case. So, as the requests come in and as we're trying to optimize and combine requests that are overlapping so that we only ask staff to do things once and not have overlapping requests are similar.

I think we have to consider whether or not we're asking to do something that's supportive or requires decision making. And if it's a decision making or an assessment task that should fall to us directly because that's what we're here to do.

We're here to examine, assess and make recommendations. However, collecting a clear list of items, for example, that's supportive and I don't see any harm in those cases if staff is able to help us to using them.

If there was a judgment as to how to create that list or what should go into that list then that judgment is our responsibility I think

Olga Cavalli: That's great. Anyone else want to talk in the queue?

Thank you Michael. It's a very good comment. (Julie), I think I capture your idea and we work in developing the first agenda and I think we included an item which is how to exchange information about (unintelligible) in relation to sub-task.

And this is where we wanted to exchange some ideas with you and be as efficient as possible in using our time and staffs time in order to exchange information. But for all of our tasks about all of our constituencies.

And this is why I think perhaps we reacted towards your comment, (S.S.), in going forward or not with your request. I agree with (Julie) that we should organize this request and I still think that staff should provide us the basic information, or the whole information, and we should work with that content.

And maybe they can help us in doing something's but with specific directions from us. So, because we are the working team.

I'm trying to figure out how to solve this as a more constructive way of doing it for the whole work that we have to do. Not only for one sub-task. Perhaps, (Julie), your suggestion of preparing some basic information from us could be useful. Could you repeat it? How could we do that?

(Julie Hedlund): Yes, thank you very much Olga. Perhaps I could make a suggestion for how I could approach this and we can see whether or not for all of the team members if that's acceptable.

When I look at the chart, the table, that we've prepared for our task 1 and the sub-tasks what I noted, and this is why I wanted to discuss this, is that each of these sub-tasks, accept for really the last one, requires going into the current charters and picking out information in a tabular form.

We really actually have a table right now that lists the information that we're interested in getting. If you look at the chart that we are all working with with the various sub-tasks the one for (S.S.)'s group has information concerning rules or principles that we could gather from each of the constituency charters. Sub-task 2 has questions about mailing lists and discussion lists and so on and procedures for developing policy positions.

Some of that information may also be in the charter document. And number 3 talks about a database. That one I'm not sure that we could - that one may require assistance from you to direct me to whom I might speak about whether or not there are current databases of constituency member. Some of that information may not be public and I may have to come back to you with questions for that.

And then the last item is the tool kit and I see that as sort of a separate piece that would have to be addressed separately.

So, what I would suggest is that I go look at the charter, look at this table and I could for instance, say, list each constituent and say, yes they have this procedure or no they do not have this procedure.

For item number 2, yes they have it or not. And use this table as a base document. And once I'm in the project I could give you a better idea of how much time it will take but I could just go ahead and start with it. And as I have questions I could bring them up to the list and perhaps you could guide me. If I can't find something in your constituency you, the work team members, could guide me on whom I might speak with.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you for the very good suggestions (Julie). I would like to get feedback from the team. Any comments?

Man: Sounds good to me.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Michael Young: I think it's a great idea.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Michael.

(S.S.) are you still on the line?

SS Kshatriya: Yeah, I'm still on the line and it has been quite a fruitful discussion and I think we'll hear from (Julie) something.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, great. (Julie) so you have something to do now. You have more jobs.

SS Kshatriya: No, no. I mean, she will be posting something...

Olga Cavalli: I didn't hear you well so, could you repeat it? Maybe I was mistaken.

SS Kshatriya: (Unintelligible)?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

SS Kshatriya: No, what I mean that once (Julie) (unintelligible) into place I think that will be useful to us.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, great. This is what I was saying that (Julie) has a job to do now and thank you very much (Julie) for the suggestion. Thank you (S.S.) for making me learning how to deal with this chair issue.

Okay, so we have the staff support points already spoken and could we move forward with the agenda?

There's a discussion on the list about the text for workplan task 1, sub-task 1. Let me give my impressions. I've been reading all the exchange of emails this morning and I think I have made a mistake in responding (Chuck)'s suggestion about changing participation instead of membership.

I review it and I think it shouldn't be membership, it should be participation. The right word to use.

(Chuck): Actually Olga, I think it should be both. I think...

Olga Cavalli: Or both. Or both. Maybe that's more open but it's not only membership.

