GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Sub Task 2 Work Team 06 July 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 Sub Task Work Team teleconference **06 July** 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/gnso/gnso-cowt-20090706.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#july

Participants present:
Victoria McEvedy - IPC - sub-task 2 chair Olga Cavalli - work team chair - NCA Rafik Dammak - NCUC Michael Young - Work team vice chair - Registry c.
Claudio Digangi - IPC

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies
SS Kshatriya - Individual

Coordinator: Excuse me, madam, the recording is on.

Victoria McEvedy: Right, okay. Well, I'm a very inexperienced - I've never been a chair or leader of a task group so please jump in and tell me off if I....

Coordinator: (Unintelligible) now joins.

Glen DeSaintgery: Can I do a quick roll call for you, Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Lovely. Thanks, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. We have on the call Rafik Dammak, Victoria McEvedy, Olga Cavalli, Michael Young and (Claudio DiGangi). And myself, Glen DeSaintgery.

Victoria McEvedy: And Rafik.

Glen DeSaintgery: And Rafik, yes, Rafik Dammak. Thank you. Thank you, Victoria, sorry.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, that's great. That's all the procedural stuff. Thank you very much, Glen.

Julie Hedlund: Hello, this is Julie Hedlund, sorry to be late.

Victoria McEvedy: Hi, Julie.

Woman: Hi, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Hello.

Victoria McEvedy: Look, what I was just saying - and I'll just repeat it for the benefit of those who just joined - is because of our first sub, you know, sub-task meeting, what I thought might be really, really useful is to actually sort of go around each individual member of the group and, you know, basically have them to speak to any overarching concerns, ideas, you know, whether process or substantive, etcetera. So that we can kind of get an idea, you know, where we have some common ground, where are issues, you know, other things that need to be added to our discussion and what have you.

So if everybody's in agreement with that, do you think we can just start and go through the list?

(Claudio DiGangi):   Victoria, this is (Claudio). I'm not sure I'm - I'm not sure I'm following what you're asking for us to summarize.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean, general overarching thoughts, concerns, issues - both procedural and substantive - about the work plan and task in front of us.

(Claudio DiGangi):   Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: So, you know, it's really kind of just an introductory, you know, an introductory discussion about, you know, what our work is and, you know, the scope of the task as we've defined it, the content, etcetera, etcetera. I mean, people can speak to any issue they like. And if they don't have anything they want to contribute, then there's no need to do so.

(Claudio DiGangi):   Okay, thanks.

Victoria McEvedy: Great. Who wants to start?

Olga Cavalli: I can start, if you want, Victoria...

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, thank you.

Olga Cavalli: One comment that - about my experience, I've been around in the ICANN process for a while. For some years, I was the Argentina

representative of the (GARC) and then I've been studying all the structure. What I have not worked is in a constituency. So in this perspective, I have seen the constituencies from the outside, working and in different committees, like the (GARC) and now in the GNSO for almost two years.

So my view is - what I can be helpful in this process is to give you some opinions and some feedback from how do you - how do I see some constituencies working from the outside and how they interact between and where do I see some lack of maybe participation or maybe some rulings. This is perhaps my value added to this process.

That's what I wanted to comment. So in this sense, I would be happy to continue with some of you working in a certain specific point. So I can give you my view from the outside. But I don't belong to a constituency, you know, I'm a noncom appointee of the GNSO.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, great. Thanks, Olga, that's great, very helpful. Anything else from you or is that all?

Should we go on through the list then? Rafik, would you like to go next? Have we got Rafik?

Olga Cavalli: Maybe he's on mute.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Michael?

Glen DeSaintgery: I think he's - I'll get him back. I think he's disconnected for some reason.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Michael Young: I can go ahead. So there's a few things, looking through the work plan that you put out, Victoria, that made me think. My own background originally is I've been in - I - some of you know, some of you may not know this. I'm involved in the industry since the first new TLV was launched, which was (unintelligible) back in 2001.

So I've actually been around this for a long time. And my initial involvement was heavily in the ITF arena, where we did heavy consensus work and really, it's all about working group models and consensus. So, you know, my general understanding of the recommendations or the overall feeling of the recommendations and the restructuring of the GNSO is to - we still have voting structures in place. But the idea is to try and drive decisions of consensus versus having to fall back to voting.

