

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

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT) meeting on Wednesday 12 May 2010 at 18:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:  
<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsc-wg-20100512.mp3>

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

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

Present:

J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair  
Avri Doria - NCSG  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC chair  
Jonne Soininen – Individual  
Iliya Bazlyankov (on Adobe Connect only)

Staff:

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

Absent apologies:

Caroline Greer

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

I would like to introduce your host. Today's call, we have Ms. Gisella Gruber-White. Ma'am you may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: J. Scott would you like to take a roll call?

J. Scott Evans: Yes, please.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. This is a PPSC Work Group call on Wednesday the 12th of May. We have J. Scott Evans, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Avri Doria, Jonne Soininen. From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Géry , myself, Gisella Gruber-White. I have apologies from Iliya Bazlyankov. If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you.

Over to you J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Hello. This is J. Scott Evans, Chair. Goal today is to make it through Section 3 of the draft and to address the comment - the public comments we received during the public comment period.

So Marika could you take us to Section B.1?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. What is up now is basically the comments have been made from work team participants sort of for us and from (Tim) and the second one from Avri. And below that, you see the actual text of the report in relation to that issue. And at the bottom of that, the comments that were submitted.

So do you prefer to go to the actual report and see that? Or would you like...

J. Scott Evans: No this - I just didn't see it because participation was buried in the text. But I see 3.1 participation in the middle of the note.

Marika Konings: And then you should be able to scroll down on the right-hand side.

J. Scott Evans: I see it. Okay. So it seems from the comment and from (Tim)'s comment as well, and from Avri's comment, that the word quorum -- because it is related to voting -- is raising some concern. That seems to be my gist of the comment.

So taking that into account, the - what do you all think would be a resolution to this issue?

Avri says that she's a bit confer - wishes we haven't - we didn't use that word.

Avri Doria: Hello. Yes. Hello. This is Avri. Had to turn on my mic, because I'm eating dinner in the background. Yes. And I'm not sure what word to use. It's just that quorum is definitely linked to voting. And it's something that we've - it's really hard to get away from all these voting-oriented words. But...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: And as I said, we've done this meeting when we've only had, you know, two, three people. And we've have good meetings. And as long as there's a notion that nothing - I mean, I kind of believe, in a sense, that nothing is ever done in one meeting. It's basically it's talked about and that in one meeting. It's chewed on, on the email list in between meetings. And then at the next meeting or sometime afterward, okay, are we still okay with that kind of notion that really gets it.

So quorum is not even significant. And I think you can have a really good and valuable work meeting, and we have with just a few people. So I don't know.

J. Scott Evans: So why just change forum? Say every meeting - to start every meeting - assessment at the start of every meeting whether a sufficient number of working group members are present...

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...just be with the meeting and discussion.

Avri Doria: Works for me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine. Cheryl here. I'm out of the Adobe room. Someone has got to let me back in.

Marika Konings: Cheryl I don't see you waving, so you might need to re-log in. I don't have you. You're in the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've got to, "This is a private meeting. Your request to enter is be sent to presenter." So...

Marika Konings: Who...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go through...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's just that, yes J.. I think those words are fine.

J. Scott Evans: I mean, I'm - that's what...

Jonne Soininen: Is this your analysis? That's really good. I think that sounds good.

J. Scott Evans: That's what we meant when we said quorum, right. We meant a sufficient number of people. We didn't mean a voting number. We just meant a sufficient number of people to have a discussion.

So if you're having a discussion and 20 people are there, but they're all registries, that's a sufficient number.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That seems sufficient. Good point. Can you all...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) remove then the second part? So then the quorum definition, do you want to take that sentence out then?

J. Scott Evans: No. I think a sufficient number has not been defined in exact numbers.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Or a sufficiency has not been defined in the exact number -- something like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: J. Scott, without the text in front of me, it may be dealt with later. But I also wondered if this is the point that we should also say that the names of who is attending need to be recorded for the public record, because it's a way of showing that it isn't half-a-dozen registries or just half-a-dozen consumer interest people; that there is blend and mix of the work group required, if that was the case.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. That would - I don't...

Marika on second thought, I think a sufficiency will cause confusion in that second sentence. So I think we're going to have to say a sufficient number has not been defined in exact numbers in this context of this (unintelligible) blah, blah, blah. (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Okay. And as you'll see, I changed as well in the bottom part, where there was as well quorum. I've changed it there as well to a sufficient number of working group members.