So, my mistake, I apologize. Maybe I had no time to go back to the previous documents that we have to use as background. And so, I would like to make that comment and I would like to open the queue because there were a lot of exchanges, interesting discussion in the (unintelligible). And we could perhaps finishing this wording during the call.

(Chuck): (Chuck) would like to be in the queue.

Olga Cavalli: (Chuck), who else?

Victoria McEvedy (Victoria).

Olga Cavalli: (Victoria). Who else? Okay, go ahead (Chuck).

(Chuck): Yeah, in reading one of (Victoria)'s last responses to that suggestion I made. I think she was right.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): And you just observed that...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): ...Olga, that it is more than just membership. I was trying to get away from us trying to define the nitty gritty of how people participate in constituencies because that's going to be an area of flexibility depending on the constituency but when you look at the board recommendations it's certainly more the membership.

I think membership is important. There needs to be open membership and the board recommendations are very clear on that. But it is more than that. Just being a member isn't enough if you're not free to participate...

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.

(Chuck): ...in an effective manner. So, I would say we need both.

Tony Harris: Excuse me. It's Tony Harris joining late. Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Hi Tony.

Tony Harris: Hello.

Olga Cavalli: (Victoria)?

Victoria McEvedy Yes, thanks for that. Look, as I said at the beginning of the call I think the email exchanges have been really interesting and I think I just want to make the overall point again.

I mean, because I think we're quite lucky in the scenario that we find ourselves in in the sense that we have the report of some board governance committee's work. Which is actually very detailed. And they give us sort of the background context and what have you and then they've given us those bullet points.

I mean, the staff workplan is basically derived, pretty closely, from the bullet points. I think it's on Page 43 of that report.

(Chuck): Yeah, the detail actually is easier to find on Page 45 and 46.

Victoria McEvedy Okay, yeah. That's true.

But what I just wanted to make - I wanted to make a general point here. I mean, if you look at Page 43, for example, which is just what I was working from. What I've asked us to do is, is there a need for - for

example, and this is the second paragraph on the page, there are a number of specific areas that must be addressed.

The first is the need for constituency developed participation rules for all constituencies, okay that encourage open (unintelligible).

The rules must adhere to the following provincials. Now, the principles, the bullet points, okay? And they include those principles have come into our workplan.

Now, the point that I'm trying to make about this is that the innumerate items in our workplan, they're minimum. They're not maximums, okay? They're floors, not ceilings in a sense. I mean, we've been asked to come up with some rules and the rules must adhere to those principles.

So, I'm just - my concern is that the work plan, in other contexts it's also very important. But I think where we have all this guidance and the floor discussion in this report.

Our workplan is less significant, perhaps, in another context and I don't think we should regard ourselves as being locked down to us because it encompass the bigger points which are fully discussed in Section 6 of the document.

And I think this participation versus sort of membership criteria's are actually pretty clear example of how there's a danger of missing the overall point. And I went through the preparation for the (unintelligible) to try and convey what I've been doing so badly at conveying over the Internet, the emails.

Some of the - the report uses words like - it's talking about constituency structures which need to adapt to reflect the movement to the working group model. Reducing various participation in (unintelligible) stakeholders.

Greater consistency across constituency structures. So, these are the bigger points. I mean, we've got all that background context and I just don't - I think this is the kind of working team where we don't need to be so locked down to our workplan. That's what I wanted to say.

(Chuck): Totally agree.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with you (Victoria). Does someone else want to be in the queue?

All right. I also want to thank you (Victoria) because your email, (Chuck) said, made me review my comment and made me note my mistake. So, thank you for that. And thank you for this comment.

So, I would ask you, how - I mean, we need to some guides to make our work and to move forward as we are a team we are not together, we are not face to face meeting very frequently, maybe at least three times a year if we can.

So, how would you suggest that we can be more open and more flexible in not missing any point about our main task?

And, also, having a feasible workplan which is clear and which is not difficult to follow for all of the team members that we are volunteering our time for this working group.

Victoria McEvedy Well, my own thought is that we should just really leave - I mean, not worry so much and now just move on from the workplan, quite frankly. It's taken up - it's taken probably enough of our time. We all know where we're going and just leave it as it is pretty much.

I just don't think we need to engage in detailed semantics about it when we're really working from a (unintelligible) much bigger reference point which is so (unintelligible) and clear.

