Geographic Regions Review Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 25 May 2010 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group on Tuesday 25 May 2010 at 12:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-geo-regions-20100525.mp3

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

Present:
David Archbold
Fahd Batayneh
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Staff:
Rob Hoggarth
Bart Boswinkel
Glen de Saint Gery
Pablo Hinojosa

Absent Apologies:
Janis Karklins
Paul Wilson
Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Glen de Saint Gèry: Thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon everyone. This is the

                        Geographic Region's call on the 25th of May and on the call we have Fahd

                        Batayneh, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, David Archbald, and for staff we have Rob

                        Hogarth, Pablo Hinojosa, Bart Boswinkel, and Glen de Saint Gèry, myself.

                        Thank you very much, over to you David.

David Archbald: Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gèry: We have apologies, sorry, from Paul Wilson and Janis Karklins. Excuse

                        me.

David Archbald: And did we have anybody that we were supposed to be dialing out to?

Glen de Saint Gèry: We have dialed out to both Cheryl and Fahd.

David Archbald: Oh okay.

Glen de Saint Gèry: And the - and I think it is Zahid and Carlton Samuels did not respond to any request for a dial out.

David Archbald: Okay, thank you for the update.

Glen de Saint Gèry: Thank you.

David Archbald: Okay people, I don't think we had a formal agenda for the meeting this morning. But Rob did circulate the most recent version of the draft report where the main additions were some thoughts from me. And I think they are now paragraphs 36 through 40-something where I had attempted to summarize I suppose various aspects of the report and then asked some questions about that topic.

The way it's written in the report at the moment if we go to for example paragraph 37 is a brief summary of a couple of aspects and then 38 are a series of questions.

Now my idea was not that the questions themselves should be inserted in the report but rather that we should be providing the answers.

Now what I would like to get out primarily of the meeting this morning is your views on this approach and whether we should continue to expand that because all I've addressed are some aspects of the general principles. That's point one so your views on the approach.

And then actually look at if you agree with it some of the answers to the questions posed and I'd like your comments on that.

So that's what I'd like to do this morning. And I'm open to suggestions or other proposals.

Rob Hogarth: Dave this is Rob. I have...

Fahd Batayneh: I just had - yes.

Rob Hogarth: I'm sorry. Go ahead Fahd.

Fahd Batayneh: I didn't have a question. Talk.

Rob Hogarth: Oh I'm sorry. I'd just like to note to Dave we can devote a couple minutes as well on the call today too, just an update on the survey and conversation about potential Brussels activity, the working group. That would be great.

David Archbald: Okay. Well let's take the survey first actually and deal with that. Could you take the lead on that Rob?

Rob Hogarth: Sure. I didn't want to - I was just noting that those would be also additional things to chat about today. I didn't want to take the discussion away from your initial question, just wanted to have those as placeholders.

David Archbald: Understood. It might get the others a little bit of time just to think about the other topic if we deal with the survey so...

Rob Hogarth: Certainly.

David Archbald: ...go on. Deal with that first.

Rob Hogarth: Certainly. And just otherwise to give background in terms of the text that you talked about, yes, what the working group received last week was consistent with the timetable that we set out was Version 4, draft Version 4 of the interim report.

And as you noted those - that was the primary addition that section that you were just referring that starts on Paragraph 36. There were also minor edits that I had made consistent with other comments from working group members.

But it was not a substantially different document other than the additions that you had provided to me.

In terms of the survey, we've had a fairly consistent dripping of participation in the survey. You know two, three people a day. We now as of this morning have a total of 28 respondents to the document.

To give you some perspective in terms of other surveys, tools, I think one of the high watermarks of ICANN survey participation through the big focus and was about 120 and that was a couple of years ago when the community was asked for feedback on interpretations, translations and other public comment opportunities. So we're somewhat shy of that.

But we still have over a week left. I think close of business on June 1st is what we had planned for the lifespan of the survey.

Obviously we can leave that timetable open for a longer period of time but we had it slated to close by June 1st to give us time to summarize the results and to be able to include those in the interim report.

Now, you know, depending upon what progress you guys think that you're making with respect to the interim report, that timetable could be extended if

in fact you all want to spend more time actually working on the interim report draft documents themselves.

So that's where we are on the survey so far. I don't have a breakdown based upon - so web availability, I have in terms of insights as to what that breakdown is by region or by community at the moment. But I can work with the (big post) guys and get that breakdown. I just figure the number was still relatively small so the statistics wouldn't be tremendously useful. There's just 28 at this stage.

David Archbald: Yes, thank you. Okay, thanks Rob.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hogarth: Sure.

David Archbald: Yes go on. I didn't mean to shut you up.

Rob Hogarth: Yes, just in terms of otherwise just sort of background on the survey, all the members of the working group did get various versions of an introductory letter to invite their community members to participate. You may recall I had the one standard indication note. That was just a suggestion though. working group members can write their own notes.

But that one recommended draft was translated into six additional languages so that various communities would have the opportunity to link that to their own language version of the survey.

So I think we've got, you know, a useful document that's available in many languages.

And I would just encourage working group members over the course of next week to continue to encourage their community members to participate. And I'll stop there. Thanks.

David Archbald: Thanks Rob. Any input from anyone else on the surveys?

Rob Hogarth: I would just otherwise...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible). Sorry.

Rob Hogarth: I'm sorry Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Just a brief, I guess it's an inquiry Rob.

We attached the survey as part of our larger survey as you probably painfully know.

I'm a little concerned it's a fairly lone number that has come back in because I was informed we had I think it was at least 75 respondents to our survey which the geographic was part of. Now I know it was, you know, not compulsory for them to go through and do each of the parts.

