

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work Team
(WT)
TRANSCRIPTION**

Thursday, 26 March 2009 15:00 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 Thursday, 26 March 2009, at 15:00 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-20090326.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#march>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsc-20090326.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants present:

J. Scott Evans - Chair IPC

Avri Doria - NCA

Alexei Sozonov - Registrar

Alexey Mykhaylov - Registrar

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

Caroline Greer - registries c.

Greg Ruth - ISP

Bertrand de la Chapelle - GAC

Thomas Roessler - Individual

S. Subbiah - Individual

Zac Brandstater - Individual

Jonne Soininen - Individual

ICANN staff

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor, ICANN Policy Support

Ken Bour - Policy consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies:

Iliya Bazlyankov - Registrar c.

Konstantinos Komaitis - NCUC

Mikey O'Connor - CBUC

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon. Thank you for standing by. The call is now being recorded. Thank you.

J. Scott: All right. We know for now for sure (who we are) this is J. Scott Chair of the Working Group Work Team and I would ask, according to our agenda, that we go through these reports of the group that we're reviewing the interim rules with regards to the nine enumerated points.

I think (Tim) (unintelligible), will you sort of the appointed, anointed, chair of Group A.

Woman: He was appointed and I'm not sure about the anointed, but yep.

Woman: But (Tim) sent a note saying he was going to be a few minutes late to the call.

Man: Well, I thought I heard him on the call just a moment ago.

Woman: Well, he's not listed on the meetings (either).

Man: Okay. I'm (riding) in my car so I apologize. Let's move to the next group. Group B.

Man: Subbiahhere.

J. Scott: All right.

(Ken): This is (Ken). Just a note, I have posted his comments to the Wiki under agenda item 1.

J. Scott: Thank you.

Man: All right. Group B.

Subbiah Okay. This Subbiah here. As you noted there's two, I believe no one else joined the group, so it was just Subbiahand (Alexei) (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Subbiah So, we just had about (unintelligible) on the call. We just had a few days I guess. And he sent me some stuff and reviewed some stuff together and I guess I thought the call would be on for tomorrow. So, anyway this is not as finished, as fully finished, as it could be but here's an initial stab at it.

But before I start on that I would like to make, personally, a statement that I found pretty astonishing. There's good debt coming - there's good debt, someone asked me, to read - asked me to read Pages 12 to 21 from (Ken) of the board recommendation. Because when I read that it became clear to me that one of the main reasons why we are moving, I mean, it featured quite a bit on one of the pages, Page 18, that one of the main reasons why we are proceeding down a working group model was the presumed success of the IDN working within the GNSO.

That it was quite successful and the who is one who later followed along the same model but the rules one isn't actually changing decisions that were already made before. It's just looking at

implementation questions and therefore it doesn't quite merit as much as the pioneering (IDN-WG) working group.

The oddest thing for me is, well, that's very nice because I was part of that group and I'm happy that there's changed based on it. The oddest thing for me to read that was, I was (belittled) and astonished to think that that was a success. I mean, that can only image that other committees before, must have been, I don't know what.

But, I can say one thing. I was just very shocked. I mean, after (unintelligible) because none of the, many of the participants, at least half of them in that group...

Woman: Excuse me Mr. (unintelligible) joined.

Subbiah Many of the participants would feel that they didn't have a vote. That their views weren't really appropriately heard and they didn't have a voting right and all of those things. So, actually more than half the participants, at least half the participants who are attending a lot of the meetings at the end would have felt, including myself, that it was really a sham.

So, okay. So, it's a perspective. I mean I'm (outraged) that something that is now being used as a model and we're moving forward along the model and I've very satisfied by that but on the other hand the (unintelligible) about what I would say many of the people on it would say.

In fact, the interest for me to join this group was the experience there. So, I would like to - just before I go to the point I'd like to say that my

participation in ICANN has been largely in IDN issues. And, predating - the reason the IDN working group was put together, the working group model was put together, two years ago that was deemed as kind of success and why we should go down this path and that's why it's relevant.

Actually was a replacement, in some sense, for something that had gone earlier than that called the Presidents IDN ICANN committee that was completed by the president.

