

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work
Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 28 April 2010 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT) meeting on Wednesday 28 April 2010 at 18:00 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-ppsc-20100428.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

(All MP3's and transcriptions can be found on the calendar page).

Present:

J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair
Avri Doria - NCSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC chair
Jonne Soininen – Individual
S Subbiah –individual

Staff:

Liz Gasster
Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies:

Caroline Greer
Iliya Bazlyankov

Coordinator: Excuse me. I just need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

And I would like to introduce your host. We have Miss Glen de Saint G ry.
Ma'am, you may begin.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, (Lori). Good morning. Good evening. Good afternoon. Good evening, everyone. On the call today for the PPSC working group we have J. Scott Evans, Jonne Soininen, Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And we have apologies from Iliya Bazlyankov.

For staff we have Liz Gasster, Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Géry, myself.

Thank you, J. Scott. Over to you.

J. Scott Evans: All right, let's start with Section 2.1.41, which I believe has to do with introductions. Now, I didn't see and I may have missed it, anything from (Subbiah) on this. I did see something from Avri regarding this particular point and the comments that were made. So, Avri, I'm going to let you briefly state for the group your thoughts, just in case they haven't been reviewed since they went out this morning.

Avri Doria: Yeah, and I apologize because some of them went out just the last minute. I noticed that they hadn't gone, the list, and then realized that I had sent them to the wrong address again, so had to bundle them off.

So I think the issue that I was taking up was that it should be possible to do closed groups because of secrecy, because of security, et cetera. And I think my first thought on that is that the GNSO shouldn't be doing anything in a non-transparent, non-open manner.

However, you know, to be so absolute as that is in, obviously, is somewhat irrational. And there may be occasions that I can't envision where it does become justified. So if there's a notion of closing something, that seems to be something that has to be sort of a super majority decision of the chartering body, and not just something that a group would decide on.

Now, if we decide to take that kind of solution, we probably have to connect with either the PDP, although I can't imagine there being something in a PDP

that remains non-transparent, or in the council proceedings as yet another reason why a super majority vote might be recorded - might be required for something. So, in other words, I mean, I sort of contradict myself. My gut instinct is never, never, never. But, of course, I realize that that isn't completely rational.

J. Scott Evans: Well, if I may pose to the group, could we not just say, "Members of the working group should be informed that all GNSO working groups are normally expected to operate"? Meaning there could - that just leaves - by putting in that qualifier, that means the norm is to operate under the principles of transparency, but there could be exceptions to that norm.

Avri Doria: And J. Scott, again, and basically just leave it open as to how breaking that norm would happen in some other documents?

J. Scott Evans: Well, I don't think that's for us to do.

Avri Doria: I'm fine with doing that, but I'm just saying.

Jonne Soininen: So this is Jonne. I'm kind of like - I think that in the last minute I actually posted something here as well. And I had a little bit stronger opinion than Avri had. I don't see really any reason why any working group should be closed. And if it should be closed, it most probably shouldn't be a GNSO working group.

But on the other hand, I think I do kind of support what J. Scott proposed and just leave it open. And if there is this unlikely event that something should be closed, then most probably there should be a policy amendment done at that point to allow that and not to leave it open, and not to kind of give the rules now how to do that.

J. Scott Evans: Well, you know, I think that the qualifier "GNSO" may be inappropriate here because we've tried to not narrow it to just GNSO working group. So perhaps

that's where we need to take it out. Take out "GNSO." "Should be informed that all working groups are normally expected to operate."

Jonne Soininen: Sounds good.

J. Scott Evans: Do you see what I'm saying, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I like the, you know, the all working groups. And even if one is very closed - is has been, you know, has been tested and proved for whatever reason for the chartering organization to need to do a lot of in closed committee or in-camera work, there will still be, I would have thought, an awful lot of - that would happen, not even as an exception as Avri was saying. It would still be operated in as open a manner as possible.

And we'd be saying, "Right, we've - we're doing this, this, and this at this meeting. And we're going to be in-camera and we'll report to you the outcomes of what's in-camera." It would still be an open - this total closed, I can't comprehend it absolutely closed, you know?

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, and I don't think that's for us to determine at this level. I think what we're doing is we're just setting out a norm.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: If the board with the IRT comes forth and they establish something that would be outside the norm, then they go through whatever powers they want to and say that, you know, the openness will be met by giving executive summaries.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good. Yes, good.

J. Scott Evans: You know, so I think we should take GNSO out before working groups. Marika?

Marika Konings: Can I make a comment?

J. Scott Evans: Mm-hmm.

Marika Konings: I just want to note, I know about that there's a desire that these working group guidelines are, you know, applied to all the parts maybe of the (IC) community as well, but the reality is that this is focused on GNSO working groups. So and, you know -

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yes, I don't think there's any harm here. And the other point I wanted to make is (Subbiah) actually did submit a comment on this. He did submit a very early after I actually sent out the email. So if you don't mind, I'll just -

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Marika Konings: I don't think he's on the call yet. I'll just paraphrase because he's, you know, supporting what Avri was saying, that he may be saying as well, that, you know, in principle that there shouldn't be any secret meetings at all. But if there would be a higher decision, there should be a very high threshold to decide for a closed meeting, or have some parts that are closed.

So if others were to just encouraged to read his comments to the mailing list, but just to know that he did provide input on that specific comments, which if I interpreted it right, it's along the lines of Avri was commenting.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So do we have consensus to remove "GNSO" and add "normally expected"?

Jonne Soininen: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Sure.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. So that was - let me go - trying to follow Marika's excellent emails that she sent out, breaking this into sections. All right, we have 2.2. This is regarding the liaison. Again, we will start with you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, sorry but the number is?