Woman: Good.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Then we might want to add a sentence at the end of that to address Cheryl's concerns.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Even if the roll call is only as we do it in a recorded state...

J. Scott Evans: Just say...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...we're not defining that it is going to be recorded or that it is going to be face-to-face. We just need to say that a record is taken of the attendees at any given work group, basically.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Is everybody comfortable with that? I see Avri is. And I think Cheryl is, because I've heard her. And as Jonne has said, he is as well. So let's move on.

Jonne Soininen: Yes. I am. But I don't know how do use these complicated tools.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Next to the little man waiving. Drop-down menu.

Jonne Soininen: I know. I just didn't find it in time.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Let's go on to the next. That's it with this one. That's all I can...

So next note. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, perfectly led.

Avri Doria: All right. This is Avri. Do I need to speak on that one? No. (Subia) - oh. But (Subia) is not here. So (Subia)'s comment is before mine.

J. Scott Evans: I mean, I don't - the only thing - I mean, it - I guess they're just wanting somebody to affirmably state. We say what you do if there is a problem. It looks to me like what they're wanting is some sort of affirmation back to the charting organization that the Chair is of the opinion that it's sufficiently represented.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I would think that the absence of a report that it wasn't representative should do; otherwise, we'll be sending a report every week -- we had a good meeting; it was representative.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I don't think it's every meeting. I think it's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: At the beginning of the work group?

J. Scott Evans: ...at the beginning of the work group.

Avri Doria: Oh yes. And perhaps - this is Avri again. I mean, the GNSO Council requires every group to give a few words of really, you know, three weeks as a status into the working group. So I mean, I think that that can certainly be included as part of the reported status. But then again...

J. Scott Evans: I find...

Avri Doria: ...do we need to give a list of everything they need to include in their week - in their monthly status? I...

J. Scott Evans: I think that all we need to do here is address this by making Avri's comment back. We left the language as it is because we believe (unintelligible) ask the (reporting) organization that it's not representative is in a - if by implication, a statement that it's representative.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If it's a - Cheryl here. If it's only at commencement, that's fine. We all know that, you know, very few people join and three do the work.

A requirement on the Chair, that part of their role is to ensure representational consistency throughout the work group process may be something worthy of having as a trigger point, so that if it changes, as it very well could do throughout the life of a work group, the Chair does need to get

back to the chartering organization to say in some fairly minor, but nevertheless formal mechanism, to say that there is - or is suddenly a lack of representation, or an over representation has occurred.

J. Scott Evans: Well the way to do that then, I think, everyone, is if you look at the second sentence. If between, "Is" and, "Expected" after. "ICANN staff, comma..."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...if we...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Insert continually expected...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...to assess whether the working (unintelligible) is sufficient by represented. If not...So that's a continuing obligation we've now placed on them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: And then if that - the Chair believes that it hasn't continued to fulfill that criterion, they're...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's a trigger point.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Trigger points are important. Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Does - do you think Avri? She's on mute.



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it - give her a second.

Avri Doria: Yes, yes, yes. That sounds cool.

J. Scott Evans: I mean, I think that solves the problem. And I think then we going (unintelligible) answers when does this obligation arrive. And the reality is the opposition - the obligation is continual.

Avri Doria: Yes. Good.

J. Scott Evans: And then secondly, we address this by saying that we believe that the absence of a report that there's under representation or, you know, is an affirmative statement that it's fine.

So I don't know to word that Marika. But that's what we want to say.

Marika Konings: A work - that a work group works on the assumption that representativeness is balanced and as required by the chartering organization, continual disclosure, assuming that affect is expected. And something along those lines.

J. Scott Evans: I don't know if I want to get into that much detail. That's just more words we've got to deal with. More words...

Marika Konings: True, true.

J. Scott Evans: ...and we're going to have to hear exactly how those words don't accomplish what we think they do.

Marika Konings: True. Okay.

J. Scott Evans: I just think we say that we believe the section is drafted; sufficiently handles their concerns.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: With the addition of continually.

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Next?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm impressed with this level of efficiency Marika. This - I've hadn't had to touch the keyboard.

J. Scott Evans: I'm all about that. This is making us move so much faster.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh. I'm - I could have coffee.

J. Scott Evans: (Office) integrity. Working groups are encouraged to focus and tailor their work ethic to achieve the identified (goals) of the charter, blah, blah, blah.

GoDaddy says, "In the paragraph sent to me, the document discusses the re-opening of the deliberations once it's been closed."

