Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 16 October 2013 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 16 October 2013 at 1900 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-policy-implementation-20130918-en.mp3
On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#oct

<u>Attendees:</u>
Greg Shatan – IPC
Wolf Knoben - ISPCP
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Philip Marano – IPC (for Brian Winterfeldt)
Michael Graham – IPC
Amr Elsadr - NCUC
Tom Barrett – RrSG
James Bladel – RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Maureen Cubberley – Individual
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Klaus Stoll – NPOC
Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC
 Nic Steinbach – RrSG
Olga Cavalli – GAC
Jeff Neuman – RySG
Becky Burr – RySG
Gideon Rop - Individual

<u>Apology:</u>
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Kristine Rosette – IPC
 J.Scott Evans – BC
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Anne Aikman Scalese - IPC
Tim Ruiz - RrSG
Krista Papac

<u>ICANN staff:</u>
Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Nathalie Peregrine

Operator: Thank you. This call is now being recorded. If you have any objections, you may now disconnect.

Nathalie Peregrine:	Thank you very much, Dennis. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. This is the Policy and Implementation Working Group call on the 16th of October, 2013.
	On the call today, we have Michael Graham, Alan Greenberg, Olga Cavalli, Klaus Stoll, Jen Videls, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Cubberley, Greg Shattan, Chuck Gomes, Wolf Knoben, Tom Barrets, Nick Steinbach, Nilo LeMier, Phil Murano. Christina Rosette, her office sends an email warning that she will be late joining the call today.
	We have apologies from Jay Scott Evans, Tim Wiess, Kirin Malchalovil, Javi Rice, Ana Kanskeesy, and Christopher Peck.
	From staff, we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Tim Cole, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.
	I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.
	Thank you very much, and over to you, Chuck.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you very much, Natalie.
Becky Burr:	Hi, Chuck. Becky Burr, also here.
Chuck Gomes:	Hi, Becky.
Becky Burr:	Hi.
Chuck Gomes:	OK. And forgive my voice if it gets a little scratchy. I've been trying to get over a cold.
	But, is there anybody on the call who's not in Adobe Connect?
Becky Burr:	This is Becky. Not yet.
Chuck Gomes:	You're going to be though, right?
Becky Burr:	Yes.
Chuck Gomes:	OK. Good. I just want to know, so that...and, again, if there is anybody in that situation, speak up if you're not in Adobe Connect. If you're in Adobe Connect, please raise your hand there, and that makes it easier to manage the queue.
	OK. Welcome to everyone. Hopefully, you can see the agenda in Adobe Connect, there. And let's jump right in to Item 2, which is an update of the Policy and Implementation work plan sub-team that has been headed by one of our co-chairs, Michael Graham.
	And before I turn it over to Michael, let me say that I'm very thankful and very complimentary of the way this sub-team has taken off and is doing

their task, and I think you'll feel the same way after you hear this update and get a chance to ask questions or make comments.

That said, Michael, it's all yours.

Michael Graham: OK. Can you hear me fine?

Chuck Gomes: I can.

Michael Graham: OK. I just wanted to note before going forward the members of the sub-team that have worked so hard. They include Holly Raich, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Olivy Kwami, and Amr Elsadr, and then on staff, Marika, Mary Wong, and Nathalie Peregrine.

And I think working together especially with the assistance of the master of the mind map, or mistress of the mind map, Marika, we've really made some progress.

We've got the mind map on the screen, but before we turn to that -- I'm going to let Marika go through that for you all, because it is the working draft of where we are and what we think the work plan may become -- I just wanted to go over a few things.

And first off was the challenge that we faced as a sub-team, and that was first to digest the various materials -- the charter, the policy and implementation materials from GNSO and ICANN, the public comments, the staff discussion proposal -- and to take the mind map that we had worked on within *this* working group and organize it into a linear set of tasks, topics, and deliverables utilizing the charter descriptions of them to try and move from a very, sort of, mushy approach to things to one that's more linear that would give us a reasonable and supportable work task and progress chart.

So, our approach was to divide the useful tasks and refer to applicable questions from the charter. We wanted, in looking at a reasonable and putting together a proposed work plan, to do so in a way that would ensure that the working group when we turned to the actual work is going to focus on the task and not on either philosophical frolics and detours or on the contentious applications of discussions of policy versus implementation, but to provide the opportunities for wholesome discussion and debate along the line.

So, the strategy, which as Marika takes us through this mind map, that we came up with was to start with, one, the necessity of defining terms, as with this work group and anything going forward. We spent one session just discussing what "what" meant and bringing all of our preconceptions of what was policy, what may be implementation, what has worked and not worked for ICANN into the discussion and determined what we need to do at the onset is to define terms, so that we're not debating their meaning, but we're accepting their meaning in our discussions.

Then, we identified the actual deliverables, again, from the charter fundamentally, so that we would know what we were trying to work towards.

We then tried to determine what work may be required to develop and test those. This is probably where we stand right now.

And, again, in moving from the mind map to the actual work, of when we put that schedule together, knowing that we need to include opportunities for public and community input and review both through public comments at ICANN meetings and through presentations to the various ACs, SOs, and constituencies.

And then, finally, in our discussions we I think agree that in order to move forward, there are certain topics and deliverables, even the big ones, where utilizing subgroups and sub-teams to address specific issues and prepare the deliverables for discussion by the work group as a whole would probably move us forward rather than having all 30 of the members voice up.

So, in order to put this strategy into force, we've come up with a draft mind map. And, Marika, would you go through this? It's the one that's on the screen now, and it's wonderfully color-coded. And after Marika runs through it, I think we could address any questions that anyone has about that.

Marika Konings: Sure. Thanks, Michael. This is Marika. I'll take control for a second of the screen to take you through the mind map. This is also the document that was sent to you by email. So, if you're having difficulty in maybe seeing it on the Adobe Connect, you may want to take that (INAUDIBLE) on the side or use your "Zoom" button that is at the bottom of the Adobe Connect pod where you can do "+" and "-". That will help you enlarge the screen, or use the full screen mode.

Maybe first, looking here on the left-hand side, you'll see the index for the mind map. As Michael said, we've used some colors to try to indicate what the different things mean. So, basically, orange means where the sub-team is currently thinking that those are our deliverables that are developed by the whole working group.