J. Scott Evans: Two point two regarding liaisons.

Avri Doria: Oh, yeah, that's one where I was rather strong, wasn't I?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yeah. And oh, yeah, and my note there. I know it was extra work for Marika, but thanks for doing it that way. It makes it so much easier to respond to. Okay, first of all, the sort of the, "I take this hat on, I put this hat off" stuff is really easier said than done, and especially when one occupies a position of power.

And while all of us, when we're in those positions of power can tell you why it really isn't a position of power, and it's just service, and we never get to do what we want to do, et cetera, when we hold those positions, we do get to decide what's on agendas. We do get to decide what's put off, et cetera. We get to frame the discussion in ways no one else in the process really can.

So and, you know, having been in such position and not been in it at various occasions in my life, there is a real difference. So when you're in this liaison role, which has an integral part to play in the appeals process and in everything else, if you are a champion for something, even if you say, "I'm switching hats all the time," it really doesn't work.

And so that's sort of why I sort of take the strong position that I do on the need for neutrality in the liaison. That's also I can argue in other places why

we have several stakeholder groups members, and so there's always someone else in the stakeholder group or constituency that can participate, or can be the champion, and can be the whatever.

But I really think that - now, the one place where it's difficult -- and this is one of the ones that I had personally played with in the past -- is, you know, the MCA who has no one from the same stakeholder group. Now, eventually, and I don't know if they're doing it now, but eventually the MCAs did work together kind of as an ersatz stakeholder group and share this and help each other with getting their work done.

But, of course, they don't. And so in those cases, there may have been a, you know, state your position once, but don't ever argue it. So don't get into the discussion because, as I say, as you start to champion a point, you can't all of a sudden take off the champion hat when that issue becomes the one in the middle of an argument. "Okay, I'm neutral now. I was arguing, you know, red-faced against you three minutes ago, but now I'm neutral because of the problem." It just doesn't work.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, first of all, the committees channel the biased comment, as I think he's done it on the call. He basically notes that I think we should allow for the dual-role possibility, but should have language to say that ideally you shouldn't have such a situation. But if we do have one, the Mike O'Connor's Comment 7 should apply in case, I think. And our Comment 7 should be included in some fashion. And Comment 8, I guess, if we can streamline, we should.

And if I can make a personal comment to Avri's position, I think, yes, in an ideal world we would have, you know, more hats from each stakeholder group or constituencies in working groups so that on can perform that liaison role, but that's not the current reality. We have certain working groups where we have zero representation from certain stakeholder groups, constituencies.

And, you know, if you can get one, that's already, you know, sometimes a, you know, a real achievement, so...

Avri Doria: You're exhausted with one, huh?

Marika Konings: Yeah, yeah. It can happen for in groups if it's a struggle because they have, you know, maybe few members, or they're not interested in the issues. So personally I agree that should be a neutral role, but, yeah, maybe we should accommodate in the current situation where we're in where we do have, you know, thin-spread community, where it's often the members who volunteer to be liaisons, that have a strong interest, or at least expertise or knowledge in the issue there to be able to try to switching hats is, I agree, an ideal situation. It should be a person that's completely neutral, has no, you know, opinion or voice in the issue. But it's not really the current reality as it is.

J. Scott Evans: Jonne?

Jonne Soininen: Yeah, sorry. Just took a little while to get out of mute. I can apply - I am somewhere in the middle of what Avri said what Marika said. Sometimes the - I think it depends on the working groups so much that we should go for the stronger one. And then the working group can, of course, say, "Yeah, well, this person isn't - shouldn't be a kind of like a neutral liaison, but has the right to speak, or has the right to voice another opinion because we are 3 people in this working group, or 10, or 15, or whatever, and not 30. And we don't have enough people to be liaisons."

But I don't think that really means kind of like any language change here. I think that if we start to weaken the liaison position by saying that, "Well, you have to be - you basically have to be neutral when you working as the liaison and try - or try to be neutral when you are the liaison, but you can actually advocate your position freely when you are not," I wouldn't like that either.

So I would actually keep the text that we have here now and take it. And it says, "The liaison is expected to play a neutral role." Well, in those cases where there is not enough people, well, that expectation might not happen. But in the most - in the cases where there are enough people and there can be a neutral liaison, so the liaison shouldn't have kind of like a dual role there.

And I think that the kind of like the text that we have here now allows for both cases quite nicely, but puts enough restriction and enough kind of warning that liaisons should at least try to be very, very, neutral.

J. Scott Evans: Marika seems to agree with that. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, J. Scott. I also agree with the keeping of the text and certainly not diluting the high-level intention to, you know, independent authority - neutrality of independence -- why, it's caught me off a bit -- where it's possible. I think we can't stitch it up so tightly that we're not going to have the realities that every - we can try, but it's going to be a smoke and mirrors exercise if we do.

The realities that Avri's brought forward are the realities of the type of group dynamics we're going to get in a work group. It's just the nature of it. However, there is a role for the chartering organization to play here. And I don't think that can be written in, but it's something that perhaps we could look at in terms of a guideline or suggestion, making some of a way or training document.

You know, we've talked about certain guidelines and skills sets being offered to chairs. Perhaps we also need a little thumbnail list for chartering organizations. And the point of liaisons, for example, where we have dual work groups, so you've got a work groups that happens to be a GNSO and at-large advisory committee work group.

Avri and I have battled in some of those in the past. And Chuck and I are doing some now as well. Using these guidelines, even in their draft form, and I just went through an exercise where we actually have a whole bunch of people coming into a work group. And so Marika's issue was, you know, how are they getting any one.

But at our meeting last evening, we appointed the liaison, and the liaison was appointed formally to carry out very specific roles on behalf of us as sort of quasi-(unintelligible) CO. And that was defined in our instructions and process of selecting that person.