But, I think it's a point that we need to be - I mean, we need to entrench this in some way so that we don't keep getting dragged back to it and dragged to us, I think. We'd have to decide just to use it as a reference and not a particularly useful one.

Michael Young: It's Michael. Can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, please go ahead Michael.

Michael Young: (Victoria), I think your comments are excellent and I agree with them. I think we also need to (unintelligible) check and balance of. So, almost what I would say is, yes, let's push ahead as your suggesting.

Let's let the work teams - the folks have come together to work on a sub-task, let them have a little freedom and if they expand beyond how far we've specified some of these sub-tasks and tasks, that's okay. Let them, I think.

And then as we come back and view the results of their work then I think what we need is an agreement that we're going to - whatever's brought back in those sub-tasks or those things we just need to check on each piece of work produced and make sure it still fits within the confines of the intent of what we're supposed to be doing and validate it more on the return rather than trying to have an overtly tight controlled on defining what they're going to work on.

I think a little bit of creativity here is appropriate as well.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Michael. Someone else want to be in the queue?

(Chuck): As far as wording the task, Olga, why don't we just go back to the word participation understanding that there's some flexibility there.

Membership is too restricted.

Olga Cavalli: I agree. I think participation is wider and participation is included in it. Thank you (Chuck).

Someone else want to make any comment to be in the queue?

Well, (Victoria) I think your comments are really very helpful and also I agree with Michael.

So, I think that I would suggest that we take your ideas as the basis for starting our work using the workplan as kind of a guide but not stick to the wording in the workplan.

This is what I think I got from your comments and started exchanging information and then perhaps we can review it as the work goes on and see if we are in the right way of solving and giving good outcome from our work and be more flexible.

And also be really open with considering all the things that we have to achieve, not restricting our work with the workplan but really having in mind all the things that we have to achieve as an outcome.

So, I think it's a great suggestion. So, what you're suggesting is that we don't discuss a lot about the wording of the workplans and we just move on. Am I right?

Victoria McEvedy That's right.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you very much. So, this is kind of solving our agenda because I have included that in it. I have one concern. I'm not sure if we are getting active participation from all constituencies. Am I right? Am I wrong? What do you all think?

I think that our main task is gather a lot of ground basic knowledge from other constituencies from all of them and I'm not sure if we are getting active participation. And I am not sure how to solve this. Maybe I can contact some people who is not participating in the calls and ask them to maybe be present in the list or in the next conference call.

Any comment about this, any suggestions?

Glen DeSaintgery: Well, I think - is it true that the only constituency that we're not getting some participation from is the NCUC? Or am I wrong on that?

Olga Cavalli: We have Rafik from NCUC but I - maybe I'm mistaken. What about business constituency?

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh, Rafik is on the...Rafik you're on the call?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Yes, I think he's on the call. I think I heard his name at the beginning.

Glen, can you see who's on the call?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yeah, he's showing still on the call.

Rafik Dammak: I'm here.

Olga Cavalli: Mute...Maybe he's on mute.

Glen DeSaintgery: He's not showing mute but as far as active in the discussions in so forth he has been less active than others. I think there's been pretty good participation by others.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Are we having business constituency participation?

Robert Hoggarth: This is Rob. (Zaheid Geneil) is the business constituency rep but I know that he's been on vacation, holiday, I think (Philip) mentioned.

Olga Cavalli: Oh (unintelligible). Yeah, you're right. Yeah. So, we'll let him be happy for a while and then I'll bother him again. Maybe in one or two weeks

I'll try to contact him. Great. Thank you Rob. I had forgotten. He had told me that in Mexico.

Okay, great. Any other comments about constituencies?

Rafik is on line. He's saying to me in the chat that he's there.

(Rafiq), can you hear us?

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Rafik you're representing NCUC constituency, right?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great.

Okay, in the agenda I sent you we have number 4...Oh, (Victoria) I was forgetting about the suggestion of the letter you suggested. I think we should discuss that.

I've included that in the agenda and I was forgetting to comment about this. Could you please explain? I really don't understand why we should be sending that letter but maybe it's because I don't get your point.

Could you please explain it to us?

Victoria McEvedy: Sure. I mean, I only realize because I get the Saturday, sort of, ICANN newsletter but I hadn't really focused on it. But, the charters

have all be resubmitted by the existing constituencies in the GNSO. I believe, and please correct me if I'm wrong; I saw some drafts being submitted to the board for approval.