And you know, I think that there are - you may have noticed some new constituency applications coming in, like the city and the IDN gTLD application, which were very interesting applications. And they both, I think, indicated strong lack of understanding of the intent of the restructuring of the GNSO and the constituency groups towards the consensus and working group model because they focused a great deal on exerting and attaining voting power or influence right up to the GNSO council.

And I think it's incumbent on us in our recommendations to try to make sure that those operating recommendations and principles reinforce the intent to take this to more of a working group model and to

emphasize the fact that the voting is a fall back mechanism, not a primary mechanism by which decisions should be made.

And at least, in particular, I think that's important within the stakeholder groups and in the new constituencies that lists within them. An interesting development and an example also of a point I want to make was, you know, I don't think that we can - I mean, on one hand, I think setting some generalized practices and principles are used consistently across all the constituencies and the stakeholders groups is a good thing.

On the other hand, I think we also have to understand that each of these stakeholder groups, these four areas, have their own unique issues and representations. And this is supposed to be a bottom-up environment. So they need to have some freedom to differentiate where it's appropriate for the space that they're representing or from the problems that they're coming from.

So I think in terms of recommendations, we have to keep that in mind and allow flexibility for that kind of perspective. And an example of that is we've now changed - the SIC advised us in the charter for the registry stakeholders group, to change our language from constituencies in our charters to interested parties. And they're suggesting the same thing is done with the registrar stakeholder group as well.

So effectively, that's going to be a consistent change to recommending across the entire contracted party side of the house in the GNSO. And you know, it's very interesting about that or their point is that, you know, at least with contracted parties, in order to have a vote in a

stakeholder's group, you need to have a contract by definition with ICANN. And that was argued in both the proposed charters and they acknowledged that and recognized yeah, that makes sense.

And therefore also the board should necessarily be approving constituencies within those two groups because there's a definition of membership as quite clear through contractual obligations. Whereas in the non-contracted parties house, there need to be more of an examination or approval because there isn't that defining membership by contract to guide membership.

And I thought that was very interesting. I think that was a good revelation and a good acknowledgement for all of us. But also, to the point I'm trying to make, there is a reasonable differentiation between, you know, whether you want to call the constituency or interested party, there's a reasonable difference between those existing in the non-contracted side of the house versus the contracted side of the house. The motivations and the ultimate agendas and interests are different because they're coming from different communities and different areas of concern and that's valid.

And so we should leave enough flexibility so that they can be represented accordingly to their communities, I think.

Victoria McEvedy: I think those were really good points. That's extremely interesting to hear that. Thank you so much, Michael. That's great having that perspective coming to the group obviously because, you know, only, you know, other in the group aren't as focused on the contracted party issue and how it impacts these reforms and what have you. And so it's very helpful.

So just keeping along, (Claudio), do you want to go next?

(Claudio DiGangi): Yeah, sure. I actually agree with a lot of the points Michael just raised, particularly about the differences between these constituencies and really the diversity that exists within ICANN and the GNSO and sort of the need for that flexibility to be acknowledged.

I'm not sure if I really have any - many other thoughts. I mean, I was looking over the different tasks and I did see a little overlap between Sub Task 1 and Sub Task 2. So I think it would be a good idea, Victoria, to invite (SS) and try to coordinate between the two groups where possible.

And I had just been thinking as far as going about completing our work, that possibly we could just have one or two people from each team or each task work on developing recommendations perhaps for some of these sub items. And then maybe circulating them to the list or to the group, having a discussion on that and then seeing if we have agreement. Those are pretty much my thoughts.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, Rafik, do we have Rafik now?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: Hi, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, I was on the call for some time so I am not sure about question.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, let me just repeat it very quickly. Because this is the first discussion that the sub group has had, we decided we're just going around the group members and just speaking very genuinely to any overarching thoughts, concerns, issues, ideas, you know, either substantive or procedural or about the work plan or how do we approach the work, etcetera.