So it sort of doesn't need to be enshrined here, you know, that person is very clearly instructed on what their role is going to be in terms of being our voice on anything, a conduit back to us, and having a role in disputes and in resolutions. And I think it's sort of done at that level, and this language gives that set of tools to work with.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, I am hearing a consensus to leave the language as written. And I read a note from Avri that says that she isn't requesting that the language be changed to make it more strident; she does not believe that it needs to be changed in a way she believes would dilute it.

(Subbiah): This is (Subbiah). Could somebody tell me exactly where we are?

J. Scott Evans: We're at 2...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Two point two.

J. Scott Evans: ...point two, talking about the liaison definition.

(Subbiah): Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Or the role of the liaison as defined in 2.2.

(Subbiah): I understand.

J. Scott Evans: I mean, the one thing we could do that would distinguish is go down to 2. - 6.1.4 is it? Where we talked about the chartering organization appointing, how to appoint a role. And we could just put - we could put in a sentence that says that every effort should be made to ensure that the liaison is, you know, independent. Or somehow we could just put in a sentence there that says, you know, the preferred model, which Avri talked to.

(Subbiah): Yeah, I actually in my note said the same thing. I mean, that, basically, that I prefer that they would be independent and neutral person, but and that would be the ideal situation, but maybe sometimes that there are mitigating circumstances where somebody has to double up.

J. Scott Evans: So what I would suggest is that we leave 2.2's liaison as is. We go down to 6.1.4 where we talk about other important roles, and we put in a little section that it's preferred that given the neutrality and the role that the liaison plays in the appeals process, that this be an independent person, but acknowledges the reality, or something to that effect.

(Subbiah): May I suggest...

J. Scott Evans: Go ahead.

(Subbiah): May I suggest that you could make it strongly preferred and make the point really strongly? Yeah?

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I mean, I think that that's correct. I think it's a strong preference that it would - I mean, the way I envision this in my head, so just let me play out my little Disney drama for you, as a person reading this: I would assume the way that the GNSO, and putting this into the world of the GNSO, how this would

operate is a member of the GNSO would be given the responsibility to be the liaison.

(Subbiah): Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Because the GNSO is supposed to "manage the process." And so as a GNSO representative, one of your tasks are that you are now assigned to be the liaison to the XYZ working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl here. I couldn't agree with your Disney plan more. We gave our liaison to this new work group a clear mandate and role. It was enshrined in our minutes. And that person has to be a member of the ALAC.

J. Scott Evans: And so that's how I sort of envision this working, so I think 2.2 seems to be fine because it's not - all it's doing is telling the working group that there is a liaison and this is their function. It's when you're talking to the audience that's the chartering organization, that you need to give the directions that what the preferred model is.

So, Marika, could you craft probably a small, I would even say a separate paragraph, that talks about that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That pulls it out, yeah.

J. Scott Evans: For 6. - is it 6.4.1?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Six-point-one-point-four.

J. Scott Evans: Six-point-one-point-four?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. (Unintelligible) because the section already describes like the liaison should be neutral, among the discretion and the roles to have.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Marika Konings: I was wondering if we can just add at the end of the last sentence something like, "So it is therefore preferred that the CO appoint a person that can fulfill those criteria or that role," something like that, or "is strongly preferred."

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Works under the specific mandate of the CO?

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Something. Let's craft some language. And I would like to put "strongly preferred" to re-emphasize that this is central to it.

(Subbiah): This is (Subbiah). May I suggest at this point when it was being made, there were two parts to it right? One - I mean, to the collective comments - one part was, you know, don't even have somebody that is related to anything else; keep it strictly separate. What we're trying to say is that while that may not be possible in all cases, but it's strongly preferred.

But the second point going with it, which was about how if they didn't actually perform in a neutral way, they should be removed or ventured or something, or some language that extended somebody, some comment that they wanted to put in. Maybe we can, once you tie those together, the idea is that, hey, you know, the strong preference is, you know, somebody who's separate.

But whatever the case is that this, especially when it's not somebody who's related that's coming into that position, then this watch out, you know, because people could appeal to the norm and not really be doing the job right. That clause that was there in one of the comments.

J. Scott Evans: We certainly can. You know, we can put in, and I'll lean to the group. I'll put to the group now, do you think it's a consensus to stay in the liaison? Because don't we have a section that talks about roles and - this is just defining and sort of saying who they are?

But don't we do down further and talk about the appeals process and the fact that if you don't like - isn't that included later?

(Subbiah): I think it is, but I think the point here was to point out that, "Hey, if you're going to have somebody who's supposed to be a neutral position, but you have decided for various reasons that they may not be a neutral, you know, then, you know, there's a stronger emphasis on the fact that, you know, you really have to, you know? That's all.

J. Scott Evans: Mm-hmm.

(Subbiah): I mean, the way I see it like your little Disney plan, it's not important to me that I'm -- since you're discussing this -- in terms of the Disney theme you had, you now, how it might play out. You know, the way I see it is when somebody's upset, I mean, people aren't going to read this, they aren't going to notice. They're just going to go ahead and do whatever, right, and appoint people and so on, and so forth.

When some unhappiness stems -- somebody's upset, some group is upset -- they want to have a piece of paper, a document they can point to and say, "Look, guys, this is where this says. This is where the strong preference was. This is where it's not happening." And then use that as a means to achieve change, right? I mean, that's about the time I think this thing would really come into force, right?

Going ahead, I can't see in the future somebody who's putting together a working group really read everything carefully that we've got here on the sheet and try to follow it? Some of it will be followed, but you know?

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So do we want to put in - because the appeals process that we have in 3.7 just talks about the ability of a working group member that believes that they're being ignored or discounted can appear. We don't really talk about having the ability, I don't think, within the document of a working group member having the ability - can we - my point is I don't think we have it anywhere addressed what happens if you as a working group member feel someone's not fulfilling their responsibilities.

Guys, I have to sign for a package, so I'm going to put you on speaker, and you discuss that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, while J. Scott isn't looking it over, (Subbiah), have you got more to say because I wanted to jump in there.