And that committee went on for a year or two and I believe there were 20 or 22 people in the committee. You're appointed on that committee directly by the president and 20, 22 people were there. They met for every week or so for...That's not every week.

J. Scott: I think we can all agree that past efforts...

Subbiah I understand.

J. Scott: Are uncertain. Specific topics have not been as successful as we like but I do believe that the GNSO is sort of more over the last two or three years.

Subbiah I understand.

J. Scott: Well, wouldn't informal working group model.

Subbiah Correct.

J. Scott: And we need to now refine that so that we can work out some of those things that you...

Subbiah Right.

J. Scott: Personally perceive (unintelligible).

Subbiah But I just wanted...

J. Scott: Before we move onto the point I greatly appreciate it so that we can keep this call going.

Subbiah Okay. Go. So only other point I wanted to make on the previous committee was that although there were 22 people listed and there were many meetings the attendance level of those meetings, we went back to look at them, was dismally low, three or four people every single time. Not even the chairs on it.

And yet decisions were almost made and some of these divisions actually reversed in the following IDN committee meeting. That's all I wanted to say.

So that is influencing some of the thoughts that we had in drafting these points. Now, regarding the Points 4, 5, and 6 I believe 5 and 6 are easier to discuss and I think that so, the 5 and 6 that's why it's audited that way, 5, 6, and 4. So, this is just a stab. We know there's going to be controversial - we don't even know what is the right way to approach this.

We're just putting some stuff up to see whether that could address some of the previous problems. Okay. The - I'll just walk through this and...At least let me just walk through the first point.

The first point is that along the board recommendation was a requirement, sort of not a requirement, one of the things they talked about was diversity and representation and make sure there's enough people around.

So, from that perspective even the committee, the sub-group, that I'm now representing, myself and (Alexei) doesn't meet the requirement. There's only two of us and we're not diverse enough either. So, actually from that perspective anything we come up is insufficient and we need more group members.

So, the other thing is regarding 4, 5, and 6 together, that's my first point, we notice that in the board recommendation it said that - there's a clause for any deviation from rules on a case by case basis. That is once rules have been set, and I think this applies for one to nine as well, not just for five and six.

Once rules have been set, eventually whatever the rules are, if there's a deviation to be had on a case by case basis then that should be allowed. Is what the board suggestions suggest but on an exceptional basis.

So, in referring to that we suggested that it's such a re-deviation from rules are to be made in a case by case basis then at least as far as 4, 5, and 6 are concerned they should be pre-set and agreed to before convening the (WG).

And, if a change is desired during the (WG) there must be 100% acceptance, I mean, on a special vote or something to change (met) cost. And then follow the new rules. Otherwise, we restart the (WG) again under new rules. That's a suggestion, you know, to address that issue.

That's not specifically the 4, 5 and 6 but it was in the board suggestion.

Then going forward in five, I mean, I think people can read basically what it is it's just suggestions. The five issue is really regarding drafting group formation. I believe that's separate from the chair or the working group of what the working group issues are. If, for example, from my understanding it's like what I'm doing right now with, let's say...We are the drafting group, sub-group.

And so the suggestions that we suggest there are open for debate. Ask for volunteers which I think is what we got here in this particular sub-group. And, again, to emphasize that the board requirements, also in this context of Number 5, actually suggests that people knowledgeable be on the drafting committee.

I mean, it does suggest that. And specifically the drafting thing. So, that's included there in terms of, again, emphasizing what (Tim) may be talking later, (Tim) was trying to raise before, that we're feasible experts and a diverse group. Both are things that the board requirements suggested be included as much as feasible.

And of course it's also, in that context, we also thought the chair of the drafting group in particular should have something (split) expertise or

experience. And I can say that it's not even clear for this sub-drafting committee group that I could be deemed as being sort of the chair and be deemed as having expertise. I'm not sure.

Then, the last one being - this is a suggestion that the drafting group is too small that it's just...I don't know what the number is but I don't think two is - I'm not sure whether it's appropriate in our present case. If it's too small or it be average attendance.

If for some reason I was trying to reach (Alex), say, over the weekend and I couldn't or the last week or something like that and then we couldn't discuss the issue of attendance. How many people actually participating and actually creating this?

And I don't know whether we need a rule for that, a suggestion for that. And so that's regarding five.