So don't feel obliged but if you have anything that you just, you know, people have been having sort of, you know, just giving perspectives and, you know, how they see this process, etcetera. So you know, if you have something, just you're very welcome to share it with us.

Rafik Dammak: Well, maybe just one point that this constituency has its own particular GNSO, how we can, how do you say, how we can partake or make that each constituency has its own particular (unintelligible). For example, for NCOS, they are in the process for the new stakeholder groups. So this is my first (council), maybe I will ask more question after.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, okay. And then Julie, do you want to contribute too because, you know, you're a member of the group in a sense, if you'd like to say anything, please.

Julie Hedlund: I think - thank you very much, Victoria. All of you are raising some very interesting and useful points. I guess as I was making notes here, I - the ones that I thought would be useful perhaps for us to give some thought to as, you know, as you go about addressing this task is, you know, as several of you noted, the diversity in ICANN. The need for flexibility, which I think was definitely a point that was raised in the

recommendations in the BGC report was the need for flexibility as we come up with recommendations.

And as Rafik had noted, that each constituency has its own particularities, in that, you know, I think we're not tasked with finding a one-size-fits-all approach but perhaps finding some general approaches, recommendations that perhaps within each constituency or stakeholder group can be adjusted to fit that group's particular needs and its particular interests, shall I say.

But I don't have anything else necessarily to add. I think this was an excellent idea, though, to get everyone to share some thoughts at the beginning of this.

Glen DeSaintgery: Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, great. And I only have a few thoughts but I suppose to be very general. I mean, I take, I mean, I think it's very - it is very useful to have had these things and I think we need to actually - my initial reaction is that we particularly need to think through some of the issues that Michael raised.

I mean, I suppose my thoughts overall, having read, again, the board governance and the LEC reports and so forth and trying to understand the backdrop of the other restructuring initiatives and new bylaws, etcetera, etcetera. I mean, I suppose in a sense I - what I come to the task looking at, having been a member of two different constituencies and seeing quite different practices in a sense is that I think it is a good, you know, the reports talk about the fact that this is just the most

enormous information and process barrier and process fears for new entrants coming through to ICANN and trying to participate.

And I really think that's true. And I think it's kind of, you know, golden and historic opportunity to sort of improve the process, hearing what everyone's saying and accepting about the need for flexibility. I mean, I thought one of the interesting things that the board governance report says is that look, we're not trying to introduce a new layer of bureaucracy. And I think - and I do, you know, it was their idea that there should be some new standardization going in. And they selected the constituency level.

And so one, you know, I agree as well, you know, it should be bottom up. There is a need for flexibility. I think we'll be doing everybody a great service if we could come up with some consistent minimums, just for, you know, for example, procedural, you know, good practice and good procedure. And it shouldn't really be that controversial or we should - maybe we can be, you know, I mean, I suppose we should be able to work around areas of controversy.

I mean, in a way, I think it's quite difficult to do this because the stakeholder group issues a (unintelligible) unresolved or as I see it, some of it - I don't know how I'm resolved their or not. And I think again, it's something - perhaps I need a better understanding of.

So there were my general comments. About process, I would just address (Claudio)'s point. I'm not - I hate to say, my own preference - and perhaps this should be one of the first issues that we go to, discuss now substantively. I'm not necessarily sure that I'm a fan of breaking sub - breaking down into sub teams further because I think

it's already a bit of an issue whether or not it's going to work, having this whole working group having broken into these two sub teams.

So I hate to say, I'm not really attracted to that but I'm open to other views and I wonder if we should put - take that round to the table or see if anyone wants to talk to that further.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I would like to add a comment if possible.

Victoria McEvedy: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, about procedures and about - I was revising the document of the (unintelligible) Task 2. I have a concern about new constituency and new stakeholder groups. And also existing constituencies and existing - this new rebuilt stakeholder groups. And it's about the diversity of - the reflection of the diversity of the whole work.

I think the big challenge that I can have now is really becoming a global institution, a global organization that could reflect the interests of the whole Internet community. That's a big challenge, especially for some constituencies. I've been talking especially, for example, registry constituency of the registrars.