Now, the charters, certainly the ones that I've had a good look at, govern every aspect of constituency operations. They talk about basically the bylaws for each constituency and they deal with all the rules about participation, membership, procedure, operating procedure, policy development etc, etc.

So, I'm afraid that our work and whatever coming out of that work that was adopted and approved by the board would end up in charts for constituencies and the board governance committees report is very, very clear that they (unintelligible) to come up with some participation rules for all constituencies and operating procedures for constituencies that reflect these common principles etc. in our guidelines.

So, it seems very clear to me in any event that whatever we do will have to be reflected in new charters for constituencies and all the constituencies will have to amend their charters.

So...

Michael Young: Well, (Victoria) if I could - it's Michael. If I could clarify something here.

Victoria McEvedy Sure.

Michael Young: I think we're - it's time we started switching the language from constituencies to stakeholders groups. And I think that's an important thing.

Victoria McEvedy Well, that's not what the board report says at all. And I don't - that's not my understanding. Because within the stakeholder groups the constituencies remain.

Michael Young: Right.

Victoria McEvedy And the boards quite clear about the fact that this changed to constituencies must take place.

Michael Young: Right.

Victoria McEvedy And it discusses that exact point. It says that while there is a new stakeholder structure that's primarily the way to organize the council while it will also encourage the constituencies to maximize their common interest. It does not, on its own, change the constituency structure itself. And, of course, it doesn't.

Michael Young: Well, it does in a sense if the voting aspect. So, take the registry constituency as an example. The voting power within that current constituency moves to the stakeholders group and the constituency effectively, as it stands today, really is only a stakeholders group and then additionally at least the way we did the registry draft charter constituencies of themselves do not have a voting right. The members...

Victoria McEvedy Okay. But the registries are unique, aren't they? I mean, that's not true of the commercial and the noncommercial...

Michael Young: Right.

Victoria McEvedy ...stakeholder structures. But that's a really good point and I hadn't focused on that.

(Chuck): Actually the non-commercials kind of gone in the same direction or at least that's one of the charters that they've proposed.

Let me comment on this from the point of view from the OSC because - and I said a little bit of this in an email that I sent to our list and that is that when the board did these recommendations it goes clear back to February, February of last year.

And that is - at that particular time the actual structure and the specific component of stakeholder groups had not been developed very far. And so there was just a focus on constituency.

So, I would say that both of you Michael and (Victoria) are correct. The - it really needs to be...We can't throw away the emphasis on the constituency operations. That's still part of the issue. (Victoria) you're right in that regard.

But what the OSC did as we got more detail on the structure of the council involving stakeholder groups, we kind of, just ourselves, added the concept that yeah, now that we've got the stakeholder concept the same request, the same task with regard to constituencies probably need to apply to stakeholder groups.

So, it's a matter of applying what the board's recommendations to those as well, even though they will vary a little bit depending on stakeholder group but still some of the same things. Membership in the

stakeholder groups, for example, needs to be open to eligible people just like they do in constituencies. Does that make sense?

Victoria McEvedy It does. This is something that we need to look at, I think, and actually study further because it raises real issues and I think we do need to look at - there must be two models there?

So, there must be - there's the registry, you say NCUC is similar but that's only because we haven't had any new constituencies yet, they haven't been approved yet anyway.

So, you're saying there are two structures. You've got the stakeholder model where you've got a whole bunch of constituencies in it, right?

(Chuck): Well, actually I think that there will be a lot of overlap between principles for stakeholder groups and constituencies. Some of the detailed logistics may be different. But a lot of - even some of the principles you mentioned from the board of recommendations on Page 43 and following in Section 6 there. Those really, I think, you'll agree need to apply to both areas; stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So, I think there will be a lot of overlap but there may be some differences that we'll highlight when we get into some detailed recommendations.

With regard to constituencies charters though I want to come back to something that you said and I'll use the registry as an example because I can't really speak for the other constituencies. But, we didn't really change our charter when we requested renewal of our charter but we anticipate that charter may need the change going forward.

So, we just requested renewal of our charter and submitted our older charter understanding that that will probably change going forward. So, I think the charters are probably going to have to evolve as details come about. And somebody may want to speak for other constituencies in terms of your request for renewal.

The (ISP) has presented theirs. Did you revise your charter Tony?

Tony Harris: Not significantly.