(Subbiah): Not really. It was just that, you know, and I put out on my email note regarding this, I took the view that let's, you know, let's give them the option of, you know, under mitigating circumstances there's somebody else. But let's put a watch on them as well, combining the comments that were made, you know, and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure. And I'm missed the staffing because I noticed your hand was still up, and I've been waving my hands. So with that said, (Subbiah), one of the things I think I wanted to make fairly clear right now is my focus right now is on the 2.2 section. And whilst we've tidied up by going into 6.4.1, I've come back mentally to 2.2, and I'm talking about the role of liaison in particular in those comments. And I'm still on the do not change our language other than that make it strongly.

It really is in terms of removal or complaint, it's the role of liaison to be a broker for the issues that J. Scott just raised. In other words, if you've got members of the work group who, you know, have a complaints person to pick up their space at both paper, or someone who has maintained that one

member is or other group is there's an imbalance that needs to be addressed, a dispute.

Because the role of liaison is very important in doing that, if we're talking about the ability to remove members of the work group, that's one thing. If we're talking about a removal of a liaison, a chartering organization-appointed liaison to a work group, I do not think that - first of all, we haven't talked about it , but I also I don't think it's the business of this document or guideline.

That's the business - the control of the instrument is the business of the chartering organization or whoever put the liaison there. And because they are working, or should be working, under clear and specific mandate, if they're not doing their job, neutrally or in a way that the rest of the work group is happy with, then that's a matter for the chairman or tip person or the petition from the work group en masse to go to the chartering organization, in other words, to bypass the liaison conduit, which is how it should have got to the CO in the first place if there was an issue.

And then it's the CO's role to pull the choker chain around the liaison's neck and say, "You are not fulfilling your role as liaison."

J. Scott Evans: Why don't we do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: "And you're to do that by what your mandate is." Or then it's the CO that makes the change. I see the removal of members as one thing under extraordinary circumstance because I think we should be re-educating and encouraging and changing the dynamic to make things work, rather than hauling bits and pieces around and trying to move pieces of players on chess boards.

But in terms of removal of liaison, that's absolutely back in chartering organizations' territory. And you'd be real close to total collapse of the system if you're into that issue.

J. Scott Evans: Well, I mean, how about in our appeals process we say, "Any member believes that - or wants to appeal a decision of the working group or the chartering organization, should first discuss it with the chair. In the event the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the working group member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the chair of the chartering organization."

I think we should - we can say why don't we just put in another paragraph, and say, "In addition, any working group member that believes that a liaison."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You'd need to have not just any working group member, J. Scott, you'd need to have practically any working group member a vote of no confidence, either in the liaison or in the chair, so this would happen.

Man: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Well, what I'm - all we need to do is put in a mechanism or headline that says, "If you think that..."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: These controlling individuals in inverted commas are problematic to the process of the work group, then the work group does need a mechanism to get to the CO without having to go through what is their issues.

J. Scott Evans: Right, and so I guess we could say, rather than just saying making it, why don't we say this. Why don't we just say that, "In addition, if a member of the working group believes that any of the positions set forth in section 2.2 are not functioning," are not - trying to think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: With the effectiveness in role being carried out by those individuals identified in 2.2, in other words, co-chairs, side chairs, secretary, liaison. And that has made...

J. Scott Evans: Everybody that's in there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That goes, yeah, that whole bunch of people that that mechanism goes...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Directly to the chair of the chartering organization.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly, yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Do you see what I'm saying? What we're saying is then if anybody is not performing the role as, you know, in accordance with the as set out in the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The guidelines.

J. Scott Evans: You know, they can go to the - that's what I would say. It's just put in a second paragraph that talks to that - to those roles set forth in 2. The first paragraph talks about, well, if we believe we're being ignored, here's the process. The second process is if somebody's not performing their role in the manner...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Outlined.

J. Scott Evans: ...outlined in Section 2, they can go to the chair of the chartering organization.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

J. Scott Evans: So that solves it. It makes it appealable. It gives people an outlet. It takes the liaison out of the loop. If it's the liaison having - who's the problem, they're not in that loop.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

J. Scott Evans: It takes the chair out of the loop, so if it's the chair that's the problem And it goes right to the CO.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I like it.

J. Scott Evans: And I see - who else? Was that (Subbiah) I heard speak?

(Subbiah): Oh, I was just simply saying that, you know, I mean, my concern here was just the other comments that people are addressing, which is particularly about the liaison if you don't have - if you decide to have the possibility of a non-neutral person in there, then accommodate it for by having an appeals mechanism. And this solves that. And I guess it solves the wider issues as well, beyond just the CO, the chairman, and the vice chairman.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, so I just think that that simply just says that there's an appeals process when one of these roles, which are sort of crucial to the smooth functioning, is not functioning correctly. You go to the CO. That's where you go. They're ultimately responsible for this process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's where it needs to be.

Avri Doria: J. Scott, can I just clarify. Do you mean the CO or you mean the chair?

J. Scott Evans: I mean, well, the chair of the CO.

Avri Doria: Oh.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The chair of the chartering organization.

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay. I was hearing CEO. It was like - okay. Chair of the CO.

J. Scott Evans: I'd say that we have consensus to address these comments concerning this by amending is it 3.7 that's the appeals process?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I believe so.

Avri Doria: Yes, that's right.

J. Scott Evans: In a separate paragraph talking about this. Can I see - I see Avri says yes.
Cheryl says yes.

Woman: Okay, I had a take. I just took it away. It's still there.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

(Subbiah): I'm okay too.

J. Scott Evans: And (Subbiah, are you okay with that?

(Subbiah): Yeah, I am.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. Good. That's what we'll do. Okay, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right, let's trudge. We got 30 minutes, and we're moving. Were there other comments we needed to address with regards to 2.2?