And they have difficulties sometimes just finding representatives or voices coming from some other regions of the world other than United States of Europe which is understandable because sometimes these

companies and these markets are more developed in the developing world. But I think that's a big challenge in these new stakeholder groups. And I like the word that Michael said, instead of constituencies, which was the word he used - I liked it because it was more general and more inclusive - I cannot recall it now.

Michael Young: It was interest group.

Olga Cavalli: Interest group - great - because it's a really interesting term. I think it's much more inclusive. The big challenge is how to include the whole community. And I'm not sure how to solve this in the first moment but I think it should be included as some ideas and some process, as a process that should go on in the development of - and this new GNSO structure and the whole ICANN structure.

Representivity of developing countries, it's relevant because the new billion - the next billion users will come from developing work. And so I think it's very challenging. I come from a developing country, I come from a region where there are no registrars almost. There are like three or four registrars in the whole Latin America and I find if very curious, very interesting to understand why this market is not developed, why - what - why is this happening, why is this region of the world is not included in this new business and new (unintelligible).

So I wonder how, for example, the registrar constituency could include Latin America. Also, the registry constituency could include Latin America view. So perhaps we could have that in mind. And in collecting model classes on, for example, which is Point 6 in the document that you sent to us, could also be taken into consideration how to be really a global - to have a global view.

Not perhaps achieving things today but having in mind some guidelines to achieve it in the future as a vision.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, thanks, Olga, that's great. It's good to have that sort of - it's very, very helpful to have that kind of perspective. Do you think we should just explore just a little further this idea of interested parties and whether or not - I'm just wondering, Michael, I don't know if you have a proposal but - or if you've thought this through as to help - I mean, are you suggesting there might be - we should, perhaps, focus on interested parties rather than constituencies?

Michael Young: Well, I'd like to - it might be a good idea to circle back to the SIC representatives. We had a presentation of a relatively quick one from them, where they explained they were advising both the registrar and the registry stakeholder groups to change that language from constituency to interested parties.

I'm not exactly sure what they did on the non-contracted side, although it was inferred in that conversation that they were going - it was going to continued to be defined as constituency on the non-contracted party side. So I think it'd be interesting to get - to circle back to them and get a little clarification on that. And you know, maybe in our recommendations, we should be, you know, specifically thinking about, you know, there's - that there is a bit of a difference between those two different groups in the two different sides of the house because of their - the base that they're coming from and address that in a recommendation.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I think that's a really good idea. Perhaps we should seek that input. I mean, also my own thought was just that, you know, this - I mean, I feel it - and even in the process that we've been through, getting to the stage in our working team, we've had a lot of resistance. Because, you know, and to some extent I think there's a desire in the constituencies to maintain the status quo as far as possible. But particularly in the non-contracted houses, until they can be sure they can replicate themselves at stakeholder group level.

And so, you know, it may well be - we don't know where it could be lost in the sense or wasted because of those sort of issues. And I was just wondering if there might be some sort of work around there. But perhaps we can put that to aside and maybe see if this is something worth coming back to. If anyone has any ideas for it down the track.

Julie Hedlund: Victoria, this is Julie, if I might make a quick comment or bring something to your attention?

Victoria McEvedy: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: In asking, you know, whether or not the interested party's language is something that the SIC has incorporated into the other charters. And I have not read the other charters but I do know that all of the revised stakeholder group charters are now posted for public comment.

I'll send you the link. But at any rate, if you wanted to scan through them, you can see, I think they're even marked up to show where the changes were made.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I've seen them. I've actually read them, Julie, so yeah. Thank you - but yes.

Julie Hedlund: That's all right, then. Great, just thought I'd mention that.

Victoria McEvedy: But I mean, of course, with the commercial group, for example, it's still transitional. So I mean, again, this comes back to the concern I was mentioning earlier. I mean, I think there's a concern not - that they shouldn't be an additional two layers of varying, you know, varied procedures and is a real danger with that. And we don't know what's going to happen of that other layer finally or certainly we don't know in the commercial. We do know in the non-commercial because they've got - they have submitted a proper charter for stakeholder groups.

But at the same time I suppose, you know, maybe the board governance committee has set - it thinks the consistent - any standardization or, you know, common principles, etcetera, should go on at constituency level or interested party's level, what have you. So I guess we just have to start with that.