But I'm a little concerned that the numbers aren't higher because of that modality. So is it...?

Rob Hogarth: Yes I think - yes, and Cheryl I was talking with Heidi about that. And what she had noted over and this was last week when we were talking about responses. Over the course of any survey there seems to be a feed factor. And so, you know, if you look even at your first survey and the first questions, you know, well that starts out at the peak number. It seems that as people continue the numbers dwindle.

And so it may just be...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: ...a product of it being a third survey. Even on our own survey when you look at it of all votes, you know, it starts out with 28 and by the time we're at the end of the survey we're down to 21, 22 responses to questions.

So I think part of that is just human behavior. But you're right. It is a relatively significant drop-off from the fact that it's almost three.

And I would note...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: ...and I think you guys get the credit probably. Like I say I don't have the breakdown of the numbers. But probably the bulk of the participants so far in the survey are the product of the At Large Advisory Committee's encouragement to get people to respond.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just wondering what that - I mean fatigue is one thing. But what it says about the degree of concern and engagement in this question is something we might also have to grapple with a little bit latter as well.

Rob Hogarth: That's a good point. Yes.

David Archbald: Okay, any other survey comments people?

All right, let's move on then. I'd like to go back to my question about questions. My concern that I expressed at our last teleconference was that we were not getting to grips with what I felt were some of the fundamental

questions that we had to answer. We may desire that the answers to those questions are of no significance.

But I think we've still got to address them is my view. And that's why I presented the questions that I did. I would welcome your feedback on this approach because obviously it takes some work to do and if you're not comfortable with it I won't proceed any further.

Can I have your views?

Rob Hogarth: And just to sum up real briefly David, if I could interject, basically between paragraph 36 and (56) you've outlined I believe it's five, you know, general areas that you were hoping to get some feedback on. Is that correct?

David Archbald: That's correct. Those - but those - I see those five as being examples of the way I would like to see us approach if you like the discussion subject.

So in many ways I would see some of the comments in I suppose Section C, the present Section C forming some of the answers to the questions above.

So I'm not looking at them as if you like separate sections but rather a different way of laying out similar information.

So if we pursue this there is the question of attempting to form the working group's answer to the questions that are inserted here plus then expanding it to cover the other subject areas that have been identified in Section C.

So perhaps ordered in a slightly different way, I was going through it by the general principles, representational issues, I forgotten, participation issues, etcetera. That we also have in the earlier report.

Rob Hogarth: Yes, I agree it would be helpful to get feedback on that particularly given the timing of where you guys are in terms of the Brussels meeting. That approach

I think would push your timetable but would provide some, you know, real valuable additional structure to the document.

I would imagine that you would be getting some, you know, substantive feedback from members of the working group.

And I think what you'll have to face as a group is that the realities of timing everything else on your schedules and on your plates to determine whether, you know, number one, the approach that you're beginning to outline does make sense to members of the working group then really what does that promise for your timetable. From a Board perspective, they have been very willing and I think flexible in terms of having the working group manage its schedule in time. Just from a staff perspective I'd want to be in a position to keep them apprised about what your guy's schedule would be.

You know we set out a timetable and a publication potential for the Brussels meeting. I think one of the concerns I would have just from my perspective is that while the original view of maybe a document for version or a document 5 version would be fairly close to complete and then just basically polishing, my sense is that we're not close to the polishing level here. But there are some more still substantive structural issues you guys are going to need to work through for the document.

Those are just my observations. You're free to, you know, tell me I'm crazy.

David Archbald: I don't dispute Rob what you say. But I don't - I'm not sure that that should be the primary concern. The primary concern should be are we doing what we're supposed to do or not. And then see the consequences on timing.

Rob Hogarth: Certainly.

David Archbald: Cheryl I can't imagine you don't have a view.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well my view is C is totally empty and all the sections from paragraph 37 on need to be dealt with.

But even at the levels of the matters 1 to 19, if you can't get the Work Group to respond to the issues of matters 1 to 19 perhaps we should try for the community to respond to issues number 1 to 19 and contribute that to the report.

I was hopeful that the survey as a tool may have cheesed out reactions and issues on at least some of those because obviously the survey questions themselves have been born from those matters.

But I'm wondering is it practical or possible for us to have a more formal consultation on at least matters 1 to 19 or if we want to use it in paragraph world, 37 through to 90.

Not all of them will respond - will get responses of anything from everybody. But we should be able to cheese out at least in the 19 macro areas of the major matters reactivity. Some of the paragraphs are a record of what those of us who have brought anything to the table have said and others raise questions.

Perhaps there's a mechanism of this approach in community. I mean just look at who you've got here Dave. You've got, you know, you, me and Fahd.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd like to think that what Fahd and I say is worthy of global norms but I'm not totally convinced that would pass any other test.

So I'm just wondering whether there's a mechanism we can use which will fill up our Part C for this report rather than us trying to create a Part C out of the

wonderful wisdom that three of us are bringing to the table and then put it out to some form of public comment and interaction.

I mean we've got to recognize by the time we get to the nut of the questions we're halfway through the document.

And if you talk about survey fatigue, reader fatigue is going to set in in the current report in terms of getting people to respond to from the rank and file or from the constituency perspective at least the major matters.

Now how we do that, don't know. Does it need to be done?

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In my totally biased opinion, yes. So if the survey hasn't been a sufficiently effective tool, then perhaps we need to look at a formal call to public comment on the matters.

David Archbald: But in a way that is precisely what the interim report is. It should be...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Only if you get through the first 15 pages. I'm not criticizing the mechanism of it as an interim report. But you have to get halfway through the document before you past the history. The history needs to be in the report.