Woman: No, because we're ignoring all the hat shifting.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, yeah. All right, 2.1.3. (Subbiah), you had some comments?

(Subbiah): Yeah, I am trying to locate them in a minute. If somebody else wants to go first...

J. Scott Evans: Avri?

Avri Doria: Did I have comments on which? 2.1.3?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Two-point-three, not 2.1.3 -- 2.3.

J. Scott Evans: I know. I've got 2.1.4.3. It talks about items for review.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, we're jumping around here.

J. Scott Evans: Well, I'm just going in - I'm trying to go in order that Marika's going.

(Subbiah): Yeah, I know.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I don't think I responded on that one.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: (Subbiah) did, but I didn't.

(Subbiah): Yeah, I'm trying to - oh, gosh, I'm trying to find where I have them.

J. Scott Evans: I've got (Subbiah)'s comment.

(Subbiah): Oh, you have it? Okay, wonderful.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. So we've gone back up, that's all because that was before 2.2.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. I just was going by...

(Subbiah): Oh, is it on the screen. Can it be put on there, on the Adobe?

Woman: It's Page 16 on Adobe.

(Subbiah): Okay, sorry. Okay. I was looking - I was searching for my...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Which is confusing because we were at the other end.

(Subbiah): Page 16, okay. Okay. Okay.

Woman: I can still review it. It says, "As soon as there is a working group, or as soon as practical thereafter, the following documents shall be reviewed." What did you say, (Subbiah)?

(Subbiah): I have no idea.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible) made the comment that they need to have other references, the sample work product, and providing additional details regarding the working group charter earlier in this document. "Or soon thereafter, the (unintelligible) shall be reviewed in order to ensure all members have a common understanding of the mission, goals, objectives, deliverables (unintelligible). Charter working group guidelines and any other documents relative to the working group's discussion is required..."

I think it's covered in that comment -- "And any other documents relevant."

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. I think we discussed in the last meeting as well, you know, and emails that are sent out to the group, that they are already receiving links to the information to where they can find reference material. So I don't know if

(unintelligible) relating to because here we talk about which items are reviewed during the first meeting. And I think in the comments I say those details should already be provided beforehand, earlier in the document, or maybe earlier in the process. But I think that has already been covered.

J. Scott Evans: They've agreed to that. Okay, so why don't we just at the end of that first sentence, put, "which normally will have been circulated to the group prior to the first meeting." So it says that the first meeting, we're going to go over all these things. And then just put a clause at the end that says, "which normally are already are sent to them but prior to the meeting."

Doesn't that answer the question? They're saying, "Well, that needs to be given to them before the first meeting." And we just put in something that acknowledges that reality.

Woman: So where - before the brackets, so after "work group's discussion," and before "e.g. policy development process," blah, blah, blah, we can say something like...

J. Scott Evans: We can add to that.

Woman: ..."preferably," well, it doesn't even have to be "preferably." "Predistributed."

J. Scott Evans: Here's what I would have. It says, "Charter Working Group Guidelines. Any of those discussions, paren, for example, policy development, processes, issue paper, which will normally be transmitted to the working group prior to the first meeting."

(Subbiah): All right.

J. Scott Evans: Or which will be.

Woman: You can't - yeah. Hmm.

(Subbiah): Right. I found my comment. What you're proposing here is fine. I mean, to put that language in. But I thought - I wasn't sure whether what (intelligence) was asking was this, in between what they were saying, which is do they want to know who makes the charter and when it's issued, you know? I mean the charter itself. Is that something they're asking of us?

J. Scott Evans: But, again, we can't get too specific here. This gets to the point of being so granular, it's too much. I mean I think what we say is we say, "You're going to get as much information as we have to inform you of what you need to do." That's the charter.

Woman: And as early as possible.

J. Scott Evans: That's the mission, the goals, the objectives. What are your deliverables? What are decisions? What are the timeframes, blah, blah, blah? If there are any issue papers, we tell you. The only thing I think they're a little - the point that's well taken is they don't know that this should have been - this should be received by the members prior to the meeting.

So can we just put something, "which are generally or normally sent to the members prior to the first meeting"?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I think that language would help. There is also the occasion -- this is Cheryl here for the record -- there is also the occasion where a work group will be formed, members will be called for, people will be busy in the process of joining and doing their declarations of interest. First meeting happens, and there's not a formalized, approved, voted on, sanctioned, and passed-down-from-on high charter yet.

It may be a situation where there are occasions where the chartering organization will say to its newly-born work group with its incredible group of talent and individuals, "Okay, guys. One of the other things you need to do at

your first set of meetings is get back to us with a sample set of words for charter for our consideration."

I wondered if that might be the question they were asking. And if it is, I'm not sure that's the place to answer it, certainly not in items for review at the first meeting, unless you're putting in anything that the chartering organization wants you to do as an item for review at the first meeting.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, but see, that seems to me it would fall into the working group's mission, goals, deliverables.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, exactly.

J. Scott Evans: Because if what the deliverable or objective is is to assist us in finalizing the charter, it would be told that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But that's where I'm saying just say anything. And, you know, items to review, to add anything that the chartering organization asks the work group to do at its first meeting, which may be, you know, drafting of a part of a charter. But that's fine because the CO says, "We want you to do this."

J. Scott Evans: Well, I think that falls in deliverables.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good. Happy?

J. Scott Evans: So I just think we just need to acknowledge the reality of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We started to fall in - I think we ignore INTA's comments. We've covered it.

J. Scott Evans: And I think we just - the thing, that phrase afterwards that says, "which are generally or normally sent to the - which will normally be..."

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Had been previously distributed.

J. Scott Evans: "...working group prior to the first meeting."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. Yep, that's fine.

J. Scott Evans: Marika?

Marika Konings: Oh, okay it'll be pinned, not ignored, but indicate it was covered earlier. Yes, dear.