And yellow are those where the working group thinks that they may be done through means of a sub-team.

And you also see some questions highlighted in green. Those are the tasks that we managed to identify from the charter itself.

And then, there are also some questions, or tasks, that are identified in blue, and those came up through either the sub-team discussions or also are already part of some of the discussions that the broader working group had.

So, looking up there then at Deliverable 0.A, as we call it. Both 0.A and B are two of the deliverables where the sub-team at the moment feels that

those are maybe the starting points for the working groups that will help set basically a level ground of understanding of where we're departing from and that will help as well at the work on the other deliverables that are further down on the list.

So, the first one is basically looking at developing working definitions of the main terms, and I think that was something that has already been suggested a couple of times in our earlier discussions. So, basically, making sure that we have a common understanding of what the terms we're using and what we mean by those terms. And that may also involve considering existing, all the state-of-the-art terms.

Again, I think for now, we're really looking at working definitions. At the end of the process, the working group may come back to those and say, "OK. Maybe some of those we need to tweak," or "We didn't get them exactly right. We may want to change them for inclusion in the report."

But, again, this is really as a starting point to make sure that we have a common understanding.

Then, Deliverable 0.B is basically Charter Question 1, which looks at developing a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation review and discussions, taking into account existing GNSO operating procedures.

You know that we've actually inserted here the word, in brackets, "working." So, basically, the idea is here again that may be difficult at the starting point of this conversation to really set in stone what those principles should be, but at the same time, having a common understanding of the broad principles, or the working principles, that everyone can find themselves in may help, again, the work for the next deliverables and making sure, again, that we start from a common understanding of where people feel that policy and implementation fit.

Again, this is a deliverable where the working group is expected then to come back at the end of its work to determine whether indeed those working principles were the right ones or based on the work that has been done further tweaks or changes should be made.

And you can see here on the right side, there were three questions that were basically identified directly from the charter. What guidance do ICANN core values provide? What guidance do other ICANN core values provide that relate indirectly to policy development? And also there's some questions that were contained in the Policy Versus Implementation draft framework that staff prepared that we propose there, as well. So, principles that may be considered.

And then, we also suggested that the working group should consider the GNSO working group guidelines and the PDP manual to identify whether there are any existing principles that can be distilled from there, whether they're either explicitly or implicitly mentioned. And, again, the proposed principles that are in the staff discussion paper.

So, I'm basically moving further down in the mind map. Then, we come with the two deliverables, or the two categories of deliverables, where the sub-team is currently thinking that those may be done through means of sub-teams.

And I guess Michael will probably talk about that a bit more, because it would be good to get working group input in there, indeed if there is support on using sub-teams as well. How that would function in practice? Would they run in parallel? Subsequently? How would feedback be done to the broader working group.

So, again, those are things that you can maybe already start thinking about, and I guess those will come up in the discussion as we move forward.

So, the first deliverable, Number 1, is basically looking at this process for developing GTLB policy, perhaps in the form of policy guidance, including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use such a process, instead of a GNSO PDP. And this is Charter Question 2 in the working group charter.

Basically all the elements -- well, not all of them -- the first element identified there, again, comes from the conversations we had in the sub-team and, as well, that came out of some of the working group discussions. A starting point here may be to look at existing mechanisms that the GNSO has used to develop policy or advice outside of the PDP. There are a number of efforts that the working group or sub-team could look at, such as the SCI, SCI. We have a couple of non-PDP working groups that are currently ongoing.

There's also a draft process that was included in the staff discussion paper. That may be considered as a starting point or at least to look at.

And then, again, there are a couple of tasks that immediately flow from the charter that looked at those issues.

So, again, looking at some of the questions that were identified in the staff discussion paper, lessons that can be learned from past experience. And, again, there are those specific questions that were identified in the charter.

And as you'll note as well, the numbering behind those questions refer back to the place where they can be found in the charter.

And then, as well, what other options are available for policy and implementation efforts, other than consensus policy or other, and whether the criteria for determining which should be used. And, again, there are some specific questions there.

Then, the next category of deliverables, basically we tried to group those together. The sub-team tried to group those together, that I think all closely relate to the implementation phase of the work. And there was a

sense that maybe those three could actually be taken together and taken as a package and worked on.

So, those are basically looking at a framework for implementation review and discussions associated with GNSO policy recommendations, which is Charter Question 3.

Then, the criteria to be used to determine when actions should be addressed by a policy process and when it should be considered implementation. This is currently Charter Question 4.

And then, Deliverable 4, which is guidance on how GNSO implementation review teams as defined in the PDP Manual are expected to function and operate, which is currently Charter Question 5.

And, again, all the questions you see here in green on the right are directly taken from the charter. And, again, you'll see some of them may be duplicate from other deliverables, but they specifically apply as well to these questions, in the view of the sub-team.

And then, again, as I said before, then at the end of the process, the idea would be then to come back to Deliverable 5 which is to finalize that set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation review and discussion, and that's the current Charter Question 1.

And, again, the approach would be to actually review what was done on the Deliverable 0.B, and actually review the Deliverables 1 to 4 and review how additional principles may be distilled or modified from these to be included in the final set of principles.

So, I think that's the mind map in a nutshell. So, Michael, I'll hand it back to you.

Michael Graham: OK. And what we've use the mind map for, I think as you can recognize, is we were trying to connect the various dots that we had on the large mind map that we've been working on as a committee as a whole, again, so that there is some reasonable direction in the development of the work group and what needs to be done first before we can move on to the next step.

One other thing that we worked on in the sub-team that the mind map is working towards was to look at work plans from other projects, working groups, see how they were organized and try to put together a draft of the same for us.

Unfortunately, the draft that I prepared I only got out a half-hour before this phone call. So, I don't know that...probably, a lot of you haven't been able to open it yet or to see it. It is a work in progress where I've tried leading up to the Buenos Aires meeting, at least, to put in some real dates and real "what is to be done," what the deliverable or the topic for discussion is, and who is going to handle it.