But, you know, then by the time we get to page, what is it, 28 or something we actually get to conclusions, that's the bit we've got to fill out before it is an interim, sorry, be able to report at the state that it needs to be. Sorry Page 24 before we get to conclusions.

So I'd like to see some mechanism rather than us go through a second loop, some mechanism of engaging rank and file in a reaction to at least the major matters.

And not all those matters are going to get reaction. You know the questions of the consensus one, how much geographic review - regions affect consensus is probably not so contentious as some of the others. For example the needs of regions and future uses probably has a great deal more for people to chew over from marketing's perspective, those matters need to be responded to from the at large structures or the individuals which are part of the membership.

And if we haven't managed to do it in a survey, then I'm a little concerned as to how we're going to manage to do it at all.

David Archbald: Yes. And indeed, I mean one could come up with answers to the question, you know, no geographic regions don't follow international laws but the follow-on question is so does it matter.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, exactly right. Now how does that affect what we do in ICANN. You know what - if you consider what the core business of all this is, it's for a global reflection and a quality of voice and a capability of import at a global level into the policy development and processes of ICANN on naming number and names that you're on the Internet.

David Archbald: Yes. So sure, I mean I wasn't necessarily - I mean that was my conclusion from that question. But I think the question has got to be asked but equally, you know, we've got to make sure that we've addressed the issue in my view.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. So what we've done is identified the issues. It's the addressing of and any conclusions to be drawn from the discussion...

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...if it's, you know, the black boxes the magic happens here.

David Archbald: Yes my - I suppose my concern about attempting to go to the general members with...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ranking (staff).

David Archbald: ...some of these questions is without the background, are these even meaningful.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But the background is there. The background is referenced. The background in many cases was (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

David Archbald: Yes, fine if the whole report is there but if you're trying to do something shorter.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well no, as I said. I'm not honing in on the structure of the report at all. What I'm saying is.

David Archbald: Fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We need to have interactivity data sets, information, more than just my opinion would be nice. And your opinion would be nice.

David Archbald: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean, you know, to draw conclusions. You know the terms like there has been conversation practically hearsay under the cultural issues. That matter is on the 19, she's just trying to remember what part of it was when she read it last week. The part that talks about, you know, should we subsect off the Arab world.

You know who's saying that hasn't been identified. We all heard it. How much actual support for that has not been analyzed. How much of it is political rhetoric and how much of it has been thought of in terms of and if we do that then what and that goes back to a whole lot of other matters that the report raises. You know they're the questions that I think this Work Group is tasked with grappling with.

We do need to hear from the (Nix). We do need to hear from the governments. We do need to hear from my community.

And until we do I'm not sure how we can do better than asking maybe the lady down the road.

David Archbald: Yes. I think you may be going a little bit too far as far as what we needed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is totally unlike me of course David.

David Archbald: Of course. Yes. No, mainly in terms of timing here, I think you're going - you're stepping into the solutions area which is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

David Archbald: ...in the next report rather than this one where we're trying to match up is it all regions doing what they're supposed to be doing. And the answer is either yes, no, maybe I suppose.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's right.

David Archbald: And then the last report is so what do we do about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In which case well I have a conclusion section in this one because we can't draw conclusions here (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

David Archbald: Because we haven't answered the question of are they...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right.

David Archbald: ...working in those specific areas. And that's what I'm trying to cheese out from the working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's what I'm saying. We can have questions which are exactly that. If this is how they are using ICANN, is this working, if it changes what happens then. Then yes, that's a valid exercise.

But allude to the fact that we could split Asia-Pacific into, and Africa to some extent, into some new inequals, you know, six or seven instead of five regions which ICANN will use, great hypothesis. Let's test it.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What does that then mean for at least 17 of the matters right in the list of 19 in this report? That's what we need to do.

David Archbald: Yes. I mean...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Otherwise it speaks, you know...

David Archbald: ...but I don't think certainly in the bit that I have addressed with my questions have I suggested that we come up with and we need seven regions rather than five, I would - you know that is going too far. That it is into the next report if that was to happen. We'd be more looking at is the present working.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

David Archbald: And express some sort of view.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well then what we can do if we're going to get to the next step is ask that specific question of each of the component parts of ICANN. Give this report and draw the attention of the 19 matters to each AC and SO and ask them how is this working for you. How does it work for you?

Move from the reporter role to the dialogue requirement.

David Archbald: I'm sort of agreeing with you but that is what I see the role apart from the problem that you've highlighted of the lens if you like. That's what I see as the interim report doing. It is something that is sent to all the SOs and other thing highlighting the particular area and saying we are await feedback people. This is what we're interested in. This is what has come up. What are your views?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well then we don't need Section C conclusions. We need Section C the following questions we desire your particular response to...

David Archbald: I wouldn't have a problem with that I don't think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...because right now if I give this to my regions I'm not sure what I'm asking them to answer. Agree, disagree or have no opinion on the option and impact statements that we highlight in any of the matters is all I think they might be able to interpret.

It does not ask, you know, it doesn't ask them to do something. It tells them a lot of information, all valid, very important and very necessary for them to react to any of the matters, if they need to react to any of the matters.

But from my geographic regions, remember I like these particularly dissected alone the current ICANN geographic regions line, I'd be asking component parts to say are they a good framework.

Well strangely enough if you ask an entity is it working, it'll probably say yes, but we'd like the following changed. I mean we do have an overarching set of considerations from the at large point of view in that the current regional (rallo) and ALS tri-layer model, the nightmare which is how we have been built has been left without alteration between our first external review and whenever the next one occurs.

A good part of our accountability and transparency is tied up in the ascertaining and assurance that we have regional balance and regional diversity criteria met.