(Subbiah): This is (Subbiah). Just for my own clarity, the initiation of a working group, right, is by the chartering organization. The chartering organization mainly is going to be GNSO. And so the first gleam of an idea of, "Hey, let's have a working group on this or something," that is going to occur in the eye of some GNSO council member.

And then the GNSO would work together in the most cases to come up with the charter, and then put the charter out there and say, "Go get a chairman. We'll put together the working group together." Is that correct? That's the order of events?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Subbiah), the good example is this joint, this cross-constituency idea, so where the GNSO will be the chartering - formally be the chartering organization to look at mechanisms to explore what ways applicants for new GTLDs who are not in a financially-solid enough situation to pay up the requirements. That working group, that resolution, that came down on high from a Board Resolution 20 in Nairobi.

GNSO and ALAC, you know, "Hell, we need to do something about that . And then you sort of, you know, create the work group. It's not always just a

gleam in a chartering organization counselor's eye. It can be tossed over the fence and the GNSO and/or other (unintelligible) or so has caught it. Then they've got to deal with it.

(Subbiah): Okay, but from my understanding...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And these guidelines give you tools to do that.

(Subbiah): Yeah. My understanding of potentially what it is, actually, I'm not saying that we answer it, okay? I'm not at all saying that we answer it. I'm just saying that I think that what they maybe caught up in, "How do I know that this is going to get started, this chapter is going to get grafted in?" I mean, that process that I may only know about it when the working group calls it on out, you know, what I mean?

I mean, this is nothing to do with us here, but I think that for whatever reasons I think that's the terms of the question, personally. But it's okay. It's not something we can answer here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Subbiah), my care factor of answering the thrust of every nuance on every question of every comment is really low right now.

(Subbiah): All right.

J. Scott Evans: I think what we should do is just put in that document, acknowledge that the way, you know, that and in response to the comment that generally this is information that's sent out by the members of the working group once they've been identified, and we acknowledge that (unintelligible).

Okay, let's move on. Again, Cheryl, we're kind of, because I've chosen to do this...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'll follow you. Just lead, come on. I'll catch up. It's all right.

J. Scott Evans: She sent out her emails last week in the order that I received them, which we're not back at 2.2 again, I think. This is again talking about elections. It was suggested by Mike O'Connor that we replace some language that requires candidates to describe certain things. I think the registries, also gives some minimal criteria for the skills, and GoDaddy wanted 2.2 and 2.3 to sort of go into more detail.

Now, Avri, I know in regards to the statement of qualifications had a pretty serious position that I saw in writing this morning. Avri, do you want to cover that?

Avri Doria: Yeah. And I mean, in the end of the day, we could put in any assorted bunch of requirements that we absolutely have to . But I really think that there's value in letting the candidates decide what it is that they think is important in this particular situation, in this particular group to say.

And it's up to the working group to say, "Yep, that's adequate. We know enough," or to ask question. So on it strikes me as going to far into the picky, you know, because then I'll start asking, "Well, have you chaired before? Well, the last time you chaired, were you successful? What did you learn from your failure as a chair last time?"

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I've never failed as a chair. How do we measure that kind of stuff?
It's too granular. It's not open enough.

J. Scott Evans: I think that, you know, you scare people away with that kind of stuff.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: That is the people that are voting should have the responsibility to determine whether the information they've received is sufficient for them to decide if this is a person that should lead.

Avri Doria: Okay, J. Scott, that's a so much nicer way of putting it than I put it.

Jonne Soininen: Yes, and I do totally agree with J. Scott on this.

J. Scott Evans: And at some point, you know, you say, "Provide a statement of qualification." Okay, they do, and what they say is, "I breathe." Well, you need to decide if that's enough. If it's not enough, you need to vote against them or ask them for more information.

Woman: Yeah, that's how you do it. Exactly right.

J. Scott Evans: So I say that we believe that, you know, our response back on this comment would we believe that though a statement of qualifications clearly sets forth, qualifications will vary depending on the working group. And it is for the working group to determine, based upon what they receive, whether that has been met. And so we leave the language as it is.

(Subbiah): This is (Subbiah) here. I - let me try to suggest something here. My position on this is very different from everyone's, yeah, I think pretty much. But I'm not speaking for that because that's (unintelligible).

Woman: You're going toward amending the work group position as well.

(Subbiah): No, I understand. No, no, no, but look, there are different ways to run the world. Okay, and none of them is perfect. Okay? And, you know, I can say that from my point of view, the way that it has been run so far with in my own experience has lead to negative outcomes in the past as far as ICANN.

And so I'm saying maybe we should change it, okay? That's the only thing. Okay, but better the matter, you know, I'm not revisiting that issue. But I think that given the comment that was made, I think that this might be a thing to do because one could at least direct it in this way, which is to say - I'm following

the lead from one of the comments there -- which is to say, we've agreed that there should be a statement.

I mean, we could even say, "Why have a statement?" That's fine. That's even more democratic. Just put up your hand and be done with it, right? Why have a statement? Right. So that's another way of looking at it, is that you've just decided that this is fair way.

Okay, so I would say that since we are going to have a statement, maybe we should just say, "You know, feel free to say what you want about yourself." I'm not saying that's the language we use, but the idea is that, "Feel free to say whatever you want about yourself, but you might want to address, you know, the points in this guideline document."

You know, the things you might want to use in a statement about yourself may be, you know, in reference to things in this document. And leave it at that. That will be a guide. That will tell you what the roles and responsibilities are, what is expected of you, everything. And you make up your mind, you know, nobody's telling you what to do. But at least you've been told that's a good place to look at.

Fair enough? Hello?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. That's the self-determined material in a declaration of interest.