(Chuck): Yeah. Yeah, same thing we did. We did some little minor things but we anticipate that once the stakeholder group charters are more firm then we may have to go back and change our constituency charter some as well.

Tony Harris: Yeah, and to that point (Chuck) and to (Victoria)'s concern, I think actually at this point the stakeholder charters in some ways, define how the constituencies underneath them will participate and they'll be a little bit of inheritance from the stakeholders charters, in some cases, to the constituencies charters.

And, so if those charters are in submission now for consideration probably a reasonable point of concern is if we come up with a recommended rule for participation as a membership that significantly contradicts one of those stakeholder charters or more then they'll be a required amendment.

But to my earlier emails (Victoria), I think that responsibility to make sure that those charters actually follow those recommendations I don't know that that's within our scope.

Victoria McEvedy Well, no, I agree with you. I'm sure it's not - I mean, all we can do is make recommendations. So, seeing any of it come through is not up to us and beyond our control, obviously.

But I am concerned. These things do happen, unfortunately, in the ICANN system. Where a change comes through and perhaps people realize retrospectively that there wasn't due process and sort of consulting or doing whatever should have been done. And I just wouldn't want - I wouldn't want any of us to have to waste our efforts basically.

So, I think it's probably appropriate for us to sort of put a hand up and ask for some sort of clarification or at least remind them that they ought to be waiting for our work and that our work is coming.

Tony Harris: I think that's very reasonable. I mean, we assume that people see these things and perhaps not everyone has. So, it certainly wouldn't hurt to put our hand up and say - just point that out. That there is an order of operation here that seems a little backwards at this point.

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible). It's a great point and thank you Michael for your comment. How would we make this call or how could we materialize this and concretely speaking?

How can we make this...

Yes, Rob please.

Robert Hoggarth: I was saying, I just wanted to point out that you all have the unique advantage to have not only the chair of the OSC on your work team but the vice chair of the GNSO council and (Chuck) you should certainly look to his advise in terms of the best way to communicate.

I think the structures set up at the work team work funnels into the steering committees which has been funneled into the council which then ultimately will agree on recommendations to the board. And using that structure or process may result in a more effective system of feedback for you than for a direct communication from a work team up to the board.

I think some of the community observed that with the boards workload sometimes responses from government input doesn't come back in a timely manner and so I just think you have to manage your expectations in that regard.

(Chuck): And I'm not the only member of the OSC that's on this work team either. So, we've got fairly good representation there already. The - one of the things that would be - I think that if we do communicate to the OSC for the OSC to do some consideration I think a little more specificity would be helpful.

And one way that we could approach it is as each of the subgroups within our work team start to delve in one of the things that we could focus on early on, if people agree, is are there any particular principles or rules that we're gonna consider that could have a significant impact

on constituencies or stakeholder groups if we make recommendations in that direction and focus on those first so that we can highlight those.

And then a communication that identified some of those that may have more impact in terms of what constituencies and stakeholder groups are doing in their charters. We could escalate those and I think that would be a very good time to communicate those.

A general communication, I think, is less useful than one that identifies some specific examples where our recommendations may change things later on.

Now, I think, and I think I said this in an email, I believe that, and maybe I'm hoping, that all constituencies and stakeholder groups as they're developing the details of their charters and revising them, will keep in mind the board recommendations so that they don't put things in there that go against the board recommendations.

And if that's the case then I think there's less chances of us spinning our wheels on this thing without having good affect.

I know in the case of the registree constituency we certainly did try to make sure that the stakeholder group charter we put forward was consistent with the board recommendation and hopefully the board and staff will let us know if we failed there, so...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much (Chuck). So your suggestion to move on with our work and then (Steve), if in the near future if it's time to communicate to the board or to make a (unintelligible)?

(Chuck): Well what I'm - I'm suggesting something a little more specific than that. You've got that right but more specifically if each of us that are working on the sub-tasks would kind of focus on (Victoria)'s concern and see if we can early on identify any particular areas...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck): ...where her concern might be a problem. Let's identify those early on and then come to bat together maybe in our next call and see if we see if we should flag those in a communication like (Victoria) is suggesting.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments?

(Chuck): Does that make any sense?

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a very good comment. Any other...?

Victoria McEvedy Yeah I'd just to make one or two comments. I think (Chuck)'s - I mean, I think it's a great idea. Let's just come back to it next time and let's see. I hear what you say (Chuck) and you're obviously a great guide to these sort of things.