Now it doesn't actually matter one iota where the regions are in equal 3 or in equals 11. As long as those equity issues are met then we can pick all our boxes.

So what we need to ask is is there any downside to what probably boils down either to cultural or linguistic issues in the current carve-up.

David Archbald: As far as (ALA) is concerned. Yes, I agree.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And maybe those same questions plus a few others need to be responded to by the other component parts of ICANN. I mean there's a few anomalies. There's a few ridiculous things. You know they're very much why we're in the middle of this process.

But identifying the anomalies, some of those, a couple of tweaks might make the negative parts, the issues with a capital I better saying that we need to carve up in some other way to perhaps match some other standardized

definition of what are geographic regions. Carving out Oceana for example is one other option which we could say oh look, we match this group.

Doesn't mean it's best practice when we simply have to say are we getting the right voices heard equitably and in some cases therefore within an affirmative action program such as in design at the Board and in the mechanism of some of the council structures within the at least CFOs and certainly within my IC. I mean those questions have to be answered.

David Archbald: Yes they do. And it's CFOs may well be different for different SOs and so on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I think that would be a really, really interesting thing to find out if the answers are different. And it's got to be measured against what does the use of geographic regionalization that ICANN makes of it do. You know why are we doing it? And is that working to meet that need?

David Archbald: Absolutely. And I think we are being tasked with identifying those things and giving an opinion. It may not be the final answer but at least giving an opinion and letting others either agree or disagree with that opinion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Do you think putting conclusions in will do that or you think something else will do that?

David Archbald: I would like to I think follow through with the line that I suggested in here to get there.

But I'm also conscious. You know we now fall back to some of the comments that Rob has made on timing and everything else. And see (our) effort in doing it particularly as you said there's Fahd, you and me on this call. Do you see what I mean?

Rob Hogarth: I think the - this is Rob. I think the fundamental issue of course that you are both striving for in this conversation is to make sure that you've got it right.

And as you said earlier Dave, not to be driven by timing, sort of let that follow. But be very clear on your plans on where you want to go going forward.

I don't think you have any pressure other than the pressure that you create for yourselves which is important to move the ball forward. But I don't think you have otherwise any pressure where someone says you must produce something by X date. I think the fundamental goal of the group is that it, you know, do a good job.

And if that takes additional discussions of the working group then I don't think anybody would object to that, additional drafting, additional discussions or whatever.

David Archbald: Fahd you've been very quiet. Let's...\

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well the poor man hasn't been able to get his words in edgewise with me. Sorry.

David Archbald: That's precisely what I was going to say, absolutely precisely. But I was trying to give him a polite to say it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dave with me you don't have to be polite. I'm made of very, very thick skin.

David Archbald: Fahd any comments or have you given up on us and gone away?

Have we lost Fahd? Can you hear me Fahd?

Rob Hogarth: Fahd you're on mute. We can't hear you. No. Fahd was on mute. He's now off mute so he can talk.

David Archbald: Okay, any thoughts Fahd?

Rob Hogarth: Now Fahd is on hold. Oh now he's back on talk.

                 Fahd can you hear us?

                 We cannot hear you although your line looks to be open.

David Archbald: Oh okay. Well can you ask the question for me? Has he any comment?

Rob Hogarth: Fahd I don't know if you can hear me Rob or Dave or Cheryl. Glen do you
                 know why we may not be able to hear him? His line is open. It does say
                 status talk.

Glen de Saint Gèry: I've not heard from the operator Rob.

Rob Hogarth: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: You talk about Fahd, don't you?

Glen De Saint Gèry: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: Your input is always welcome as well Bart.

Glen de Saint Gèry: He could be away from his line. So his line could be open but he might
                 not be in his room for example.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He may have stepped away yes.

David Archbald: Yes, we drove him off. In the interim Bart, do you...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Dave that in itself is an issue though because if this is a product of a
                 dialogue of merely two or three of us then it concerns me greatly.

David Archbald: If it were a final report with recommendations to the Board, I 100% agree with you. Where it is something that is going for public consultation with lots of feedback I am less concerned frankly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Well let's ask the public some questions.

David Archbald: Yes, but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But change the report to ask them some specific very concise, even if there's some hypothetical, if this and this happens then what. Sorry Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: So looking at - sorry.

David Archbald: Bart go on, yes please.

Bart Boswinkel: So listening to you and so going over the report again, is - I think say the second bit on so as of Page 17, so the further discussion of the matters or the issues and the questions raised around it. I think to take the working group a step further that's the first step. Say the history is very important. It is the way where we got where we are. And now we need or the working group needs to take the next step.

So what I would suggest is say talking about conclusions is not so much conclusion because I agree with Cheryl and is conclusions is too early. And we change conclusions to recommendations as a word. But that's something else. Is - so if you want because there is a lot of substance in the matter area.

The first step would be say, do you agree with all these matters. And if so what are the priorities? Because the - so you've got 17 or how many are there matters identified?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Twenty-something.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, 20-something. Now it depends very much on the priorities of these matters how the recommendations or how the future will look like.

And these priorities differ. And I agree again with Cheryl, is they might...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh this is scary Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: No. But they might differ. And so that's probably experience from the CC world as well is they might differ per SO and AC.

So it might be useful to have at the next meeting and say, look we identified as working group all these matters. This is based on our previous work. We've done a lot of work in drilling them down. Now we need to identify which matters first of all have we captured what is the - say what is - why these matters do matter.

And secondly, what are the priorities. Because if you want to address them all it's - you have a complete - you will come up with a complete different recommendation then say if five or ten really are priorities and the rest is less relevant. And they could change again per SO and AC.