Shall we move through actually looking at some of the other agenda items and perhaps - we don't have that much more time probably but - and perhaps just start to discuss any of those? We've discussed the general variation versus uniformity. Do people think it would be helpful to talk about that further or should - or is that one of the big issues that we should perhaps leave to the end? Do people have views?

(Claudio DiGangi):   Victoria, this is (Claudio). I was just curious, earlier you had expressed some concern about breaking up into smaller groups. Did

you have a thought regarding how you thought we should proceed on completing our task?

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I mean, essentially I think some of the issues of principle need to be discussed and we need to agree on that. I mean, I'm not so focused on document, you know, the documentation. I mean, I think that's a danger; people get very focused on documenting. I mean, there are some bigger issues which are sort of issues one decides in the work plan, well, I mean, issues one to four. They are issues of principle that need discussion.

The model clauses issue and/or the, you know, the materials that we're going to work from, I mean, that's kind of a practical question we could begin with right now on a, you know, procedural level if that's what you'd like to do.

Shall we start with Question 5 then, given it's practical and then perhaps come back to the issues of principle which are 1 to 4, which may have further contours, once we've dealt with some of the practical tasks? If other people have views on that?

Okay, so now, I think when we turn to issue, you know, Question 5 in the work plan, this is collect and put on available models for operating procedures for more sources, including those referenced by the board governance committee reporting, so forth. Now those are possible sources. And also, we have the work that's been done on best and worst practices, which is a body of course of available sources for practices.

I think one of the early issues that arises is whether or not - and Michael, you may have views on this - is that with your proposal, the best and worst practices, do you have a view, Michael, whether or not it's inappropriate to look outside ICANN - existing ICANN procedural operations?

Michael Young: I think it's encouraged to bring ideas in as far as I understood. And you know, in terms of this whole consensus based approach and going more into a working group model, I mean, the ITF in particular was cited many times by many people. You know, the reality is that, you know, it's nice - we'll have to pull some of the ideas out of these things.

And I mean, for the ITF, ICANN actually advised what works in practicality. I mean, things that are things that are sitting there in documents that are actually never used in the meetings or in the working groups because they actually - they look good on paper but frankly they just don't work.

So if we were to pull some things from, you know, W3C or (unintelligible), you'd want the same - someone from that group ideally telling us, you know, what actually worked in practice, just because it's, you know, listed on a Web site or on a document somewhere doesn't meant it's actually getting used. So I can certainly do that for the ITF element.

Victoria McEvedy: That would be really, really helpful. Do they have sort of constituency-style grouping or stakeholder groupings or interest groups?

Michael Young: Well, what the ITF has basically is just a working group which is effective in the interest groups because they're self-formed and there's a process around which you build up enough initiative.

Now the other thing, the barrier that you have hit with the self-interest group like that is they declare themselves, they declare a charter. And they have to engage one of what we call an area director in the ITF, which there's a couple of area directors for each area and they specialize in a span of technology space that's appropriate under the ITF overall mandates.

So you have to basically - if you will, you have to achieve sponsorship from a full time guide, if you will, within the organization. You gain their sponsorship, then you have to go through the process and pass several listed barriers that actually reach working group status. So I can pull some of that stuff out and talk about that. And when the groups are operating, I can also pull out some of the nice elements that they use to actually - what's unique about the ITF probably is how they operating the meetings.

Victoria McEvedy: How's that?

Michael Young: Well, they've got some auditing, really. They don't like to vote, putting hands up and hands down so they hum.

Victoria McEvedy: What is hum? What does hum mean?

Michael Young: They say well okay, if the group wants to go left, can I have a hum. And then people hum. And then well, if they want to go right, can I have another hum. And whichever is the louder hum wins, okay? And

the idea is to actually not call people out and have them take, you know, extreme sides and say, you know, I'm for this or for that. It allows a little bit of softness to that.

And you know, if it sounds like the entire room, for example, is in agreement with something, then they're just ask for one general hum. And if it's quite deafening, we realize we move on. And it's a funny thing. I have to tell you, sociologically it's a bit of a funny thing but it works.