And then, beyond that, it includes -- I see you've got it up there. Once we get beyond December, where we have a finalized draft work plan -- and I say draft work plan, because we recognize as a subgroup and sub-team, and I think the entire work group needs to recognize as a basic underlying principle, that anything that we schedule and any dates we set are set in mud and may change based on the work that we're doing or demands or issues that come up during the process.

So, we're very cognizant of that and at the same time in trying to use the ICANN meetings as mile markers, what to try to put together some not unreasonable target dates.

So, what I've done with this first page, again, is to actually put together what we should be able to accomplish prior to the meeting, including a draft working plan, which is basically this form itself, and being able to have that for discussion in Buenos Aires.

And after that, after December however, I've only included at this point some of the most general types of deadlines, the first one being to work towards the drafts of principles underlying, which is the Deliverable 0.A and, again, that's "working" principles.

And then, moving to November a year hence, towards draft deliverables actually from the sub-teams working on the Deliverables 1, or Deliverables 2 to 4. This does not include a lot of the actual process dates or what would go into the actual work. Some of that I would like to have filled in prior to the -- I guess it's October 30th -- working group meeting, the next one, so that we can begin discussing that perhaps.

So, that's still under development, and we should have one if not two more meetings of the sub-team before then to actually fill in some of the blanks.

The other document that I sent out -- and this applies in part because some of this will have to do with how we set up this proposed work plan -- is some directed questions for the face-to-face meeting in Buenos Aires. And being someone who cannot stop typing once I begin, this is far more full-some than we can hopefully deal with and have meaningful discussion.

But these are some proposed questions that we might be able to handle and that would be part of the working process which we've sort of mapped out to be that Deliverable 0.A, which is developing the definitions by the time we leave Buenos Aires, having some of those in hand. And then, also, beginning to discuss some of the policy issues.

So, Question 1 through 3 -- well, especially 1 and 3 -- would be important for the definitions.

For the schedule...so, this may not be something so much for the discussion in Buenos Aires, Chuck, as it may be for our next two meetings here, and that is looking at the various deliverables and what all goes into preparing those. And I encapsulate my understanding generally

in Question 12, which is asking does this look realistic, that this would be the process for any particular draft deliverable.

So, the sub-team still has a number of things to complete before Buenos Aires. The draft Policy and Implementation Working Group work plan and timetable is of utmost importance, and we're stretching -- and I don't know if you wanted to discuss this at all or get some ideas, Chuck, during today's meeting -- but we do have an overriding general question of what is our understanding of the length of time that this project might call for, again recognizing that that may lengthen or shrink according to what is decided along the way, but just so that we have some hand on that so that we can try to apply some dates to it.

And that's pretty much where the sub-team is now. As I say, we've probably got two more meetings before the 30th, and hope to be able to fill in some of the blanks of the draft policy and implementation draft work plan and timelines.

But, certainly, anyone's comments, suggestions on either the mind map that we're working from or these other materials would be more than welcomed.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Michael and Marika. This is Chuck.

We have a couple of hands up, and we're going to get to those in just a second. In response to one of your questions, I think if we have time today I think it would be good to talk a little bit about total time frame, but I want to caution people don't jump to any conclusions in terms of how long this working group is going to take, because we're in the very early stages of looking at a possible schedule and that will change as we get more and more information.

So, when we're doing that, don't get scared off thinking that you're going to be working on this for five years. Hopefully, that will not be the case. But, I think it would be good if we had that discussion.

Now, what I think would be a good idea now is to let participants ask questions that they have on the mind map that was just gone over by Marika and by Michael. And also, then we'll entertain some comments after that.

So, Michael and Marika, are one of you comfortable with managing the queue? I don't think there's any reason for me to get in the middle, unless you want me to?

Michael Graham: Sure. I think we can probably handle it. And of course, it's sub-team members who have their hands up first, which doesn't surprise me.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Well, as Michael just said, I am on the sub-team, but I do have the caveat that I didn't attend this last week's meeting. So, I may be a little bit out of sync with what the sub-team has done, is doing.

I was one of the ones who pushed that for the very first part of the process being to come up with definitions we all agree on. And it's more important that we all are using terms in the same way even if we have to invent terms -- scrap "policy and implementation" and call it "XX and YY" -- to make sure that when we're talking we all have the same understanding of what we're saying. And right now, for a whole bunch of reasons, I don't believe that's the case.

For instance, as Geoff and others have suggested, it may well be that there are more appropriately three phases -- policy, implementation design, and execution -- or call them what you want. And maybe there's four.

I think we need some precise terms. Once we agree on those, I'm a little bit worried that we have laid out a plan using the undefined terms, and we may find that the plan itself should be changing, not dissimilar from what Chuck said, that once we go along we may find the schedule changes. Well, the detail of the work plan I think may change also.

So, I think we should have a mindset, understanding that this is what we see now, but if we come up in the definition phase and redefine the terms we're using from just a binary "policy and implementation," then the questions which use those terms may have to change also in the later phases.

So, I think we need to understand that what we're doing now is as best we can do given that we haven't started yet, but the whole structure may change as we end up with more preciseness.

Thank you.

Michael Graham: This is Michael. Alan, I totally agree with you. I think for the purposes of the mind map and also for the work plan at this point, we've tried to keep whatever definitions, the wording that was actually used in the charter and such.

But, I do agree that once we have set the definitions, and I think as part of that we'll be setting some of the goals as well, that that may affect not only how we speak of these things but also the order in which things might have to get done, or what gets done within them.

So, I appreciate that, and I thank you for that input.

Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi. Thanks, Michael. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, here. And I'm perfectly in support of what Alan and you have said, just by the way. And indeed, these things are as you quite rightly pointed out written in mud, not as opposed to concrete. Perhaps, we shouldn't write them in sand just yet, but we do need some frameworks to follow.

The reason I put my hand up was actually to raise what I think might be a useful tool that I saw about six hours ago now. And I have just checked through the email, and I haven't got a copy of it but I will forward it to our sub-team, Michael, as soon as he comes through on my other list.

We had a meeting, our first meeting, of the Metrics and Reporting design team, and at that Barry Cobb presented the work plan for our activities in a new tool. And I've got to say I am blown away by this new tool.