Now, I'll just take a break here and (Scott), I don't know how...

J. Scott: They'll take a queue and I'm gonna be first in the queue to say...

Subbiah Okay.

J. Scott: The group that you are assigned to is not a drafting group. It is merely a group that is looking for and putting together ideas...

Subbiah Okay.

J. Scott: So that the larger group can have a discussion.

Subbiah Okay.

J. Scott: The fact that it may be one, two or four you're not having any sort of decision making power...

Subbiah I understand that.

J. Scott: (Unintelligible) ideas for the larger group to discuss.

Subbiah Yeah, absolutely.

J. Scott: And...

Subbiah But am I also to agree that any rule that we come up with, even as a (WG) working group, okay? Everything that we come up with we don't have the decision making capability either. It's somebody above or the board or whatever actually decides on the actual rule, correct?

J. Scott: Well, somebody has to decide.

Subbiah Right.

J. Scott: What will go in the final report.

Subbiah Right, correct.

J. Scott: And so there is a decision right now whether that gets implemented. The implementation decision is not ours to say. So - but my points to you would be I've been involved with ICANN and I'll let (unintelligible) but I've been involved with it since it's (succession). And I can tell you

that if you say that ideas and progress can't move forward because you've got 22 people signed up and only three people are showing up we might as just well pack up and go home now.

Because, in my experience that's the way it's always been and that is the reason why we try to bring things up and open it up to public discussion at every level so that everybody will. Because many, many, many people will not be engaged in the very last step.

Now, obviously I don't know what your experience has been but that certainly has been mine.

Subbiah Right.

Woman: Yeah, certainly not as long as yours but you get the people that really are dedicated to something work on it and they're often the ones that have the strongest viewpoints and what they start and put down on paper is what other people start building their comment from both in agreement and disagreement with. And actually, I think it works in the long run by going through many levels of review until something comes out that has, more or less, been discussed by everyone that cares to discuss it at some level or other.

So, in terms of this stuff I think the decision will actually be made by the PPSC and then either endorsed or not by the counsel and it doesn't go to the board other than for the board to see it and go, hmm yeah, that seems okay. But I don't think they actually have a decision on how working groups are run.

Subbiah Okay.

J. Scott: Anyone else want to speak in the queue?

Woman: Not at this stage.

J. Scott: Who was that?

Woman: It was me saying not at this stage, (Cheryl).

J. Scott: Okay. Let's then move to Point 4 quickly.

Subbiah Point 6.

J. Scott: In the (whole). I'm sorry.

Subbiah Yeah, okay. Because I think the Point 4 will take, will make a lot - they'll be a lot of discussion on that I image. Six is regarding procedure rules not followed.

That is that if procedure rules - meaning, actual rules of procedure are not followed and someone wants to object as opposed to they're not happy with a particular vote or a decision that is made about something. It's a procedure rule.

And so on that one the suggests that we thought might be reasonable are the (unintelligible) objector brings it privately to the chair or even the case of the drafting group (unintelligible) drafting group. And I'll just stab at one week for a private resolution to a satisfaction of the objector or a process put in place that will lead to a satisfactory

resolution by the chair which is agreed to by the objector. So something that's in private to solve the problem.

If it doesn't, if A does not work, then the objector places a formal objection in writing to the whole (WG) mailing list chair. And the chair and objector inform whoever the - there must be and I just didn't know what the term for that is so I just came up with this thing called a boss entity, I guess, whoever's on top. I think the (IETF) people - they have a different director role or whatever.

But, the point is, somebody above the (WG) about the chair will be also informed of that. And at the next scheduled meeting, or if the chair convenes a special meeting or by email or some way to discuss this - at the next scheduled meeting...We just thought that C would be a helpful way to bring information to the arbitrating body above the chair. This goes up to that. So, it's just to take a basically a survey or a vote. It's not even a vote but information gathering where the (WG) participants themselves feel if the procedural rules were misapplied or not.

And some way to collect that information and send it to the person who would be interested at sort of the boss entity or whoever's doing the arbitration or looking into the matter. It's not necessary but if that - the reasoning for getting that information up to the top would be simply so that they can come up to speed quickly and decide on how to decide.