So, if you say it might be helpful to be more specific. I guess the thing I would just note about that discussion, it's so helpful to have proper phone calls instead of emails isn't it because...

(Chuck): Yes.

Victoria McEvedy Because, I'm just realizing how different like...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I agree.

Victoria McEvedy You were coming with very different perspectives to things to very valid reasons.

And I suppose that I'm thinking particularly of constituencies who haven't changed their old charters whatsoever. And of course that's not always the case and some people may have had the (unintelligible) in mind.

But I just note, for what it's worth, and I'm sure we'll come back to all of this in detail but my reading and understanding of the boards, of the board governance committee's report is very much that what we should be coming - it says that one side may not settle.

But the whole gist of that report, when it talks about constituency structure and these issues is very much about sort of common roles that will apply right across. It's very clear about that.

So, I guess that's the only thing - I just note this and I'm sure we'll come back to this issue. This is the way I've been looking and understanding where we'll be going.

It's all about participation with all constituencies. The rules must follow these principles. And all constituencies function. So, I suppose I was thinking that we would come up with rules that would pretty much affect - that everyone would have to...

Those that were excepted by the council and the board would apply to all constituencies and so there would probably be no constituency that would be left unaffected and not having to amend the charter.

But certainly the way I was understand that but maybe not.

(Chuck): Yeah and the constituencies and the stakeholder groups have the board recommendations in front of them too to the extent that they're not followed is probably where we're going to have the conflicts that you're talking about.

And if we, as a work team, can identify any of those areas where maybe that's particularly going to happen - and since each of us probably know what our constituencies and stakeholder groups are doing that information that we have in our various constituencies might be very helpful in helping us flag any problem areas.

Olga Cavalli: So, perhaps for our next conference call we could have some feedback from each of us working in different sub-tasks and tie that into five (unintelligible) possible problems or areas of conflict. And if it's worth to communicate to the board or not. Could we perhaps have that in mind for two weeks in the future?

(Chuck): So the tasks of each little sub-group would be to...

Olga Cavalli: Or maybe it's too soon.

(Chuck): No well...If they need more time they can tell us.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck): I think (unintelligible) on the list or if they want to do a call or whatever. We'd kind of start off focusing on that and see if anything jumps out that might be a concern and then communicate what they come up with next time. I think that would be good.

(Julie Hedlund): Olga, this is (Julie). Could I get in the queue please?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Please go ahead (Julie).

(Julie Hedlund): Yes, and I would expect that what I would hope is that in the next week or so, and as I say, I'm not sure of the exact timing but I will address this right away. As I produce the table indicating which constituency has - which of the items in your charters - I would think that that would be very helpful to the sub-team to help them flag areas of concern.

If I go through and I see that a charter does not have a particular area that is in the recommendations I think that would help with this particular task.

(Chuck): Oh, that's a great idea.

Olga Cavalli: That's a great idea. Yeah. I totally agree (Julie). Thank you very much for that.

Robert Hoggarth: Olga, this is Rob.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: If I can make a comment as well.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, please.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. Many of you are perhaps familiar with - because you were in Mexico City are aware of the award resolution with respect to constituency renewal. Also as members of various constituencies you may be aware that as a follow-up to that resolution the staff has been having informal discussions with constituency leaders to talk about their renewal submission.

The board set up a process by which staff would give some feedback to the board about potential changes that the board may want to ask individual constituencies to make to adjust their charters to compile with the principles and the bylaws of transparency, openness and fairness.

What I will commit to do, as a staff member, as we prepare that information for the board I will alert them and remind them of this work teams jurisdiction and efforts so that they at least have that insight into the GNSO operations that these discussions are taking place.

Victoria McEvedy Robert, could I just jump in there for a second and ask you just to clarify this? Does the board resolution authorize this information procedure?

Robert Hoggarth: Yeah, the resolution specifically says it is resolved if the board acknowledges and thanks the distinct constituencies for their submissions and awaits completion of the following activities; one, staff analysis and constituency submissions and public comment and

identification of changes that the board may want to request each constituency to make over the coming months.

To ensure that their charters and subsequent activities comply with the principles contained in the bylaws. And expanded upon in the GNSO improvements report and subsequent GNSO improvements report and subsequent GNSO restructuring resolutions approved by the board last year.