So, I was really keen, if you agree, Michael, for Marika to track it down from Barry. It was a piece of proprietal stuff, because it had a copyright on it, and it would be very easy as we make modifications and changes to your drafting that's been put out earlier today to copy that across to the new tool. And I think you'll find that the work group as a whole will be able to see that it's a lot more flexible and it lends itself to a great deal of updating and, indeed, job tracking.

And I just wanted to try and get that as a little action item, if at least the sub-team could have a look at the wonderful new work plan project management tool layout that Barry used this morning in that drafting team. It would be very handy.

Thank you.

Michael Graham: That would be great if we can make that connection and take a look at that. I don't know what the easiest way would be, but probably...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Marika is on to Barry now. So, the magic will happen.

Michael Graham: Yes, if you can get that to Marika, I think that probably would be the best thing, and we can see how we can incorporate that. That would be excellent.

Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. This is Chuck. I have a very -- well, it's probably a very simple question and one that I probably should have figured out myself, but I haven't yet. There are some numbers used in parenthesis in the green colored items -- A1, B2, C3, etc. What do those mean? What do they refer to?

Michael Graham: Well, I'd have to go back and look. I know that they derive from references to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In the charter, the charter questions.

Michael Graham: You're right. Questions in the charter. And in part, it was trying to track because as you're going through the deliverables, there are some questions... and the deliverables of course were separate from the questions as we had laid them out. In many cases, those questions would apply to more than one deliverable.

So, it was a way of just trying to track what those were and where they came from. And, especially I think if you take a look at the far right side, beside the two yellow deliverables, there's a large block that goes from A to E, and it's identical for both of those deliverables, as are the other ones. And it's just trying to tag in where...I could give you the exact system it was, but I'll have to look back.

That's going to be what it was, just tying it to the charter so that we could identify that these are the same questions being applied in two different places.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Hey, Michael, this is Chuck again. And I don't need the answers right now, but if we're going to leave those in there, we should either provide a little legend or make them more explicit, looking forward to when other people outside of the working group will look at this mind map. So, that's just a suggestion.

And then, let me suggest that you continue and ask of the working group members the questions you have for them and what feedback they have in terms of the direction you're going and so forth. And I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but this is a great opportunity to get some feedback from the full working group.

Michael Graham: Right. Well, frankly, for the purpose of first things going forward, I think probably the most important questions that I had within those directed questions and that we could either answer now or have submitted or discuss, and that is identifying the terms that we need to define with specificity so that we can have meaningful discussion without discussing the terminology, so that we can accept these and understand what they mean when we say them.

The terms that I identified as (INAUDIBLE) are "policy," "policy development," "implementation," "implement," "principles," "consensus." These definitions can either be from ICANN definitions or somewhere, wherever we pull them. We just need to agree on them.

But I think the first thing is to identify any other terms at this point that we believe we would need to define. And then, once we have this list, then we need to consider what these terms mean when we say them.

So, the first question would be, would anyone like to posit other terms based on this discussion, on looking at the materials, on your understanding of the charter that we need to define? And it's in part so we understand them and also in part so that we avoid the discussions that are extremely interesting and maybe contentious but that are not carrying out the mission which is to put together materials.

Maureen, I see your hand up.

Maureen Cubberley: Yes. Thanks, Mike. I think I'd like to see "consensus policy" added, as well, because the word "consensus" has a meaning, but there's an already established understanding of "consensus policy" within the GNSO and the rest of ICANN. Would that make sense?

Michael Graham: Yes, it would. And it's a perfect example of something that we can probably go into ICANN materials and pull out the definition of that, and if that's acceptable go forward with it.

Maureen Cubberley: Right. That's what I was hoping. And that would probably avoid some confusion over the word "consensus" itself.

Thanks.

Michael Graham: Becky?

Becky Burr: I'd just point out that there are...we have to be very careful because "consensus policy" actually often gets used in two different ways. So, we'll probably have to bring two definitions and figure out how to work through it.

Michael Graham: And what term was that?

Becky Burr: "Consensus policy."

Michael Graham: OK. Right.

And I hate to sound like a lawyer, but the first thing that would be done in any of these -- and this is something we had to do in Metrics -- is to ensure that in our materials we include these definitions so that reading the materials going forward, to the extent possible, people leave their preconceptions at the door and accept what it's intended to be.

Maureen, do you have your hand up again? Or, it's just still up there.

Maureen Cubberley: No. I'm sorry. I'm just taking the hand down. I agree with that, by the way. Leave the preconceptions at the door. Otherwise, it'll be a 20-year undertaking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You could get away with murder that way.

Michael Graham: I will say I think Alan's spoken analysis of this and his emphasis of the need for the definitions came out of I think the first meeting of the sub-team in which we had a spirited and very interesting and philosophical discussion of terms, and realized that while having those discussions is what we like to do, but to accomplish our goal we need to avoid discussing those terms and actually accept what they are and go forward and try and deal with the larger question of policy and implementation structures, frameworks, and such.

Wolf, you have your hand up?

Wolf Knoben: Yes, Mike. Thank you. This is Wolf Knoben speaking. Just a question regarding the organization of work. So, I understand from the mind map that the different colors they are indicating the different level and different kind of working levels and working teams and groups. Is it correct that, for example, the yellow one would mean a working group, for example, for

the Deliverable 1 and a separate one for Deliverable 2? Or, is it...? Well, what is your intention with that, to organize that and to obvious regard to chartering such groups?

Michael Graham: Yes, Wolf, you are correct. That is what the yellow is to indicate.

What we considered in discussing the work plan -- and this was out of leadership questions as well -- was whether or not some tasks might be better or more quickly and more efficiently handled by sub-teams rather than the work group as a whole.

Now, what that means is that the nuts and bolts analysis, drafting, and such would be handled by the sub-team. But then, that sub-team would always bring it back to the work group as a whole, again, for review, revision, and discussion.

But our thought was that especially with a group that's the size of ours, if all 30 are involved, that may actually hinder getting some deliverables prepared that can be the basis for preparing a final draft.

I will note that one of the questions that I have as a directed question for Buenos Aires actually does have to do with the sub-teams and in reviewing this, whether or not there were other types of divisions that might be appropriate.