It's not just - it's not a popular vote things but just an information broad up to them. And that was...

J. Scott: I think that sounds very interesting. A lot of these ideas, in my opinion, are multi-layered and complex and are going to require some time to think. So, what I would ask is that we quickly let you finish up on Number 4 and let everybody take these and digest them over the next two weeks and discuss them on the list. And then we'll come back to them for more robust discussion.

Subbiah Right.

J. Scott: After people have had time to digest them.

Subbiah Right. That's precisely my view too.

J. Scott: So, I'm happy to let you finish up and take any comments that you have...

Subbiah Okay. Okay, I'll go very quickly then.

All right.

J. Scott: We need to move this forward.

Subbiah Okay. So, that's precisely my idea too and I think this is going to - especially Number 4. I think it's going to take a lot of time for people to come to agreement. And so is it even - at this point (Scott) would (unintelligible) for me to walk over there's? I think they're pretty self explanatory.

J. Scott: I think if you just wanted to say that you think fours one of the - I think just telling us that that's one that requires some, if you believe in your

personal opinion, some extra special consideration. Because it is one that you voted difficult...

Subbiah Yes.

J. Scott: It's not and I would ask if we just look them over and let's move to the next report.

Subbiah Okay. Good. Okay, sure.

People take a look and make an active debate and I guess our team will try to work to modify changes and put them in as we go along.
Thank you.

J. Scott: All right. Who is C. Is that (Cheryl)?

Man: Ah, yeah. (Cheryl) and (Zack).

Woman: It's (Caroline) and (Zack), sorry.

Man: Oh, sorry.

J. Scott: Oh, I'm sorry (Caroline).

(Caroline): No problem.

J. Scott: All right.

Woman: I think we have some overlap there because we thought we were 6, 7 and eight per (Karen)'s notes and per my own notes from the last

meeting. So, it appears that we have overlapped with Subbiah who has also done six.

(Tim): Hello, this is (Tim). Actually it was 4, 5, 9 and 6, 7, 8.

Woman: Yeah. So we were 6, 7 and 8.

Man: That's what mine has, right?

J. Scott: So, it's nine that hasn't been looked at?

Woman: Yeah.

Man: Right, right. Yeah.

J. Scott: Okay. I would ask that we do that. But right now I think it's not a bad thing that we have two people looking at six. (Caroline), because that just gives us two different perspectives and brings in some of the diversity that we heard. There was a little concern that there wasn't a diversity of views or ideas.

So, if you would just quickly summarize what you all have come to, just really quickly, and I would ask everyone all these reports have been circulated to the list and review them so we can have a more robust discussion on the list and at our next call.

(Caroline): Okay. I'm back with our team (unintelligible) so (Zack) do you want to or should I do it?

(Zack): Yeah, I'd be happy to.

(Caroline): Okay.

(Zack): Yeah. We had a look at 6, 7 and 8. Everyone had a look at the report. We did this much of a report we made a couple of initial additions to the interim rules because there were a couple of points missing with regards to Point 6 in the appeals process. There's not really much to add to what Subbiahsaid except that the process should be transparent to the entire working team and that's all there for everybody to see. So, have a look at that during the week.

So Point 7 includes rules applicable to later comers and working groups. Not much was really said at all with regards to late comers. So, (Caroline) added a new paragraph and I agree with it for the whole part that is the chair has the power to accept late comers as participants. But they also require the new comers to review all previous documents and discussions and not reopen any previously closed matters.

I feel there also needs to be reiteration on submitting a statement of interest incase it gets bypassed for some reason in the third part of the team rules. But, again, that's up for discussion so thoughts on that would be, obviously, greatly appreciated.

And on Point 8, required disclosures and standardized statement of interest forms being on public review. That wasn't mentioned in the rules. So we've just added a statement there at the end saying all statements of interest will be made publicly available for review online and by email.

So, if anyone has any questions regarding or any ideas regarding to those please have a look and we can discuss it next week. But, that's pretty much everything that (Caroline) and I discussed during the week.

J. Scott: Great. (Kim)?

Man: May I? This is (unintelligible). Just got...

J. Scott: Yes?

(Bartrell): May I, just one question...There's something I'm not completely sure of. Am I right in understanding that the suggestion done by the group C has been added actually to the interim working rules?