Okay. This all has to do with this - when is something put to bed?

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: And believe that - and I - that this is continually abused. And I think Avri has a pretty strong opinion on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: Sort of. Yes. I mean, I - this is Avri again. I definitely believe that we have to avoid constant re-openings. However, as I said, we shouldn't make a religion out of it. It's if - certainly it's good to put in the note there that, you know, in

613 - and pardon my illiteracy in running these things. But you guys are probably all used to my illiteracy by now.

But that if somebody obviously comes back after a long bounce, sure. And maybe we should add a newbie plus somebody coming back after a long absence in 613. That, you know, seems like an easy thing to add for his condition.

I think that it's a Chair's thing. I mean, it's - I kind of look for guidelines to be guidelines in people that do it. And when something comes up, the Chair says -- yes, yes; we covered that; go read this; go read that; you know, reminder to somebody that's coming back; you know, you should touch up with your reading and your listening.

And for the Chair to be in a position to sort of say -- yes, yes; that was covered; and these were the following conditions; and this was done. And spend a minute going over, re-explaining, because people can forget. Even people that pay attention. You know? Some of us being older and dizzy, we forget.

So if somebody has enough - oh, yes, yes, yes, yes...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...as opposed to -- that was closed; we're not talking anymore; that's final; you know, go away; we are enforcing this. And - but, you know, certainly.

And we always have to be open for the new revelation, the changed fact, the something that the people who were so myopic earlier didn't see. So that's why I think the strictness can't be there. You always have to be willing to take a quick look, make the 1 to 10-minute detour, and then come back and say -- no; this is not anything new; you know, go back and do your homework. So that's it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've been standing and applauding, but a little green (unintelligible) will do me.

J. Scott Evans: You want to put something here at - by this new information that has been introduced period. And then put a sentence that refers to -- if the re-opening is received as - of an issue is perceived as dilatory or abusive, a working member can go to the Chair. I mean, I'm just - and can bring this point to the - I mean, that seems to me what they're worried about, right.

They're worried that somebody keeps coming back and bringing up new stuff after everyone's settled. They keep stirring the pot. And so nothing ever moves forward.

The only time I've seen what we would want to stop that is if it's actually being done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Week in, week out, being abusive. Okay.

Avri Doria: Right. this is Avri again. I think - I mean, I think we already rules in here that, you know, if people behave badly, there are remedies. I think, you know...

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...certainly, if you want to add something that, you know, repetitive abuse of this, like any other rule, gets your hand slapped.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Why don't we say -- if the re-opening of issues perceived as abusive or dilatory, a working group member can...And then -- appeal to the Chair. And then cross-reference down to the session that's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's it. That's neater, yes.

J. Scott Evans: And then we just cross-reference to the session.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes.

J. Scott Evans: The behavior, if you believe there's abusive behavior, here's what you do. I mean, I think that's about all we can do. I mean, we have said that it requires new information. So...

I mean, I got to tell you, I have dealt with someone in the IPC that 3.3 makes you pull out your hair. They don't show up to half of anything. And then they're happy with the outcome. They're always having to go back and spin and argue about stuff.

And then when you ask them to come up with a solution, you never get a solution. You know? You never get - you say, "Okay. I get your point. Next meeting please come up with your thoughts." They don't show up. Two meetings...

Woman: Exactly.

J. Scott Evans: ...(unintelligible) show up. And they're like -- well...

So finally, as Chair, a couple of times I've just said, "You're done. You're finished. We're not doing this anymore." You know? And I'm not very well liked, but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hey, you don't have to be. And as a Chair, you're not out there to get, you know...

J. Scott Evans: Not out there making friends.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly.

J. Scott Evans: I think what this does is it just says that it can be perceived for abuse. And, you know, and I think Marika, in our comment back, you know, our little bubble that we've been doing, we would put a bubble that says, you know, "Guidance is give - we believe guidance is already given, because it talked - it refers to in light of new information."

And it also refers back that if this is perceived as abusive or dilatory, members have the option of going through the process in section blah, blah, blah.

So what do you all think?

Woman: Good.

J. Scott Evans: And then - I mean, I think we have to address back to GoDaddy why we didn't give the - what they want. Like why we didn't say -- an issue will be closed when the - on the third day after...You know? Because I think that's what he's looking for. Am I wrong?

I think he's looking on some sort of formal pronouncement that it's closed and we'll never go back to it. (Unintelligible) recovery, that's problematic.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Jonne this - are you comfortable with this?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Jonne? You on mute? Is this...