Victoria McEvedy: It's also (chicken) house rules, by the sound of it. As you said, there's a softer side to it. So it's kind of - it's a kind of secret ballot, in a way as well, right?

Michael Young: Yeah, yeah. And, I mean, semi because you're sitting next to people and you can kind of tell if they're humming or not. But it's pretty hard to gauge the whole room - yeah. And that's why we hum instead of clap.

Victoria McEvedy: So people can sort of vote on conscience then rather than along party lines, in a sense, right, because there's no accountability as such.

Michael Young: That's right. And to be honest, in those groups, you know, part of it's because it's really technical issues and frankly, most of the representatives are primarily technical purists. There's not a lot of collusion really within those groups, generally speaking. I mean, I'm sure there are people in those groups there that are representing, you know, private interests - there always is.

But it's not as overt. As I would say, it tends to be in groups like ICANN, to be honest. You know, it's a little subtler and the - part of that is the methodology by which people express themselves. Very hard for anyone to dominate a conversation.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, that's extremely helpful and it's regarded as an extremely successful model of bottom up sort of decision making. So I mean, anything we can learn from that would be useful.

I mean, if you're going to take that and tell us a little bit more about that and perhaps, you know, bring anything to the table that we might use from that model, maybe everyone in the group should select another organization and then we'll be able to combine our best and worst practices, ICANN models, other models, you know. And would that be - how do people feel about that as a starting point?

Woman: I think it's a great idea.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Can I make a comment?

Victoria McEvedy: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: I would like also perhaps to review the procedures of our regional RAR technique, which I think in my opinion are - it's a very interesting organization, very inclusive and very much devoted to the region with

several mechanisms that I cannot recall right now because I don't participate actively in their working group.

But perhaps I can interact with them and bring some ideas because I have many friends in there and I see the work they do in the region and they're quite inclusive and quite dynamic and very bottom up oriented. So maybe I can bring some ideas from our local RAR.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, that sounds fantastic - great. Does anyone else have any - want to volunteer to do - want to volunteer to do - that's like, (RIPE), isn't it, Olga? Is that your regional version of (RIPE)?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, exactly.

Victoria McEvedy: It is, okay, great. So leave -and I guess I can look at (RIPE), I suppose. Who else have we got to - (Claudio), do you have a preference about, you know, would you like to look at a model? You can (unintelligible)?

(Claudio DiGangi): The W3C?

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, great. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: We've got Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes?

Victoria McEvedy: Rafik, would you like to choose, like, an organization and bring some ideas perhaps from their operating procedures? Has anyone got any suggestions on organizations?

Rafik Dammak: I don't know any.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I guess you could look at (Robert)'s roles or something. You know, sort of just standard meeting, you know, standard governance or meet indoor, you know, meeting procedures.

Or I tell you what, this is just a thought - and please shoot me down, someone, if it's a bad idea. But can we borrow from the working group model? I mean, is that not the kind - is it not - has it been a lot of work done on how working groups should operate and might there be some useful procedures and so forth there?

Michael Young: Sure, I don't see why not.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, Rafik, are you happy to do that?

Rafik Dammak: Well, currently I'm not in the US.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Listen, I can email you - we can do this on the list afterwards and then I can make, you know, send you a link and explain. I'm conscious that we've got very little time left because Michael, you have to go, right?

Michael Young: Yes, unfortunately, sorry.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Well, this has been - I think this has been very helpful. So should we go away and perhaps do our work on the list and then, you know, do people - should we have - I think we should have a really tight time frame, so almost by the end of the week, if that works for anybody - with everybody.

Michael Young: Works for me.

Man: That's okay for me.

Woman: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy: That'd be great - all right. Well, does anyone else have anything else, other business?

Man: Nope.

Victoria McEvedy: No - great. Okay, look, thank you very much, all, for bearing with me and my bad chairing example. But that was - I think it was pretty useful. Okay.

Man: Thanks a lot, Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks, bye-bye.

Woman: Thanks very much.

Woman: Thanks, Victoria, bye.

Victoria McEvedy: Bye, thanks, Olga.

Woman:　　　　Thanks, Victoria, bye.

Victoria McEvedy:　Thank you.

END