J. Scott: Yeah.

(Caroline): Yes, we did. I don't know if we oversimplified the task some what but that's what we thought we had to, include any of the Points 1 to 9 and we had 6, 7, 8 and that didn't fall into the interim rules. And therefore we marked up the document and we just circulated it within the last half hour.

(Bartrell): Okay. So that means that the document that we're working on is actually the rules for the current work team?

(Caroline): Correct.

(Bartrell): Wow.

J. Scott: The rules that we are working on are the interim work team rule...

(Bartrell): For (unintelligible) group?

J. Scott: And they apply to (unintelligible).

(Bartrell): Wow.

(Caroline): But the...Excuse me. But the rules are changing or we're just using that as a base document to edit.

J. Scott: That's correct.

(Caroline): But the rules aren't actually changing in real time.

Woman: Right. We used it as a baseline.

(Caroline): Right.

Woman: I thought we were comparing the two documents and making...

J. Scott: That's correct. That is correct.

(Caroline): And I think (Bartrell) what you were concerned with was that the rules were changing in real time which I don't believe they are.

(Bartrell): No, it's not exactly that. It's - there's a methodological thing here which is starting from the interim rules that we have used for this work team as the basis instead of starting from the requirements of the, basically,

the board governance committee and trying to make things as clear and simple as possible.

My concern is the following; I'm catching up after having missed one, at least, of the previous calls. And one of the difficulties in the ICANN process is length of documents. The drafting mechanism always leads to very, very detailed additional specifications here and there.

What I can see is at the moment I looked again at the board recommendations on the notion of work groups and the nine elements. And what strikes me is that there would be a possibility to highlight the main elements that are contained in that. Otherwise we're going to paraphrase and basically reinsert the formulations that have already been written.

For instance, the first point that we will come to now - I understand that the fundamental notions it that the groups are open, period. Then we make qualifications. In terms of the writing the current methodology is leading naturally to very lengthy documents. This is just a concern. But now I understand better and I'll come back to that later.

Women:

One thing I would mention about using the interim rules is there what working groups are using at the moment and those are the things we're gaining experience on. But, I would agree with you that we certainly don't want the document or the guidelines to get longer and longer and longer.

But, there is something to be said, I hope, for trying to use what we're using and build on it as opposed to coming up with something new.

Man: Well, that was the whole point of this entire exercise (Bartrell) and I guess because you missed the call before is to ensure that the boards recommendations and their goal, that is expressed in their report, is captured in these interim rules and if it is not what adjustments need to be made to ensure that they are captured?

(Bartrell): Yeah, I agree but...

Man: That's what we're trying to do...

(Bartrell): Lets move forward. I'll come back to that on the list.

Man: Okay, (Tim)?

(Tim): Okay we were tasked with reviewing 1, 2 and 3. So, in regards to one where the board recommendations were in regards to it being open as (Bartrell) said, yet I would mention manageable size and expertise and skills so that the interim rules don't really get into anything about specific size. So, the group (unintelligible) there definitely needs to be delved into.

And that's - in regards to size the minimum size is just as important if not perhaps even more important than maximum size to make sure that any necessary or desired diversity that's needed for this particular work that's going to be done exists within the group. And that interests are covered or included within the group to (incorporate) interest (unintelligible) groups.

In regards to the expertise and skills and interests, again, not a lot is said really about that within the interim rules. It does mention the need

for completing a statement of interest. That needs to be expanded on. Perhaps a statement of interest could be used to include the skills or expertise that one might think they have in regards to that particular working group.

And also, perhaps looks at outsourcing in particular cases where it might be necessary to provide the balance that we need to be effective in the working group, or for the working group to be effective.

On Number 2, which was about the notification in making sure that there's a write of notification is possible about the working group to encourage participation. Again, the interim rules don't mention that. That would need to be included or delved into as we expand on those rules and also more about - as far as what languages those notifications might be made in, again, that was included in the board of governors recommendations. Perhaps in languages other than English.

Excuse me, and then in the third one was in regards to having a strong experience expected in neutral chair. Fair treatment, etc. Interesting to note that when we looked at the more detail around what the board of governance committee was recommending they actually recognized or suggested the possibility of professional facilitators or chairs to ensure neutrality and promote consensus.