Avri Doria: Yes. I'm trying - I get - yes. I had to - not only did I have to turn on mute, but I wasn't quite sure what dilatory went, so I had to go look it up. And yes, I agree.

And trying to waste time and lag behind, yes, yes, yes. We don't want any dilatory people.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I have the same problem. So I'm actually wondering -- did I even spell it right?

J. Scott Evans: D-I-L-I-A-T-O-R-Y. Just one L.

Avri Doria: No. Not I-A. D-I-L - yes, you're right, I-A.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: No. No I-A. D-I-L-A-T-O-R-Y, dilatory. (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: It means to be in a pattern of delay.

Avri Doria: Right. Or they'll use close - cautious, slow strategy to wear down opposition; avoiding direct confrontation.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Let's move on.

Jonne Soininen: Yes. Now that I found my mute button, it seems even the phone is too - more - way too complex for me today. So yes. I thought of every...

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, that's cute.

J. Scott Evans: We can move on Marika.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh dear.

J. Scott Evans: You know, this is again one that sort of speak to, I think, the same thing GoDaddy is concerned about.

I mean, I personally don't have a problem with Mike O'Connor's redrafted language. But I'm just the Chair.

Jonne Soininen: This is Jonne. I think that he (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Hello?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm still here. Yes?

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I'm here too.

((Crosstalk))

Jonne Soininen: So this (unintelligible) pretty good.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I think - Jonne would you put something in the chat room, because you're - there's such an echo we didn't hear what you had to say?

Okay. He said, "Okay." All right. So he likes Mike's language.

Anybody else have an objection to it? That's the - he wants to replace where the alternative members are expected to participate, basically, the work group's process.

For example, attending meetings, providing input, monitoring discussions and should formally withdraw if they can no longer (unintelligible)...

Woman: Yes.



J. Scott Evans: ...fits their expectation. Working group members can request a review by the Chair if a member disrupts the work or decision making of the group as a result of an inconsistent participation.

Avri Doria: Hey, this is Avri. I have my standard objection; that although this is borderline on it, that sort of participate faithfully is equivalent to attending provide - that the providing input...Although, he does say, "Monitoring discussion." So if you just put an or before the, "Monitoring discussions" I'm fine with it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Let's not make it a mandatory checklist that, you know, if...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...12 out of 15 of the following events have to be done type stuff, yes.

Avri Doria: Right. In fact, I would have probably put instead of a, "For example," I would have put an inter alia -- including, but not limited to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nothing wrong with that either.

J. Scott Evans: But GoDaddy's, I'm a little confused, because they're interpreting, "Chair" in this paragraph as Chair of the GNSO. But that's not who it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

J. Scott Evans: It's Chair of the working group. And then the liaisons. And then to the Chair of the chartering organization. So are - they're saying that it should be - we should put in another step?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Anything, I think they're misunderstand...

Avri Doria: I think they got it wrong. Yes. I think because it says, "And if unsatisfactory, resolve to the Chair of the chartering..."

J. Scott Evans: Yes. But he says, "Establishes the GNSO Council's escalation contact." So maybe they do get it right, because that's where it escalates, because first...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. What - but I understand what you're saying. Instead of going to straight to the Chair of the GNSO. I think they're suggesting that the Chair or the Council liaison of the working group that actually goes to the representative of the stakeholder group, or constituency, or the Vice Chairs.

I think they're trying to build in another step and I'm not really sure why. Maybe to avoid overload of the Chair. Or address it first at a lower level before going to the Chair. That's how I understand the comment.

Avri Doria: I would think that this is still fine. I think that because between the liaison and the Chair - I mean, in a sense they're right. There are many other options that one could take.

And one would expect that a - I mean, unless some chartering organization decides that one of my Co-Chairs is a disciplinarian and always go to, you know, this Vice Chair for anything. Then have to do an appeal. And then that's fine. But that's still going to the Chair.

And the Chair should be able to say -- oh; and listen, you know, have you checked with their, you know, stakeholder group Chair; have you checked with their AC Chair; have they - have you...

But you can't put all those possible varieties through. And that's why the Chair is sort of a funneling point and it's just, you know, the easier now. Maybe somewhere in the beginning of the work, we want to define, you know, the Chair as - because we're being general about chartering organizations.

By Chair we mean Chair, or Vice Chairs, or any of those, or the leadership of the chartering organization, so that it's - so that is more flexible.