And of course, this is only beginning now. As any of these deliverables is approached by the working group or by sub-teams, it may become apparent that certain tasks need to be carried out. And generally those are carried out by individuals and they'll bring it back to the work group or sub-team. And in some cases, that may be a separate sub-sub-team.

But what we wanted to do with this proposed working plan is to acknowledge and introduce the idea that we may find efficiencies in utilizing sub-team type of structures and then have that team bring back their deliverables to the working group for the final analysis.

Wolf Knoben: I see.

Michael Graham: Marika, you have your hand up?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to add to what you said and the response to Wolf's question, because I think that's one of the things we really would like, or the sub-team would really like, to get feedback on from the broader working group.

I think first of all, do you think that it would be indeed helpful to carry out some of the tasks, or some of these deliverables, through the use of sub-teams? And, if yes, how would that work?

For example, for the Deliverables 1 and 2 to 4, would that be two separate sub-teams that would work in parallel? Should it be two sub-teams that would work subsequently, one first finishes its work before the other one finishes? Would they work in an altered way?

Because I think there are questions that you would need to take into account. First of all, I think it's a resource question. How many working group members are able to serve on the sub-teams? And would you be able to serve on more than one? How much time would you have available to participate in this? And it would as well help define the overall work plan and timeline for those tasks, of course.

And then, of course there's also the question, how does the linking back with the working group work? And I think there are several of you who have participated in other working group efforts where we've had sub-teams, and some of them have been very successful and others less. There have been some efforts where a sub-team went away, did really a lot of work, and then came back to the working group. And the working group would go, "What are you thinking? We don't like this," and would throw it out, and where the whole sub-team would be completely disillusioned and say, "Well, we'll never do this again."

And then, we've also had other efforts where we had sub-teams where actually hardly any work would get done in the sub-team. No work would be done in between, because people did sign up for it but there was just not enough resources or time available to actually get substantive work done. And actually in the end, after a couple of weeks trying with the sub-teams, it actually would go back to the overall working group.

So, I think that's one of the items that would really need some significant consideration by the overall working group in how to go about that, to make sure that there's a structure in place that would get us to deliver what we set out to do.

So, I think having feedback especially on those items would really help the sub-team prepare the work plan, hopefully for adoption in Buenos Aires. And of course, that determines to a large extent as well the timeline going forward and how to map out the different activities over the next couple of months.

Michael Graham: Right. Michael, again. And I think the very end there is the most important thing in a way that you just said, Marika. And that is that we can really only project out a couple of months in what will actually be done, with an eye to the big picture.

And I know, I think yesterday, the other day we spoke when we had our leadership call, one thing that we might propose if we utilized sub-teams would be to ensure that at least one member of leadership was on each of those, not as a leader but as a member and also as being able to direct the team if it looked like it was getting off course from what the group as a whole, our understanding of that direction is.

I'll also point out -- and this would be something for consideration -- this is one approach to the working plan. The basis for this is focusing on deliverables.

Another potential approach -- and it might actually be a parallel approach -- is to focus on answering the questions. The one downside of having the same questions relevant to the work of two different sub-teams is that those sub-teams may come up with different and competing answers, that once we bring the teams back together again we find out they are in fact speaking a different language.

So, some of those green, the last questions on the far right, might well be the subject (INAUDIBLE) clear working group answering in our regular meetings and exploring those, and based on those answers, feeding those answers back to the sub-teams for their application to come up with their deliverables.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. I put my hand up a while ago, when Marika was talking about the various outcomes of sub-teams that we've had. And I think one of the things that perhaps is important to say, certainly from my perspective, is there's no way to predict ahead of time which of those outcomes it's going to be.

And we've had some occur in combination. We've had sub-teams that worked really hard and thought they considered everything. And then when it went back to the major team, they either completely ignored the work or decided tacitly, although I don't think they ever consciously said it, to do it over again.

So, it's a grab bag. It's one of the things that we have not refined to a science, yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good leadership helps, though, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: It does, but that doesn't guarantee the committee as a whole accepts the outcomes afterwards.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. That's good communication.

Michael Graham: And I think that's an important point, too, that utilizing sub-teams to prepare drafts and such does not mean that that work would be carried out in a vacuum. And in fact, I think for the work group as a whole determining how we want to relate the work of the working group as a whole to having these teams go out there.

I sort of view it as, we need something. Who's going to go out there and bring water back so that we can drink it? And the sub-team would be the group going out and getting the water. But then, it's useless until we all drink it together.

Maureen?

Maureen Cubberley: Yes, thanks. I wanted to make a comment on your approach which is focusing on the deliverables rather than the questions. And I do agree with that approach. I think it brings the questions into a tighter focus. And

in fact, by focusing on the deliverables and working through them in the way that you've suggested, it begins to inform the answers to the questions.

I think it's the right way to do it. Some work I've done recently in other sectors has been exactly the opposite, and we've worked on questions and it has become very muddied and very circular.

So, I think that this approach that you've sketched out is the most effective. So, I just want to put my vote in for that one.

Michael Graham: Thank you. And I think what you just said...and it's similar to going on without limited definitions, that the questions can lead to wonderful discussions, but if you don't have an eye on what it is that you're trying to produce, the end question and end result, you get off the track.

Other questions or comments at this point?

Certainly, any insight that anyone might have after you've had a chance to digest all these materials outside of this meeting, we on the sub-team would really appreciate receiving, because our goal is to produce a draft work plan and questions that we still have, so that at the meeting in Buenos Aires they can really be hashed through and clarified, at least as a starting point.

And, again, I think the work on the definitions will be very important towards that, and I don't know if we want to...I hate to form a sub-team at the very outset, but that might be a useful exercise, Chuck, to have certain people who would want to search the ICANN vaults for definitions that might be proposed at Buenos Aires for further discussion, rather than just having the words out there?

Chuck Gomes: Michael, this is Chuck. Actually, I think that's a good idea. Does anybody object to forming a sub-team to start focusing on the definitions task? If so, put you "disagree" in the chat, or speak up.

I see Amr has his hand up. And then, I saw Alan's come up. Oh, I see agreement there. OK.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They're all tics. They're green tics.

Chuck Gomes: They're tics. Thank you, Cheryl, for keeping me straight. You're good at that. And Marie has done it. So, thank you very much. I don't see any disagreement.