That's something that we might want to look at but that's also to be sure that we don't miss or that we do focus to some extent on developing those skills internally so that we have a good group of chairs that we can draw from that are currently involved on a regular basis within ICANN's processors.

That's kind of a brief summary.

J. Scott: I think that's very good (Tim). Does anyone have a comment?

Okay...

Man: This is (unintelligible). Just one comment regarding the question of size and movement when working groups are being formed. If I look at the parallel work that is being done in the policy development process review I can imagine that actually in the course of the development of an analysis of a given issue the entities that will be dealing with the given issue will evolve. And in particular the question of size, I can't imagine that at first you can have two different situations. You can have one situation where an issue is addressed by a relatively small group for the initial fact finding and issue scoping.

And then this leads to a working group that will naturally expand provided that the first report is attracting more attention. And then as the process grows and actors are more numerous, maybe in the group, then the question that Subbiahwas addressing of the formation of smaller groups for drafting will come into play or you have the reverse. You have a group that starts very large at first with a lot of people participating and then dwindles a little bit more afterwards.

In any case, the question that I'm asking at the moment is in the current thinking what stage are we addressing because in the PDP there's the initiation then there will be the drafting of recommendation of regimes and then it goes to the validation afterwards.

But, I suppose that the working group is likely to have different shapes and different participations at the different stages.

For instance, and I'll finish with that, it can be very, very open at first and if it has attracted too many people at the discretion of the chair or the agreement of the group. The group can say we form a subgroup more limited to have a better balance of expertise and make sure all the views are represented. And this will basically feed back into the main group like when we have a mailing list with a lot of people watching what's happening and just a small group drafting.

If they're taken into account and do we integrate enough thinking the different stages we're talking about.

J. Scott: I think those are excellent points and I would appreciate it very much if you could put that in writing for the list so everyone can think about that as they go through and consider these.

My next suggestion is that, moving to the next point on the agenda, we need to know think about dividing into two separate teams; one that will continue to assign these thoughts and comments into something for the work world. But we also need to put together a team that puts together guidelines for drafting working charters. And both of these teams are merely going to be for generating ideas. They are not the team that is the ultimate decider of what goes into the report. That will be to the larger group, entire work team as a whole, and the entire list.

But, because we have - we're trying to have something presentable for consideration in Sydney, proving the workup, seems to be the most

efficient model and then bringing it back for full open discussion with the whole group.

So, that's what I would like to do. But before we do that I think we still need a little bit more robust discussion on these particular suggestions that have come forward today. So, I would suggest that we take the next two weeks and during that period we discuss the suggested work rules and revisions that have been presented today into three separate reports on the list and come back and have another discussion about them in two weeks time.

And then at that time if you would please identify during the next two weeks which of the two sub-working teams you would like to be a part of. Realizing, of course, that we're going to have to split up. It can't be two people doing charter guidelines and 17 people doing work rule.

And so I, as chair, will take the discretion of if you identify yourself as interested in something and it's unbalanced I am going to (conjole) members to move from one group to the other in order to keep it balanced. And the work balance so it doesn't fall all on the shoulders of one particular individual or a couple of individuals.

Subbiah This is (Sebia)...

(Tim): (Unintelligible) this is (Tim). Can I get in the queue.

J. Scott: Yes.

Man: Subbiah was first.

Subbiah Yeah, my question is...I mean, I work by example so I didn't quite understand your distinction between the two. The work group I understand it's about the kind of stuff we've been doing so far. In terms of charter what do you mean?

J. Scott: I'm talking about just - it would just be a guideline that a new group in sort of giving them a broad outline of how to go about drafting a charter.

(Liz): Hey (Scott) can I get in the queue? It's (Liz).

J. Scott: We have (Tim) and then we have (Liz). (Tim)?

(Tim): Yeah, my thought was on the charter group as well. That I can't think offhand exactly what the charter is for the policy process working team but there might be some overlap there potentially. I think we should look at that and if there is, at the very least, that group may want to liaison to some extent with the other work team. We can be sure that we stay in sync.