But to trying in each instance put something specific would be difficult.

J. Scott Evans: How about this -- and if unsatisfactorily resolved to the Chair of the chartering organization, or his or her designated representative?

Avri Doria: That will be fine. Do you want to put that in everywhere, where we say something goes to the Chair of the chartering organization?

J. Scott Evans: Let's look at it but...

Avri Doria: Okay. You may want to go the beginning at - of the net where - of the thing where we talk about Chairs and stuff. And just say -- for every use of Chair we need...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do we have to have the his or her? Can't we just be -- their designated representative?

J. Scott Evans: Yes, sure.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: It's incorrect but we can do it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know it's incorrect. But I, you know, less words is, you know...

Well maybe we're going to get in there - no. I won't go down that path, right, till we're face-to-face...

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...Avri.

Avri Doria: We can use that...

J. Scott Evans: So Marika would you make a note to check for consistency on with whenever we appeal something, the Chair of the chartering organization, we add the phrase -- or their designated representative?

Marika Konings: Yes, I can check for that.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. Does that solve - does that look okay? We're going to amend it. So we're going to amend this...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...ask Marika to be identical to Mike's language, with the exception of an or between. "Input" and, "Monitoring" in the parenthetical. And then we're going to add the phrase -- or their designated representative -- in the first sentence after, "Chartering organization."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I ask - sorry to be difficult. But in a situation where work group is put out by - if the chartering organization is, for example, by resolution of the Board, should we look at terms like -- all the delegated authority -- as opposed to the designated representative?

J. Scott Evans: Well, it seems to me that the Chair of a chartering organization -- if that turns to be the Chair of our Board -- could say to designate whoever they want you to. You go to them and they would send you to someone else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure. Okay. So you're happy that designated representative is definitive enough, as opposed to delegated authority. That's all. I just had a flashback to local government days, and it was (unintelligible)...

J. Scott Evans: I think designated representative is better because it...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. That's fine.

J. Scott Evans: ...allows the Chair to appoint someone, rather than get into the argument of whether they're - have authority.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, okay.

J. Scott Evans: Use words, like authority, people are going to say -- well they don't have the authority; they may be, you know. I've represented...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. But there's a formal call to empower some individual with delegated authority. That's probably getting a little bit too...

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I think I'll just sit right there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good. (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: That's my thought. Anybody else agree or disagree? And no, we're not going to use hear. Thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: What is he up to?

J. Scott Evans: Does - she's seen that little crappy stuff down in the comments. All right. Just on to Note 12. Hear.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well (George), spell check is mad.

J. Scott Evans: Now this, in my opinion, is just - is wicked of all. So I want to hear from you guys.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. And I should probably - I definitely agreed with the last point. I wasn't drinking yet. But our last point about facilitate. And yes, there are better words than that.

Instead of unanimous consensus, that is a tongueful, full consensus does work. I think we have to use something there, especially in ICANN, because consensus means so many thing. We've overloaded the poor word. And there's just so many different meanings of what it is, so we have to give it a modifier.

Now if unanimous is really too much of mouthful, unanimous consensus, full consensus works just as well.

To differentiate between rough consensus and strong support but significant opposition, perhaps, you know, we need to define rough consensus using similar words to strong support and significant opposition. And so what I was really saying is that rough consensus is really very, very strong support, but minimal. But not in - that was not an S. That was a O, which - but minimal opposition.

And that's really the difference between the two; is when you've got rough consensus, you've got near unanimity and there's just one or two. You know?

In fact, I was in a meeting today when somebody defined rough consensus. And since we're on Chatham House Rules, I won't say who it was. But I'm allowed to say that it was. Rough consensus; when everybody agrees, except for the flakes.

J. Scott Evans: Why don't we do this? Why don't we say -- full consensus, hyphen, a position where no minority disagree? Then take rough consensus and make it consensus.

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: And then leave the modifier -- a position where a small minority disagrees, but most agree. And then could say - we could change the third one to -- no consensus, but strong support for one position but with significant opposition; strong support for a common position. And then we could do - leave it -- no consensus. Or we could just say...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I like divergent positions, to be...

J. Scott Evans: I'm fine with that too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...because it doesn't give some value...

J. Scott Evans: That we don't say no consensus on the last one. We say -- divergent positions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Avri? No, no, no, no, no. No, no Marika. Hold on a second. No...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...a point for a common position...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...but significant opposition. And then the last bullet being -- divergent positions. Now Avri.