So, here's the real test. Who would like to volunteer to do that, to start that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go on, Alan.

Chuck Gomes: Alan? It looks like Alan is volunteering? Is that it? (laughter) And Amr, you're volunteering?

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: If you're looking for someone to chair it, I have very strong opinions. I may not be the best chair, unless you like opinionated chairs.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, again. I don't mind opinionated chairs, so long as they're clear when they're giving their opinion and they respect the opinions of others. And I think you've demonstrated over the years that you're able to do that.

Alan Greenberg: I understand, but some people really like impartial chairs and I wouldn't be that in this case.

Chuck Gomes: OK. Thank you. Is there someone that would be willing to lead this group, this little sub-team?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Maureen's hand is up.

Chuck Gomes: Maureen? Is that from before? Or, is that a new hand? Maureen?

Maureen Cubberley: Sorry. That's an old hand.

Chuck Gomes: That's what I thought.

Maureen Cubberley: If no one else volunteers, I would volunteer to help with that group.

Chuck Gomes: Very good. Well, we're going to...it would be helpful to have several people on it. Are you volunteering to be the coordinator, the lead, of that?

Maureen Cubberley: Um.

Chuck Gomes: (laughter) I'm good at putting people on the spot.

Maureen Cubberley: You certainly are. Yes, with some help of course, frankly.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Sure. Well, I think there would be several people. So, we have Maureen and Alan. Would anybody else like to volunteer on this? And Marika and Mary, if we can send out a request to the list to see if there are any other volunteers?

Michael, I see your hand up. Are you volunteering? Or, just have a comment?

Michael Graham: No, I'll volunteer as long as I don't have to chair. I already have some definitions out here. So, I can bring them in.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I think it is good to spread the workload around. So, that's great.

So, we have three volunteers so far. Let's put out a request to the list. I wouldn't be disappointed if there was just three, but we should welcome others to join.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan. My hand was up as a hand, not a volunteer.

Chuck Gomes: Oh. Well, you don't want to have an opportunity for your opinions to be shared in a non-leadership capacity?

Alan Greenberg: No, I originally just put my hand up to make a comment before you started asking for volunteers.

Chuck Gomes: I will let you do that.

Sorry about that interference. Alan, go ahead and make your comment.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure I want to.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, just a second, Alan. Somebody, mute your...

Alan Greenberg: OK. There's no echo now.

Chuck Gomes: Mute your phones, please, just because we're obviously getting at some times some echo and interference there.

So, my apologies, Alan. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: OK. Thank you. I've lost track now who said it, but someone said we should go into the ICANN vault and try to find definitions for some of these terms. If ICANN had definitions for some of these terms, we wouldn't be in this situation we are in today. So, just, it may not be worth looking too hard, because I don't think anyone's bothered to think about defining these terms until now.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. This is Chuck. Now, I do believe though that there are some that are there. Like, for example, in the GNSO working group guidelines, there's at least a definition there -- whether it works for us or not we'll have to determine -- on the term "consensus."

Alan Greenberg: Oh, yes. But I was talking about the definitions that we're using, the substantive definitions of "policy implementation" and things relating to that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Right. OK.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. This is Chuck again. Did I see another...did I miss another volunteer for that group? There were some things popping up there. If so...Wolf, did you want to speak? Or, are you volunteering?

Wolf Knoben: I'm going to volunteer, yes.

Chuck Gomes:	Thank you. And, Amr, are you volunteering?
Amr Elsadr:	Yes, I am.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you very much. OK. Well, I really appreciate the quick response on that, and Maureen will kind of take the lead role, but I expect all of you to help her on that. And hopefully you can do a lot of that on some email exchanges.
	Maureen, please let staff know if you would like a little list for that, so we can facilitate that.
	Now, in the intent of keeping this agenda moving -- and I think our next items are less time consuming -- let's jump to Agenda Item 3, which is the outreach letter to the GAC. Now, I sent that out yesterday, and I think it didn't go to the full working group at first, but it did I think yesterday before the day was out, at least for me.
	And I made some edits to the base letter we sent to the other ACs and the SOs. And Maureen already provided some suggestions on that. Maureen, would you share those? And let's give people an opportunity to comment on that.
Maureen Cubberley:	Yes, sure. I'd just have to pull that up. At the beginning, where you talk about the code...Sorry. I'm just going to check my notes, here. Where you're talking about the ICANN code and you pull out some specific examples, I wondered if it would be more neutral to leave them out? That was the first point.
	The second one...Sorry. I'll just be a sec here. I've forgotten what I said in the second one. Do you have it in front of you, Chuck?
Chuck Gomes:	I think I do, if I pull up the right paper here. I thought I had it.
Maureen Cubberley:	Yes, that's what I'm trying to find, is the right email. Here we go.
Chuck Gomes:	OK. Go ahead.
Maureen Cubberley:	Yes, I'll just be a second.
Chuck Gomes:	That's OK.
Maureen Cubberley:	OK. The second part was point 5(b), and you use the word "flavors," which I think is an English language descriptor. And it might be better understood by everyone in the GAC who will be reading the letter or be seeing the letter if that point contained either a brief explanation of what is made by "flavors" or if it's a term that's been used in the past, perhaps just a reference to where it was used and how the meaning is intended.
	So, it really is just a clarification thing.
Chuck Gomes:	Thanks, Maureen. This is Chuck again. Do you have maybe another word that might be better?