J. Scott: I tell you what I do. Since we're taking the next two weeks before we move to this step I will work with (Liz) and (Jeff) to ensure that nothing we're taking on is duplicative and if there is overlap that we do cross consolidation.

(Liz)?

(Liz): Yes, I commit to that too and what I was going to suggest is taking a look at, on the Wiki the draft work plan that tries to take all of the things that we've been talking about, items one through nine and divide it into

these two deliverables in the sense that (Jay Scott) is referring to, the working group model. And then a sort of template for a standard charter that could be used by the counsel to address the essential elements of each working group.

And I think you'll see how we could plug in the work that you've already done and into this way of dividing up the overall elements that we're trying to enhance here. And this is just a suggestion but I think it might help to make it clear sort of how the tasks before the group might be divided into these two deliverables.

Does everyone see that work plan on the Wiki? Those that have access right now?

J. Scott: Here's what I would suggest (Liz) is that by close of business Pacific Time tomorrow we get a brief summary of this call out. We put those points in that summary...

(Liz): Sure.

J. Scott: And then we take the next two weeks to do that. If (Lynn) could send out a (doodle) request for two weeks from today, but let's due Wednesday and Thursday of that week. (Cheryl) I'm remember your Saturdays here.

(Cheryl): Thank you dear.

J. Scott: So that we can get this next call scheduled. I will go ahead and send out an agenda at the end of next week so that if anybody wants to add any other business or refine it under - I'm just going to put broad

things. If they want to put small stuff, topics, under the broad topic we can do that.

I want to tell everyone how much I greatly appreciate the effort that have been put into this and the thought that has been put into it. And I am every encouraged that the group, as a whole, will take as much time to review the areas that they did not participate in and come back to our call in two weeks with points that they need clarification or alternative points or things for a robust discussion. And I appreciate everybody's time today but it's now been 45 minutes, 40 minutes of actual conversation and we need to use the list a bit more.

I'm not seeing some activity. So now you have something to talk about on the list. Take time to talk about it on the list. That's two things that happened; one, we have more time to put your thoughts down and review them and make sure they're organized and you're doing extemporaneous discussions on a telephone call.

Please make sure to reach out to those members of your communities that you are here to represent either formally or informally because you have shared ideas. To make sure they're aware of what we're doing and that they understand where we're coming from and can relay back to us any thoughts or comments they may have so we do have a robust discussion with different views.

So, with that I would like to bring this call to an end. I thank everybody very much for their time and effort and we will talk to you in about two weeks time.

(Lynn): Yeah, (Scott). Sorry, this is (Lynn) can you hear me?

J. Scott: Yes I can.

(Lynn): Two weeks time, Wednesday the 8th, is Passover.

J. Scott: Can we do...

(Lynn): Can we only do the Thursday 9th?

J. Scott: Can we do Tuesday and Wednesday?

Woman: You've got to be flexible. Of course, you've got to avoid...

J. Scott: Yeah. Why don't you pick something that week that doesn't fall within the Passover.

Woman: Well, the whole week is Passover.

Man: I'm wondering if it should be the following week actually.

((Crosstalk)).

J. Scott: Can we do it Monday the following week (Lynn)?

(Lynn): The following week will be the 15th of April. Will that be all right?

Woman: As long as it's early in the week, yeah.

(Lynn): Well on a Wednesday or a Thursday.

J. Scott: Let's do Tuesday or Wednesday that day.

(Lynn): Tuesday or Wednesday. Okay.

J. Scott: Okay?

(Lynn): Okay. Fourteenth or 15th, I'll do that. Thank you again (Scott).

J. Scott: All right. That gets up past Easter and Passover and I'm sorry, I don't know any Indy holidays during the time. I've got the (unintelligible) holiday covered.

Subbiah This is (Sebia). Not that it matters to me, I've already done my taxes, but I'll just let you know (unintelligible).

Woman: I've done my taxes too.

Subbiah Over Passover or taxes I can tell you (unintelligible).

J. Scott: Okay well then that's what we'll do (Lynn). If you'll send out the (doodle) request so everybody can do that and we can figure out when we're having that call so people can get their schedules together.

Again, I greatly appreciate it. Thank you for your time. Look this over, let's discuss it on the list so that we can move forward quickly.

Thank you.

Man: Okay.

END