And that's a way to check whether this working group has - yes, say those who contributed have captured what is needed and based on that one then you can move forward and say how do we incorporate this in a set of recommendations.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fahd back with us?

Fahd Batayneh: Yes, actually I'm here. I'm sorry I actually went to grab some water to drink.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, no. We just hoped I hadn't driven you away screaming to the other end of the building.

Fahd Batayneh: Oh no. No, I was just thirsty. I'm sorry.

David Archbald: Well we were asking Fahd if you had any comments to make or any views on as much of the discussion as you could possibly bear listening to it.

Fahd Batayneh: No, no comments really. I've been unable to read the entire document really so I'm sorry about that.

David Archbald: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bart I'm uncomfortable with changing conclusions to recommendations because I agree with Dave. I think we're a little - that's a bit presumptuous of us to be making recommendations at this point in time.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Sorry Cheryl. I agree. But that's say I wasn't clear on that. That's the way where you work through.

                   But if you say you stop at the end of conclusions, say it matters, and then go say D is in fact questions based on matters.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I'd like C to be - so we've established the matters. And might I say, I think we have in fact captured the majority of the issues. We've referenced them and it is a lot of a piece of work...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...to have got to whatever it is, 24, 25. What we now need to do is say assuming this set then how do we sift and sort those looking through the filter of what ICANN does and what we need ICANN to be in terms of its accountability as a global and internationalized organization which cares about participation from a wide geographic group.

And just sort of start somehow cheesing that out whether that's putting up hypothesis or no hypothesis, asking how much do you agree or disagree, asking for simple action and reaction to statements. There's a whole bunch of ways we can do it.

But I think we are probably up to needing to do that.

David Archbald: So really we're saying...

Bart Boswinkel: I think sorry. Please go ahead Dave.

David Archbald: Yes, sorry. Let me try and spit out what I'm trying to say.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbald: I'll put my thoughts into words. So Cheryl are you suggesting then that rather than having some separate kind of consultation rather we try to tailor the interim report so that it is clearer what feedback is required and what input we need.

Am I interpreting you correctly?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Very closely to where I'm gently perhaps non-too softly trying to herd us to. If we look at this as the menu, I want to know what the people actually want to eat and then what they actually like. What they'd order again and what they'd like to see as the future limited menu that we're going to be working off perhaps in the future. I think in other words drill it down to recommendations that way.

David Archbald: Yes. I don't have a problem with that. I don't have a problem with that thought. Actually doing it is a different issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well do we have - perhaps I should have paid more attention to. Do we have face-to-face interaction with community planned at anytime?

David Archbald: We did. You asked that question at - about Brussels, did you not Rob?

And I think said we should.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I in fact did. Yes. Well are we then?

Rob Hogarth: Yes, on our...

Bart Boswinkel: So I can answer your question for the session. And that is there is no special time scheduled say for the sessional meeting itself.

Rob Hogarth: On our last call if you recall that was attended by the chair and staff. We talked about the possibility of the working group not only having a working session in Brussels but setting aside time for a session with, you know, interaction with the community.

My personal vision of that was that at the very least Dave you doing your presentation which showed the evolution that you first showed this working group which I just thought was really great, sort of crystallized the issue for a lot of folks.

That the ICANN meeting staff is currently working very hard to come up with a schedule that the various SOs and AC Chairs as you know Cheryl are comfortable with.

And while I have advised them that this working group was discussing and very interested in having a session, I wanted to let all of that dust settle so you all would be able to see what the draft schedule is so we could get it in a request prior to 15 days which is the process for, you know, after 15 days before the meeting basically the schedule locks down.

So the meeting staff knows that we have an interest as a working group in a session. We haven't styled it either as a workshop or as a forum or anything particularly.

But I've held off committing to a specific time because I know you guys have a lot of competing challenges. There's a lot of (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well as long as you don't run with Monday you're pretty right.

Rob Hogarth: Yes, that's for sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know that's (duck and cover) territory.

Rob Hogarth: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well if we - if Dave if I might, if we've got an opportunity for interaction then we can use pretty much what we've got now as the source material for that interaction.

Rob Hogarth: You mean Cheryl the draft as it exists at the moment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh well it would need to be twittering. I'm sorry tweaking. Excuse me I've been socially network far too much if I'm twittering about this.

I mean for example I wouldn't go live with something such as paragraph (17) which talks about, you know, this calculation could be flushed out to Cheryl's specific guesstimates for ALAC. I'm not sure we want to go with...

Rob Hogarth   Oh sure. Yes. No, I agree.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...(unintelligible) tweak with that. Thank you. Coming back to just ask Dave and I; I mean, you know, I mean I'm not sure we need to go public with that junk yet.

So given some tweaks and I think what you're outlining, you know, with Dave giving the history, that brings us, you know, up to Page 15 or 16 to then put up - well, you know, the major matters. Some of those can by the way sort of get lumped together into similar subsets.

David Archbald: Yes, I think there's some editing that can go on. Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. And that again I'm not criticizing. I'm just saying, you know, it is what it is. You know for example I wouldn't touch matters of solvency with a barge pole. Yes, that's almost a "if then what" type question.

You know but we can ask the questions of the points raised in the 2007 15 or so documents, you know, should we be looking at a alteration in the - either the number of regions or the ways in which the ICANN regions are currently carved up? Yes or no. Yes, no or maybe. Depending on the mood of the room, yes, no or maybe.

Let's then look at okay, if it's no. Fine, we can all go home. That's great. It is as is.

If it's yes or maybe, well if it's maybe what options are there? Do we look at small island states as a subset? We look at language groups as a subset. Do we look at some other, you know, third party authority that's carved the world up differently as a benchmark?