Maureen Cubberley:	I'll have to think about it. I'll see if I can get back to you with one.
Chuck Gomes:	OK. Thank you.
Maureen Cubberley:	You're welcome.
Chuck Gomes:	This is Chuck again. With regard to the first suggestion by Maureen, in taking out the examples, does anybody disagree with that?
	OK. So, I think that edit is OK.
	So, if we can just come up with another way, or if somebody has a suggestion to reword 5(b) without using the word "flavors," that would certainly be entertained. So, let's see if we can come up with something there.
	Now, while people are thinking on that, are there any other suggestions, suggested edits, or things that should be added or taken out in the letter as it stands right now? And while you're thinking...
	Oh, there, I see a hand up. Wolf?
Wolf Knoben:	Thanks, Chuck. It all seems right. I think it was handed out shortly before the meeting. Just also one sentence in the second big paragraph, starting with, "As part of the efforts."
	So, we are expressing that we would like to ask the GAC for, or to gain inputs from the GAC to "assist" us in our efforts. So, I'm feeling it would be a little bit more stronger if you ask to "support" us in our efforts, rather than asking the GAC for assistance which, from my understanding of the language, is "assistance" means, "OK. So you're my assistant." That's my understanding of that. So, that was the reason why I was thinking about "support" in this regard.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you, Wolf. And I just pulled up your email, because it came in...well, I got it either very shortly before this meeting when I was on another meeting, or something. But, thanks. It is an email for the working group, if you haven't seen his suggestions.
	Anybody disagree with Wolf on the use of the word "support" rather than "assistance"?
Speaker:	No. Good.
Chuck Gomes:	Yes, it seems fine to me. Let me get back over to the -- I'm looking at my email right at the moment. Let me get back over and look for hands. I don't see anybody disagreeing with that.
	And he also suggested that we change "policy or implementation" to "policy and implementation" in any cases that that occurs. So, that's a pretty straightforward one, and that was a change that occurred in the GNSO. And Wolf is very aware of that. So, thank you, Wolf, for that.

	So, anybody else have any edits or suggested changes, additions, deletions with regard to the letter?
	I would like to get this out as soon as possible so that we give the GAC as much lead time as possible.
	And I see Marika's hand.
Marika Konings:	Yes, this is Marika. This is just to note that Nick Steinberg also sent a suggestion. I see he's on the call, but I'm not sure if he's on the audio. But he also sent a suggestion by email. The suggestion is...
Chuck Gomes:	Oh, there it is. I see it. Go ahead.
Marika Konings:	...to change the sentence, "As part of the effort, the working group wants to reach out at the beginning of our efforts to the GAC to gain input to assist us in our efforts." I think his suggestion is to use a little bit of less "effort" in the sentence, and he's suggesting to change that to, "From the onset of this process, the working group would like to gain input from the GAC to assist us in our efforts."
	And maybe one thing I wanted to note as well, because one of the references to "policy versus implementation" actually refers to the title of our discussion paper, at which time we still were actually referring to it as "versus." I have no problem in changing it, but it's just that the title of the actual paper does refer to the "versus" instead of the "and" as we're using for the working group.
Chuck Gomes:	This is Chuck. And we probably should keep the title correct as it was written. In other cases, though, in generic uses, I think Wolf's change is good.
	So, a question for Mary and Marika. Can one of you take the responsibility for making these changes in the letter?
Marika Konings:	Yes. This is Marika. That's fine. Although I think we haven't seen any suggestions on the "flavors" word, how to change that.
Chuck Gomes:	Yes. So, let's see if we can come up with one of those fairly quickly here on the call. Those of you that want to end early, if you could come up with a good suggestion there, that would help. Again, putting you on the spot.
	Now, with regard to that, my suggestion for either Marika or Mary, whichever one of you does it, if you could accept the changes, the red lines that are in there now, and then do a red line of the changes that we made as a result of our call today and the email input that we've received, that would probably help all of us to keep track of what we did today.
Marika Konings:	Sure.
Chuck Gomes:	OK. Thank you.

And then, what we'll do is we'll just send out that red line version shortly after this meeting for one final look. And hopefully by the end of the week, we can actually send that to the GAC. So, let's see how that goes. And then, Marika and Mary, you can coordinate with...we can coordinate together in terms of going ahead and sending that out and so forth.

So, any other input on the letter? No ideas on "flavors." Let's do this on that, rather than belaboring it here. If everybody would give that some thought, and if you can before your day's out today -- and some of you, probably that's already the case -- if you can maybe propose a suggestion there that we can use.

Otherwise, we probably should come up with another alternative, like Maureen suggested is to provide an explanation of what we mean by that.

So, if you have some suggestions there, it would be much appreciated.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan. I'm not at my computer right now. The word "types" has a similar meaning, but it doesn't have quite the same depth. So, I really don't know a better word, but you can probably -- again, I don't see the letter in front of me right now -- but you can probably substitute "types," but I don't think it has the same real impact and meaning.

                    Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. If we don't come up with a better word than "types," my inclination would be to go with that instead of "flavors." But, let's see what Marika has to say.

Alan Greenberg: Well, or define "flavors."

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm just actually looking at what people are suggesting in the "Chat." The word "variations" has been suggested by Maureen, and I think several people have indicated that they like that term.

Chuck Gomes: Alan, let me put you on the spot. Do you think "variations" has a little more depth than "types"?

Alan Greenberg: "Variations" is much better than "types."

Chuck Gomes: OK. Well, let's go with that, barring no better suggestions that come in. And then, we'll have a new red line that we can distribute later today and then try and get that letter out by Friday to the GAC.

                    Moving on the Buenos Aires meeting planning agenda, and the main issue...we don't need to worry too much about the specifics of the agenda today. We'll work more on that in our coming meetings.

But, let's talk about timing. Marika sent out a message on that today. I did a little response to it in terms of my own personal needs there, and a few people have responded on the list. One comment that I thought was really good was that we're better off doing it at a time when more people might be able to participate, although keep in mind that there's conflicts at both times. So, we don't know whether that will be the case.

But we pretty much can assume that early morning meetings won't be well attended. So, that would lead us to trying to schedule a session from 4:30 to 6:00 on that same day. What do people think about that? Any comments?

Does somebody prefer one of the other options? And I'd throw it open to totally different suggestions, but the problem with that is the scheduling is so complicated and there are so many complications that I don't think that's a wise thing to do. So, I would restrict it to the options we have right now, unless staff thinks there's another good one somewhere else.

OK. Does anybody have any strong objections to trying to change it from 4:30 to 6:00?

Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to note that of course this is also tentative. The information I've provided here is on what I've received earlier this week, and I'm sure others are making changes at the moment as well. So, I'll make sure to keep a close eye on what the different moving parts are, and I'll keep the chairs informed as well if things change.

But I just want to make sure that the working group is aware that this is not final yet. So, things may change further, and there may be a scenario as well that if we move our session that in the end we may be in a worse position considering other sessions have moved. But we'll do our best as we move forward in the scheduling process.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. That's a very good point. And for those of us that have been involved in scheduling in the past know that that's a very true statement. So, we can't assume that it'll be this way, but my suggestion, barring other comments, that this may be the way to go.