Number 2, follow-up submissions from constituencies as needed provided to the board no later than at June 2009 meeting to confirm those constituencies have implemented recommended changes.

We had informed the board that we were going through an analysis charter document that had been submitted and they agreed not formally in this resolution but got a useful process where as for us to provide some initial feedback to existing constituencies to give them a sense of our efforts.

And so we are doing that with their blessing but that was not an official part of the resolution.

Victoria McEvedy Well, I have to say I'm really astonished to hear this and to hear it so late given that it goes directly to the heart of our work. And it's actually (unintelligible) exactly what I feel. I think I'm afraid of exercising going through the motions.

(Chuck): See, I don't see that at all. So tell me why - can you give me an example of anything that we would be doing that would be going through the motions?

Victoria McEvedy I'd very much like to have a look at that board resolution and I'd also like to have a look at those staff analysis and I think the committee should have a chance to review the work that's already been done and then perhaps discuss this on our next call.

Olga Cavalli: I must confess. I lost track of the conversation.

Robert Hoggarth: I would be perfectly happy to, momentarily here, I shoot the resolution link. I'm pulling it up here on my laptop. I can circulate that to the group and we'll certainly do so.

(Chuck): Again, I make my request that let's talk about specific examples where we think that we're wasting our time?

Victoria McEvedy Well, I'd like to read that board resolution and I'd also - as I say, thank you Robert for offering to send it over.

I mean, I think it's very important that I'd like to be fully informed before we have, what I think, is a very, very important discussion and I haven't seen any of these documents.

Now, Robert, can I ask you then, while we're on this topic, what analysis of the charters has already been done by the staff?

Robert Hoggarth: The staff has gone through the charters that were submitted that have been posted in the public comment forum. We are also going through the process and have been and - and actually went through the process of analyzing and summarizing the public comments that were made with respect to the charters.

We have put together some preliminary documentation as we have gone through the various charters to try to get some general assessment as to whether there are areas of commonality between different charters than the rest that might be useful for other groups to investigate or share.

The process that we outline to the board is that we've had some initial informal discussions with the existing constituencies, tell them what the status of our work was generally as we prepare to provide a report to the board.

That's still in its real preliminary stages, I must confess, given other recommendations and requirements that the board has asked us to do. But, that's generally where we are at this point.

(Chuck): I'm gonna...Excuse me for jumping in, but I have to jump off because I'm about 12 minutes late for another meeting. Thanks everybody.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much (Chuck) for your participation.

Victoria McEvedy Robert, is there any work products that would be - would obviously, because obviously there's a lot of crossover with the exercise that (Julie)'s been tasked with? I mean, it sounds like that exercise has already been undertaken.

Robert Hoggarth: I'll ask (Julie) because I don't know if that's true, and I must confess, I don't know the specific work product that you guys have been talking about for her to generate. Clearly we don't want to duplicate effort. So, that's something that I'll talk directly with her about.

We have, in general talked; let's see, with two or three constituencies in general about our observations. I'll check and see what the specific documentation is that we have.

The initial approach that the board suggested was just to have some informal discussion but I can't see myself any reason why we couldn't share that documentation with this work team to help you guys in your efforts.

Victoria McEvedy That's great. And can I just ask you, were are going to send us the board resolution, can you also refer us to the board meeting authorizing this procedure?

Robert Hoggarth: Sure.

Victoria McEvedy That would be great. I'd just like to see -I'd just like to fully understand the background and how the exercise is working and just...I'd like to see all the constitutional documents etc., etc. So, that would be helpful and then we can talk about it on the next call.

Robert Hoggarth: Great.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Rob and (Victoria). If you receive this information and you can share with us your concerns that, at least for me, would be very helpful and I think for the working group also.

Michael Young: Yeah, it's Michael speaking. To add to that (Victoria) obviously we all get the sense of your developing concerns here, I think just to reinforce what (Chuck) was saying. Given - as you look through these things if

you have issues, if you could give us specific examples of how fears could come into play I think that would make it a lot easier for the rest of us to understand where the points of concerns are.

Victoria McEvedy Well, I hate to say it's not a specific point. The whole procedure to me (unintelligible) of being totally the wrong way to go about something like that. That is not open and transparent. It's not an open and transparent process. Sort of backroom meetings and negotiations and this is really why we would be asked to be doing the front room screen kind of exercise.