J. Scott Evans: I mean, we could do statements of qualifications from candidates that set forth the qualities and experience they believe as...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is of interest or use to the group.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. So you sort of loosely inform what it should say?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. How extensive a stamp collection you have may not be relative.

J. Scott Evans: Right. Statements of qualifications from candidates set forth the qualities and experience they possess that would serve the particular working group. I'm not on Adobe, so I can't see if everybody's throwing tomatoes at me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nobody's throwing tomatoes at you. It's resounding silence, excepting (Subbiah)'s got a leftover tic from an earlier part, unless he's re-agreeing with you.

J. Scott Evans: Will that work for everybody? All it does is it doesn't say - it doesn't go down to the granular detail, but it does give, you know...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It encourages by saying, "You know, do feel free to share information you feel is relevant to the operation of the work group."

J. Scott Evans: Right.

(Subbiah): Yes, sound really good.

Woman: Perfect.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, Marika, let's do that then.

Woman: Excuse me. Sorry.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Now we've got the thing about 2.1.4.2. And, again, we've moving up again. "Unless the chair is already been named by the chartering organization, normally a chair will be selected first. Until that time, the charter liaison will fulfill the role of interim chair. The work group can elect to have co-chairs, vice chairs, or request ICANN staff to perform the role of chair."

I think the biggest question that I have, and I don't know the answer to this, is can staff perform the role of chair? I didn't think about whether that was a violation of the by-laws.

Avri Doria: Hi. I don't know if they can be chair. Certainly, there have been occasions where there has been no chair, and staff has quite actively and well filled the role of coordinating the group in the absence of leadership. And but I don't - but we supposedly have a liaison whose function as interim chair and gives us time as there is a chair. So I'm not really sure there's a void. But, yes, of course, I think any time that...

J. Scott Evans: Well, why don't we do this. I think this is - the problem is when you don't have anybody that wants to - why don't we just change the language. "A working group can elect to have co-chairs, vice chairs, or request the CO to appoint a chair."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Interim chair.

J. Scott Evans: Well, no, I said to appoint a chair. Let's say nobody wants to be chair.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, okay. I see what you mean. That's right, yeah.

J. Scott Evans: If you go back to the chartering organization with the problem, "We don't have a chair. Can you find us a chair?"

Woman: Yep, fair enough.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: That's if nobody wants to do it. So rather than just pull staff for it, throw it back to the CO.

Jonne Soininen: Yeah, this is Jonne. I like that. I think that's a good idea. But I don't have a wording in my mind, but maybe couple words put there also that make that in the case that there is no chair in the working group, as you kind of pointed. That's become kind of like the standard practice then.

Woman: Yeah, that's become a normalcy. It becomes an...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, so we could say, we could have the sentence, "A chair can elect to have co-chairs or vice chairs. In the event there is no interest in chairing the working group, the working group can request that the chartering organization appoint a chair."

Jonne Soininen: Sounds good.

Woman: Yep. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, and if we want to put in something about, you know, emergency situations, you know? Because in those circumstances where there is no elected or appointed leadership, you know, staff can be asked to coordinate the activity of a group until such time, et cetera.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, why don't we just say, "Under extraordinary circumstances..."

Avri Doria: "...staff may be asked to coordinate."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: "...to perform administrative and coordination function to..."

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: "...administrative coordination until such time as a chair can be elected or appointed."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Good. It's simply just allowing the work group to staff.

Avri Doria: Well, J. Scott and others, are you okay with that?

J. Scott Evans: I'm fine with it, but I don't vote so...

Avri Doria: Right, but speaking a role on staff, I also wondered...

J. Scott Evans: Marika, is that something you see?

Marika Konings: I think it's fine. Could you just repeat what you were saying, "May be asked to perform administrative coordinative role," is that what...?

J. Scott Evans: Administrative coordinating.

Marika Konings: Coordinating.

J. Scott Evans: "Administrative coordination of the working group until such time as a chair can be elected or appointed," or something like that.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: And it would be - you need to put in extraordinary circumstances.

Marika Konings: Yes. Yeah, I had that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, guys, that's - we're done with 2.

Woman: Woo-hoo!

Woman: Yay!

(Subbiah): Hang on. I thought there was another point, by the way.

Woman: Oh, dear.

(Subbiah): I thought there was a point regarding about appealing the chair if the chair is rejected by the CO. Was there not?

J. Scott Evans: You may be correct. Let me see here.

(Subbiah): Yeah, and I think I had thought that perhaps in the field process should be in place. And I thought Avri had thought adjusted that. That is that if a chair has been selected by the group, and then it goes up to the CO, the CO has to sign off on it. And if for some reason they reject it, then the question - the commenter had asked, you know, "What criteria would they use?" or whatever, you know? And then would there be an appeal mechanism?

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, but I mean, who would you appeal to? If the CO's rejected, do you go to the Ombudsman? You'll never get a decision.

Avri Doria: Can I? I've got my hand up with a question.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Avri Doria: I think that, you know, it - there should be a process perhaps to sort of, you know, if they say, "No," they're going to give you a reason. There should be an expectation that they'll give you a reason. And you should be able to go back to the group that rejected. And I don't think there has to be further appeal because it is the chartering organization that's rejecting. And if you can't come to an agreement on something that little, then you've got a much bigger problem.

Jonne Soininen: It's not going to work.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, why don't we do this, why don't we put in - I'm just thinking aloud here. Why don't we think about a thing that says, "In the unlikely event a chair is not endorsed by the..."

Woman: "...a selected chair is rejected by the CO."

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, yeah. So that means "unlikely event" implies that we think it would be rare. "It must articulate its reasoning for such rejection to the working group." And that, "The members of the working group have the ability to request reconsideration..."

Woman: Good word.

Woman: Yep.