But, let me listen to Wolf first.

Wolf Knoben: Thanks, Chuck. Wolf, speaking. Just a question, Marika. Is it clear that the council meeting is finished at that time already?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Basically, the way it's currently scheduled is that the council meeting -- let me just pull it up -- is going to have a two-hour meeting in the main meeting room from...

Wolf Knoben: 1:00 to 3:00.

Marika Konings:	...1:00 to 3:00. And then, there's as well an administrative meeting that will follow after that from 3:00 to 4:30. So, we'd basically be immediately after the end of that meeting.
Wolf Knoben:	OK. Good.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you for that. This is Chuck again. I don't see any other hands. So, anything else, Marika, that we need to cover on the Buenos Aires meeting for now?
Marika Konings:	This is Marika. No, I think the only thing that may be helpful is if maybe people can send an email -- not to the list; they can send it to me -- and I can keep a tally of who's actually planning to be in Buenos Aires and who's planning to participate remotely and who's not planning to participate at all, so we have a bit of an idea of how many members we can expect to receive during the meeting.
Chuck Gomes:	And it'd be a good idea to send out that request to the list, so that those that are not on the call can respond as well and probably facilitates it even for those of us who are on the call. So, let's do it that way.
Marika Konings:	Yes.
Chuck Gomes:	OK?
Marika Konings:	Yes. (INAUDIBLE)
Chuck Gomes:	You can reply to just Marika instead of the whole list if you want. But, it's probably good that that go out to the whole list.

Thanks, Marika. That's helpful.

OK. The last agenda item. Note Marika's note -- OK, sorry about that -- on Agenda Item 5, because we're going to have some time confusion because Europe goes on daylight savings time I think a week before here in US and Canada do.

So, please be aware unless there are objections to that, we will keep the time as the same we have, and then we will all be back in sync I think.

Marika, do you want to describe that, your note there? |
| Marika Konings: | This is Marika. Yes. As Chuck said, there will be...the meeting on the 30th is the one week where Europe and the US and some other countries that end daylight savings will be out of sync, basically.

So, the proposed approach is to actually leave the UTC for that meeting at the same as it currently is, which means that for those in the US and those countries that are not changing yet, or ending their daylight savings yet, it will remain at the same time as it currently is. But for those that are in Europe or are switching, are ending their daylight savings in the week before, the call will be an hour earlier. |

Then, basically, in the next meeting on the 13th of November, we would actually change the UTC time. So, then at that point for everyone, the call will be back to normal.

Although I see Cheryl's hand up. I think it may affect, I guess, participants in Australia who don't have daylight savings. So, I'll let Cheryl comment to see if that actually works for her.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. And Cheryl, are you going to tell us where Australia is?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd be very happy to tell you all a few things, yes. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, here. First of all, Australia does have daylight saving time, and for the last ten days we have been in it, which means my time and everyone in this area, unless you happen to be in Queensland, have already switched forward an hour.

So, I'm a great one for just leave UTC time as UTC time, and we will deal with our little variations of summer and not-summer times locally. I would more than happy just to leave UTC time and that's it, because for me, I'm already an hour later and have been for...

Chuck Gomes: And so, what you're suggesting, Cheryl -- this is Chuck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Leave UTC.

Chuck Gomes: And not change it on the 30th. Is that correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Does anybody object to that?

Marika, your hand is still up?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Changing the UTC or not changing UTC basically means that the hour of the call changes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's correct.

Marika Konings: So, that may affect participation...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It already is for me anyway, yes.

Marika Konings: Well, it's only for...for (INAUDIBLE), for example, they wouldn't change. So, basically, it would change the hour of the call and that may affect participation.

So, the main reason for changing UTC is that actually for most people it would just stay at the same time as they're currently used to and as they indicated at the start of our working group process that that was the time that would work best for them.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Let me make sure I understand. So, the change in...UTC would still be the same as we sit now.

Marika Konings: No.

Chuck Gomes: No?

Marika Konings: No. Well, on the 30th, yes. But I think Cheryl is suggesting that we actually leave the UTC at the same time following that, on the 13th of November.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Marika Konings: But because many countries will have changed at that time, in effect it will mean I think that for most people the call will be an hour earlier, if I'm not mistaken.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's correct.

Marika Konings: So, the question is, does that significantly affect participation, as when we originally did the doodle poll for this meeting, that was the time that was selected as working for most people? And maybe changing an hour may affect participation or affect other calls.

                        I know for example it would conflict with an internal call that we have that takes place, that we are moving the UTC time for.

Chuck Gomes: OK. Let me make sure I'm clear. This is Chuck. So, right now, our time is 19:00 UTC. What would it be on the 13th, in UTC?

Marika Konings: On the 30th, we would leave the UTC at the same time.

Chuck Gomes: 19:00?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 13th.

Chuck Gomes: OK. That's all I needed to know. OK. And that's what you were suggesting, Cheryl. So, that's helpful. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. Cheryl, here. The following meeting, it will then change. Marika is saying that on the following meeting, it won't be 19:00 UTC. It will be 18:00 UTC.

Chuck Gomes: OK. I missed that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's the second part of her proposal.

Chuck Gomes: And what were you suggesting, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Leave it alone at 19:00 UTC.

Chuck Gomes: That's what I thought.

Marika Konings: Cheryl, I think it actually moves then to 20:00 UTC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, 20:00. Fine.

Chuck Gomes: OK. And, Cheryl, does your suggestion remain there?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. I'm a minority, and I'm already two hours out. So, let's stick with the northern hemisphere biases, which is hardly unusual, Chuck. (laughter)

Chuck Gomes: All right. I was open to it, but OK.

                     And people wanted to end as early as we can. Is there anything else before I adjourn this meeting?

                     OK. Not seeing anything or hearing anything, I want to thank you all for your participation. I think it's been a productive meeting. Thanks again to the sub-team that's doing the extra work on the plan and also to the new volunteers on the definitions.

                     Have a good rest of the day and a good rest of the week. Thanks a lot. Bye.

END