I mean, that's just totally inappropriate but I don't want to comment further until I've had a look at...The process to me is wrong. But, I haven't seen the documents and so I want to reserve judgments but I don't understand why basically you'd have the same exercise that we're tasked with being conducted behind closed doors.

Michael Young: Well, I don't - well, that's a very strong statement I think at this stage. I think we need to understand it further before...

Victoria McEvedy Yeah, we do. No, exactly we do. So, like I said, I just don't think that we're anywhere helpful. But I'm not - and I'm not sure that it's about specifics either because for me it's hugely my initial concern anyway without having seen the documents is one of good practice and open and transparent process.

Michael Young: Right.

Victoria McEvedy Right and you know...

Michael Young: Let's try to understand it. Let's review it...

Victoria McEvedy Yep.

Michael Young: And then let's frame the concerns. I mean, ultimately some of these concerns may go beyond the scope of what we're tasked with doing. And I think we have to be sensitive to that as well.

Robert Hoggarth: This is actually, this is Rob. This is actually an excellent case study because as we've communicated with various leadership teams in the constituencies, it becomes an issue of then what do the constituency leaders share with their members in terms of participation and what's going on? And so I think this ultimately becomes an interesting case study in that.

The other aspect, I think, and this is helpful at the risk of continuing the meeting for another 30 seconds or so, the process that the board looked at was to say we have existing constituencies, let's make sure at a very high level that at the very least they are still adhering to the bylaw principle.

And so the board said submit your charters. We'd like to take a look at them. We're going to be inviting new people to come into the GNSO community. We want to make sure that as we create expectations for them that the existing players are adhering to those bylaw principles.

And so the board set up this process to essentially invite folks to renew/reconfirm themselves without any deadlines that anyone would be decertified or anything like that. But merely as a process to insure that everybody's thinking in the right frame of mind.

All of that work could be ending up consumed by the creation of the stakeholder groups, the work of this team and the recommendations that you all make for the GNSO moving forward.

But I think that the board was concerned about the timing of that process and just wanted to ensure that while all this is going on that the existing constituencies in their current makeup are consistent with the bylaw principle.

So, I agree there's some challenge there (Victoria) in terms of process and workload and several constituency leaders have expressed concern certainly publicly in Mexico about some of those processes and the work that has to be done.

Michael Young: Well, and you know to your point I can see how this would be, at first blush, a very big concern to anyone viewing it but in principle what you said actually makes a lot of sense.

I mean, we really know, so to speak, the rubber hits the road if we put out our recommendations and then there's the concentrated effort for - and it might be over expires or different cycles, but for all the relevant charters to come into compliance.

I mean, when you make changes you can't necessarily expect a hard (twich) date on all elements of it and so that is probably something we need to think about in our recommendations. Make suggestions on how these recommendations are implemented.

Victoria McEvedy That's a good point.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. We should be closing our conference call. Rob, could you share this document and information that you talked about and perhaps (Victoria) you can share with us, as Michael said, complete examples. And so maybe you can help me more because I don't believe to a specific constituency and (unintelligible).

So, this would be, for me, very helpful. Because I don't work within a constituency so I'm not able to touch on this (unintelligible) things.

I think that with Robert's information that will be sent and with (Julie)'s input about information that they already have about constituencies we have some food for thought and can start our work in sub-tasks. Am I correct?

So, we could have some of this information maybe during the next week and start and for the next conference call we can have a sense of where we're in and which kind of information we are having and which kind of difficulties are we having in our sub-tasks. Is that correct for our action item for next week? For the next two weeks?

(Julie Hedlund): Olga, this is (Julie) that sounds fine. I will start my task right away and try to get information to the team as quickly as I can so we can use that as a basis to identify areas of concern.

Olga Cavalli: Great (Julie), thank you very much. And Robert could you send the information that we have been talking about so we can hear more details from (Victoria) about her concerns?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, I've taken that as an action item.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you very much. So, I think it's all for now unless anyone has something to add?

Thank you for the patience of staying 20 minutes, 22 minutes, longer. It was a very interesting call. I agree with (Victoria) that the conference calls are much better than the email. I don't know why but it's easier to fall into discussion, to exchange information in the conference call and also face to face is even better.

So, thank you all for the patients for participating and we keep in touch through the list and we talk again in two weeks.

Victoria McEvedy All right. Thank you.

Man: Thank you Olga.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

END