J. Scott Evans: "...of this decision." And just leave it at that.

(Subbiah): Okay, there are two other points that were raised in connection with this. One was the - what happens if the appeal fails. And one option, as was just suggested, is just forget about it. Now, I have some thoughts on it, but I think the reason I'm bringing this up is I believe the whole idea of the working group ethic here that we're trying to do, is to make this a grassroots effort, right? And the decisions get made down at the bottom by people and then pushed up to the top, rather than the other way around.

And I think that's the intent of all of this. But so if we have the unlikely circumstance where the working group selects a chair and appeals process goes through, and the CO decides no, what do we do in that event? I've been with ICANN for all these years now, whatever it is, and we've seen, you know, all kind of craziness, right, events that you wouldn't think would happen, a rare thing.

So is it possible that in such a situation the working group could just say, "Look," as a group because they've asked for this chair, and it doesn't work out. The CO says, "No," and throws everything back down. The working group, what does it do at that point?

Obviously, it could just go forward, or the working group could say, you know, in a situation like that, "You know, we don't want it to do this anymore. Basically, this is not working out. It was a little thing we couldn't agree on, so a means to it may be dissolving the working group and starting again afresh." I don't know.

I mean, not in the context of just the chair. It was just a thought that I had that was triggered. And that that would be a message that would say the group itself can't agree to the point, right? And I don't know. It's just a thought.

And the second point the person brought up was, "What criteria would they have used?" There's the issue of just a reason now, I think. Are we going to have a reason? But simply put, if you wanted to give some criteria, I think, some criteria for rejecting it halfway through or something, that the working group majority have lost faith in the chair, or if there's a criminal activity. There must be some ICANN by-law where there's some criminal activity, so you can be removed.

I don't know. It's a minimal list was required of reasons, of criteria -- we can't supply everything, obviously -- but a suggestion of one or two things. But anyway, that's all I wanted to point out.

J. Scott Evans: Group?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. All I wanted to say is all of those things strike me as extraordinary circumstances.

(Subbiah): Yeah.

Avri Doria: I thought we handled extraordinary circumstances in appeal. And what happens to the group in the meantime, as it goes into administrative coordination?

J. Scott Evans: What I think we should do is with regard to the questions about what happens and all that kind of stuff, we're going to have to handle that down in 6 where we talk about...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, absolutely.

J. Scott Evans: ...organization.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In appeals, yes.

J. Scott Evans: Seems to me, that's where we tell the chartering organization because what we need to do is we need to say in that section a strong preference that the working group's election of a chair will be honored unless there are extraordinary circumstances or something to that effect. But that will be handled in 6.

Because it depends on who you're instructing. In this section, we're instructing the working group. And we're just telling them what's going on and what's happened. But when you talk about the stuff, (Subbiah), you talked about criterion and all that stuff, I don't think you can nail it down that particularly.

(Subbiah): Sure. No.

J. Scott Evans: But I think you can say to the chartering organization that, you know, they're strongly encouraged or whatever. And we'll deal with that in 6. But I think for

here, we still need extraordinary circumstances, so if they come back and it's reconsidered and we're still have no resolution, staff can run it administratively. That's what we said.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: You have to remember, it's not the working group that gets to decide whether the working group goes forward or not, it's the chartering organization.

(Subbiah): Oh, I understand.

J. Scott Evans: Now, if there's - if the working group is zero, as I understand from early discussions yeoman in most organizations that use this model, that usually means there doesn't need to be a working group because you can't get anybody interested enough to do anything. So, Cheryl, do I see your hand out?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Look, you took some of the words out of my mouth. I was putting my hand down. Yeah, it's belongs in 6. The resolution, and the discussion, and the advice to the CO belongs in 6 because this is a chartering organization issue.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, so let's say that we've reached - we've finished 2. With regards to the two comments that talk about those...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...those, Marika, that we will handle those in the section dealing with chartering organizations.

Woman: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: And with that, I'm going to bring down the gavel. We're going to move to Section 3 next time. In accordance with - the problem I have is next week I am in Monterey with 200 other Yahoo legals at a off-site, so I will be unavailable on Wednesday. So I would like to ask that since we have a larger section to do, if it would be possible if we do our call the following week, which I believe is the 12th?

Woman: Oh, yes, please.

J. Scott Evans: And that we take the time to look at all the comments for Section 3, and would it be possible that we do a 90-minute call if we need it on the 12th?

Avri Doria: I won't be here on the 12th, but I'll send comments ahead.

J. Scott Evans: If you'll send comments ahead, Marika always makes sure that we do not ignore you.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I have an ITF meeting that week, so I'll be as...

J. Scott Evans: I hear Marika coming through. Yes, ma'am?

Marika Konings: Yes, J. Scott, I just wanted to propose that I do the same thing as we did for this section, that I send it out in separate email threads.

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely, that worked well.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) the mailing list.

Jonne Soininen: That was great. And I am (unintelligible) the meeting because I am away next week as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'm away next week as well, so I'm all for this change.

(Subbiah): Okay, on the 12th, I may not be there for part of the time on the 12th, but I'll send emails ahead.

J. Scott Evans: Oh, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If we're running up to 90 minutes, that means we can do a full loop back if we need to.

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely. Okay, so next call the 12th, 90 minutes. Just an aside, I'm not saying we'll go 90 minutes, but I'm saying I just don't want you to have any other conflicts if you can avoid it during that time, and that's when we'll meet -
- 12th. Same bat time, same bat place.

Jonne Soininen: Excellent. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, J. Scott. I really appreciate that. That's excellent. Marika, can you make sure Gisella knows that because that's the only thing left is slotting that time out so we don't put other work groups in there.

Marika Konings: Yes, of course. I will.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Marika.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you all very much for your work, for doing your homework, and pain pushing this forward. I appreciate Marika. I wish I was on your balcony as well, but I'm glad that you had a nice weekend. Everyone have a nice weekend and we'll talk to you in two weeks.

((Crosstalk))

END