To what model should we be looking? If we look to a different model then what? Or is what's important is that whatever model we use it does this, this and this.

And if we have just that conversation then I think we're going hugely forward.

David Archbald: Yes, I think a conversation of that ilk would be good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we need the IRRs at the table. We need the - yes, if you look at, you know, you've got GNSO, you've got ccNSO and you've got (ASO). And the (ASO) is only linked to a particular type of geography. The way they do what they do. They're not going to change or if they are well let's ask them. Hey guys are you planning on a whole remodeling? No.

Okay, right, well how is whatever you're going to be doing mesh or not with what ICANN may or may not do as it goes through this review?

And those are the sorts of questions that based on what we already have here distill out into these matters. I think we'd be taking the work of this Work Group to the next level.

Can we ask all of our members as in members of the Work Group, not members of our constituencies that we're representing to look at the particular issues, the matters as identified and sort of bundle them in some way or sift and sort them in some way to help with us that conversation?

How do you think we should try that Dave?

David Archbald: Well we have tried it to get feedback at that sort of level many times I think.

I've got to the stage where I think we have got to make some firm suggestions to the members and let them then say no, that's not going to work or that is going to work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right. But we're competing against, you know, little things like the budget for FY '11 whether or not we should have, you know, a DNS search for God's sake as a new focus in ICANN.

I mean these blow, are we happy with five geographic regions or do we need to look at some other subsetting out of the water at least from my community's perspective.

David Archbald: I think it varies from community and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

David Archbald: ...location...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

David Archbald: ...because I think for some people it's an important issue. For others it's not even of vague interest.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not necessarily even the priority or the criteria or the importance. It's the bandwidth. You know the volunteers only have so much bandwidth.

David Archbald: Yes, absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that...

David Archbald: We agree.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well indeed. And, you know, don't exclude me in that list. And it's that that worries me greatly.

So I think we just have to, you know, ask the hard questions. And whether that is setting up some more, even maybe's, some hypothesis or no hypothesis. Let's put up a map and slice off island states. You know put some as a pretty, you know, (so Greece) or something and say okay, how's that for an alternate region? How do you all feel about that?

Okay, now let's carve it up in language groups. How does that work for you?

But measured against the - what...

David Archbald: Or all the above.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, or all of the above. And measure that against the filter. You know, the optics need to be why it's important for something like ICANN and particularly ICANN in an estimation of commitments environment.

Why do we need others in, you know, two governments, the European Union and a couple of major corporations to have any say anyway?

And I hope you all know, my tongue is firmly in my cheek when I say that.

David Archbald: Yes. I'm just hoping that we can use this recording some stage in the future.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Well I'm quite sure that even my tone will of. But you do see, you know, where I'm trying to get to I hope.

David Archbald: Yes, indeed. What I'm going to have to think about because I don't think we've got it yet, is exactly what the immediate next steps are. Where do we go from here?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well if we get face-to-face time in Brussels then that does afford I think a very important opportunity to...

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...take a big leap forward.

David Archbald: Yes, I think we've got to be able to say, Rob that comment from the last meeting that yes, we do want to get face-to-face time. I think it is important. I think Cheryl's right.

Rob Hogarth: Now to confirm. You are referring to face time with the community, not just among...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes look...

Rob Hogarth: ...yourselves and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...Dave and I can meet in the bath, you know, so Dave and I can have breakfast sometime. It's not a problem. We can see each other. It's in direction with the AC, (GSOs) and those that call themselves ICANN.

David Archbald: Yes, the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So.

Rob Hogarth: May I make a - some suggestions in terms of next steps Dave that you guys are free to roundly shout down?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh gee. Do you think we might (reemphasize)?

David Archbald: Yes bring them on.

Rob Hogarth: I constantly exhibit - I'm constantly exhibiting my soft underbelly Cheryl. You know I come home and my dog's on his back going oh, rub me. I'm just very conscious of, you know, overstepping my boundary factor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right Dave. I think both Dave and I and Fahd would let you know if you've (bid) your throat or (anything).

David Archbald: Yes, we're not exactly shrinking violets here.

Rob Hogarth: You know it's given me part of my personality.

Here are my thoughts maybe just based on what I'm picking up from your conversation and that is as one possible step forward this - my impression is you're not going to have a final document done in time for Brussels.

So as an alternative cleaning up what exists today as a Version 5 consistent with the timetable that we already had here, and saying community, this is what the working group has at present in draft form. It is simply a draft for discussion purposes, (works) and all. And the cleanup by the way is taking out, you know, we need comments from Cheryl here or from Bart or from Dave there and presenting it simply as that, my concern being that if a document is to be discussed in Brussels then we need to have it posted by May 31st.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: And in our - I think in the original version of our publication timetable the thought was that we were not going to discuss the interim report in Brussels but simply discuss the progress of the working group.

The - under that scenario the interim report could be released as late as the day before the forum and you wouldn't be violating any structures of the Public Participation Committee because the goal of Brussels was not to discuss the document.

But based on this conversation what you're beginning to suggest is it will be extremely useful for the community to have some insight into the questions and the struggles of the working group to really define what some potential conclusions could be in their next report.

So therefore community, here's your (works) and all. It's always been available if you clicked on our wiki but here's (works) and all formerly is our draft document that we are working on.

We're going to have a session in Brussels where we talk about this. And so we're presenting this to you now. We've still got to survey the building that we'll close in early June and we hope to produce the results of that survey for discussion in Brussels when we have our forum.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: And so we're getting together on Thursday morning in Brussels. You know our chair's going to give you an overview of the issue. We'll have a couple members of the working group if not all the members there.

So please come and we'll have a dialogue. And then maybe what this working group can do post Brussels is take that feedback from the forum. Maybe in Brussels if you have some working group time, look at the survey results.

And then with a defined timeframe of maybe two or three weeks after Brussels, maybe longer to say okay, we are going to then take all this stuff that we gathered. We're then going to look again at our interim report. We're going to produce a document.

And then get community comments and then we can discuss what the intercessional time looks between Cartagena and Brussels.

But essentially right now just sort of throwing out what you have slightly rushed but not terribly so. And just basically using that as a means to spur discussion because let's be frank. In the initial report we've got one comment and then, you know, two at the outside. So I mean it was very limited.

And maybe we just need to find a way to jumpstart the community a little bit. And if they see a (works) and all version, then that'll help do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dave.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm wondering depending on how much time we can get allocated in the Brussels' agenda. Just sort of I keep flipping through these, you know, paragraphs basically, you know, 90 backwards to the 30 something's.

And I keep seeing them almost as a script. I'm wondering if this might be an opportunity to resuscitate something that I thought was very successful; the (ccNSO) did before when it wanted to get the community's juices going on something.

And that was to very much run a hypothetical exercise which with the right facilitator and moderator and you have those goal sets within the ccNSO in a number of people can, I mean even if you do little more than actually sit the Work Group members around a table plus a few other people, you know, the (GACNE), you want someone from the Board, blah, blah, blah. And just challenge us. Just say okay, well if this, then what.

And just have that dialogue and take people through that exercise. And then they might all - we might have to leave the survey open still after then perhaps. I don't know or let them dive back in.

Rob Hogarth: Well and also Cheryl, this is Rob, you might, you know, ask different questions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: You know after having that dialogue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But depending on what the reactions are.

Rob Hogarth: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So ask those Caribbean and island states, okay, here you are. You know we've drawn that line. There's the model up there, right. You know, one of this, this, this or all of the above.

Now how's that going to fit into an ICANN (trailer)? What's that going to do to this, that and the other?

Let's run through some of the exercises.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you think, I mean really this is a question I suspect back primarily to Dave and to Bart. Do you think that's something that would be worthy of our time and energy or will it be six of us in a room again?

David Archbald: All six. Yes. But it takes - don't underestimate the work that that would take to do it properly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes. Believe me I know what it'll take.

David Archbald: Yes. Again it comes back to how much do you think we can get? I almost feel it would be worth doing a two part thing if you like and that is giving a quick

overview or background and then going into of what is and get your views as to the follow-up, the second half of it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You'd have to set the scene, absolutely.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

David Archbald: So I get back Rob.

Rob Hogarth: This is Rob. I'm wondering. Sorry go ahead Bart.

David Archbald: Yes. No, Rob it was me I think. Dave.

Rob Hogarth: Oh I'm sorry Dave, go ahead.

David Archbald: Can you follow-up on this face-to-face meeting issue and what sort of time we can slot in there? I understand the problems of scheduling at Brussels. But before we do a great deal of work or further thought on it, we've got to know that yes we are going to get sometime and what sort of time it is.

Rob Hogarth: Yes. I mean you guys can have the time. The issue is number one, will you be there Dave? Are you planning on going to Brussels because you're a critical piece of that?

Number two, what I typically do in terms of any of these things is first talk to Gisella and see if certain people's schedules are free. And Cheryl you know who I'm talking about there.

And then it's just a matter of, you know, yes, saying okay. We've got a 90 minute slot. Unfortunately it conflicts with this session, that session and another session. That's always going to be a problem. There will be overlap.

There will be conflicts. And so that will for better or for worse ultimately drive attendance.

Can we have a session? Certainly, so I mean from a timeframe perspective and from a scheduling perspective we can identify a room. We can identify a place. We can have the remote participation facilities available.

Then it's an issue of, you know, agenda (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

David Archbald: What's it clashing with?

Rob Hogarth: Right. I really like this idea of the scenario. I'm wondering if, you know, the real challenge is you do that in conjunction with the interim report or with the final report. Depending upon which report you're doing it for, obviously the agenda is different.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I say it is going to be a lot more useful in the interim than it would be in the final. Because when that type of scenario exercise is successful so much is learned, light loads come, you know, doing, doing, doing out of so many people's heads. If it's left to too late in the process then you often have the oh, I wish we had done this or we now need more time to integrate this type of...

Rob Hogarth: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...situation. Bart the last time and I think probably the only time this was done was looking at delegation, re-delegation matters where no report was wrapped around it. It was simply an issue that needed to be beaten to death in the public forum.

And that was back in, correct me if I'm wrong...

Bart Boswinkel: Wellington.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...Wellington. Wellington.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Wellington.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean that was beyond standing room only. But there was certainly when you test these things and it really, really does need some scene setting and some flexibility, you know, because a good hypothetical, you don't know where you'll be taken to next. You have to act and react based on the information that you're given. And there's a good bit of role planning that needs to go on.

But, you know, we can give voice to the language concerns. We can give voice to these small states. We can give voice to the Oceana and the language groups. We can give voice to the - we diverted from the original model. Is that a crying shame or not?

You know all of that can be run up the flagpole and we can see what happens.

Rob Hogarth: This is Rob. I defer to Bart in terms of what goes into that agenda development preparation for the meeting and the rest. I harbor some substantial concerns about bandwidth for being able to pull that together by the Brussels meeting.

Again just thinking out loud, are there also going to be other international forum that we could piggyback some sort of workshop like that onto? Because, you know, the real challenging thing here is we've had this quick run-up to Brussels and then there's this, you know, tremendously long period of time until Cartagena.

And, you know the balance of trying to accomplish this sooner rather than later I believe Cheryl is critical in terms of helping to develop. If you all as working group members collectively think the exercise would be useful and if you're again doing it late.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well you see Rob, I guess because oh dear, okay Cheryl is now declaring a military medical background. And in the military medical background these type of hypotheticals are test situations which you go in cold. You know your other guy was off. You're pulled into a room and you do a white board exercise.

And the lack of preparation is almost half of the importance of it all. You know you can't go into these things with a script because you don't know what your action and reaction will be until you're presented by the moderator of well okay, you said this and you said that. So if we go down this pathway why then what.

What you need is willing and able individuals sitting around and ability for an audience to interact with that and a skilled moderator and facilitator. You need the scene set. You need to have and it's what we've got in Section B here is just begging for a moderator to go through and go I'll have to have that one and that one and that one. That would just be wonderful.

So yes, I think you can do it if you want to go down that pathway Rob. I think it's a good thing that you have a long whole piece of time between the Brussels closure and the Cartagena because if this type of exercise does what it could do then that is where you will really have fuel to the fire on community and SO and AC interaction with then an interim document. That'll be all fired and ready to act and react to an interim document which will give us a great deal of material to move to the next step in our reporting and work processes.

David Archbald: If you thought this one was difficult wait till you hear the last one because of reports I mean.

Now people I'm sorry. I'm running out of time because I've got another meeting in about ten minutes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I've got a whole 41 minutes before mine.

David Archbald: Well there you go. You can keep talking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've got plenty of time.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well anyway, where do you want to go with this? Dave seriously, but where do you want to go with this? Do you want to (unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

David Archbald: Yes, I think we have got to do something to stimulate response. And I think what you suggest is probably the best way that there is to do that. So I'm comfortable with that.

I think we've got to do some editing and tweaking of the present document to make it even this is the present draft. That's going to take some work. It's also a question of finding the right people to participate in our scenario as it were.

And that will involve people from every SO...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Everything (unintelligible) yes.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know ccNSO and the GNSO and the ACSO. Gee someone from my model better be there.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You probably need, you know, someone from the (NTIA), you know.

David Archbald: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: It's going to be difficult.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. That will be unless we've got a lot of prior planning because some of those people won't necessarily be around if and when we get a time slot.

Bart Boswinkel: Is it Rob, this is an idea that say by the end of say business close tomorrow you'll try and resend some suggestions to the working group?

Rob Hogarth: Oh yes, I mean what I'm going to do is outline what you all have just discussed here.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: I'm going to proceed with the understanding at least from what I heard that the idea is to get something circulated to the community by the deadline which is the 31st of next week. That means we've got to get something

posted. That posting can include a head's up to the community that there will be a workshop. I'm talking out loud here so please again.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: And Dave, you know, another 45 seconds of your time before you have to leave please.

You know basically saying here's the draft. Here's where we are. We're having a workshop in Brussels on it's likely to be Thursday morning. That's the only, you know, area where there seems to be any (hollow) ground left before the public forum and so there will be, you know, a big crowd still there.

And we can spend, you know, the working group can spend their next meeting really fine tuning the agenda. But with the understanding that that 90 minutes will be a loosely 20 minute presentation by the Chair, Dave Archbald, who outlines the issue and the remaining - the remainder of that 90 minutes being a white boarding, what if, hypothetical section forum among members of the community to discuss different scenarios about, you know, potential ways that geographic regions could look in the future with interested members of the community contributing their unique points of view, blah, blah, blah.

And that's essentially where you guys are at this moment. We can, you know, we'll have to work pretty quickly over the course of the next couple of days to, you know, clean up this document, at least putting it in a framework that there's no embarrassing methods as to working group members in it.

But not...

David Archbald: (Unintelligible).

Rob Hogarth: Otherwise we're realistically not expecting that we're going to get a lot of substantive feedback from working group members.

David Archbald: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: And that's okay given this discussion. Was that a good summary?

David Archbald: Okay.

Rob Hogarth: I mean and I think you're all hearing sort of the staff concern or that we'll just have to find a way to figure out the details a little bit. As you already know as with Nairobi I'm - to the extent I'm even able to show up at this session...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're going to be busy.

Rob Hogarth: ...will be great. I hope I'll be able to at least be the RP Manager for that session.

                   But beyond that, you know, basically the key is from what I hear Cheryl is, you know, if it's non-scripted, it's just making sure we've got the right people...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Rob Hogarth: ...and post sometime to the exercise.

David Archbald: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hogarth: And not everybody on the working group can work for in terms of encouraging members and reps in their community to make some time.

David Archbald: Yes. Okay. Yes, that's fine Rob.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if you are doing remote participation then Rob this is one of those particular topics where real interaction from the wider community who are either in the room and want to, you know, twitter or whatever, chat or something, you know, that has to be (fed) into the system if we go down that way so it would be excellent if you were involved to that point.

Rob Hogarth: Yes, and what I'll try to do is find a time where if possible we are using the facilities of that large users so that there may be opportunities for interpretation or other stuff like that. I'm not quite sure where we are with that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Rob Hogarth: But we'll work with Heidi and the TSM.

David Archbald: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks guys.

David Archbald: Thanks Rob, so...

Rob Hogarth: Your next call...

David Archbald: I'm sorry. I really am going to have to disappear.

Rob Hogarth: Your next call is (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

David Archbald: You know essentially get back as soon as you can. Yes.

Rob Hogarth: Yes sir.

David Archbald: Okay, thanks people. Thanks Cheryl. Thanks Rob.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Take care everybody.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Rob. Thanks everyone.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks. Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

                              END