Avri Doria: Now Avri. Well the consensus, while in some sense it bothers me, but in another sense it really is what we mean in ICANN.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: That is the ICANN notion of consensus.

J. Scott Evans: Why don't we just - that what are they saying...

Avri Doria: Yes. No consensus. What does it add to say no consensus but strong support, as opposed to just say strong support?

J. Scott Evans: Well because they get in this whole thing about, well, strong support seems to indicate something different. So if we just say no consensus, which means we just define it different. And no consensus for the strong support for a common position. And here's that position, but there's significant...

So I see that as like a 48% against, 52% for, if you were going to percentage it out.

Avri Doria: I wouldn't percentage it.

J. Scott Evans: Oh, I'm not going to put it in the document. I'm talking about...

Avri Doria: I understand, because that all of a sudden opens up a whole new kettle of worms. Full consensus, consensus, no consensus, divergence.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Divergence as opposed to divergent positions. It's just a sound equivalent. But yes, I can live with it.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. And maybe we could have...

Woman: (Unintelligible).



J. Scott Evans: ...divergent positions, the dash or hyphen, no significant support for a common position -- leave it at that. Meaning that there is no significant support for one position, because if they're submitting support for - and why don't we change strong to significant support? Or we just use the same term Or we could change no strong support for a common position. Either way.

What do you all want to do? I just think we need to use the both term - same term in both...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Strong - viciously strong, that's we've already had in there. That's what they're used to seeing.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I have a question in relation to common positions, because if you say no consensus but strong support for a common position, common position to me implies that there is a common position, or that it's supported by all. That confused me a bit.

J. Scott Evans: Or a position for one position for a (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Specific.

J. Scott Evans: ...position.

Avri Doria: Specific?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Why don't we say position/solution, because it's not always a position? Sometimes it's a solution.

Marika Konings: Well what we use in most of the working groups now is recommendation...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...because in the end, it's not, you know, they're not proposing solutions but a recommendation for consideration.

J. Scott Evans: Then let's say recommendation.

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Hey, would everybody just debate...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Good.

J. Scott Evans: Then you would - yes. That seem to do it?

Marika Konings: Next?

J. Scott Evans: I mean, the reality is I - in my personal - I'm speaking as my - any label you put is going to have detractors. But there's no way to make everyone happy.

I think we've addressed the concerns that I saw repeated; was that they believe that strong seemed more forceful than rough. And they were concerned that it would seem like it was - it required more not less. So we've taken out that modifier, with regards to labels we used. And explaining what the label means, but not as the label.

I see Cheryl's got a green. How about you Jonne?

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Technical - technically...

J. Scott Evans: I think he's watching (Steve). And I'm not going to say anything.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's the fact somebody - anyone who agrees, this is scary.

J. Scott Evans: Avri said she could live with it.

Avri Doria: Yes. I already gave up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Very good.

Avri Doria: I still think divergence is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) so grateful, I didn't even...(Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Sorry. I still like divergence better than divergent positions, but I...

J. Scott Evans: We can say divergence. I'm fine with that. It seems to me to be grammatically more close to what we've used prior...

Avri Doria: Yes. That's why I like it.

J. Scott Evans: You want to say divergence? I don't have a problem. So it's full consensus, consensus, no consensus, divergence.

Avri Doria: Yes, that works. Happy.

J. Scott Evans: How is that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Made no difference to my cheek.

J. Scott Evans: Well basically, it just - it makes it grammatically correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. But you never ask me about grammar. I'm an Australian. We don't understand those things.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Let's move on.

Woman: We've all got wonderful attitudes tonight.

J. Scott Evans: I'm not going to be sucked in into any deals (unintelligible). I've had it. As an American, I think I should steer clear of that. All right. Let's go to Note 13.

Marika Konings: I just got there was some other comments in relation to appeals process are also part of this...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Who is it? I have to scroll down.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought we picked up on - that's what I was doing; scrolling down to make sure we picked up on...

Marika Konings: The registry, for example, say, "While Paragraph 3.6 Notes the facilitative role of the liaison in the case where there's disagreement on a support designation, the same function not foreseen in appeal process about when the Paragraph 3.7 - it should be included as an interim step"

And also in the GoDaddy comment, there's also the second or third step of the appeals process are unclear and require additional definition. Many scenarios are not compared.

For example, what if the Chair and liaison do not agree on the level of consent achieved?

And should GNSO Chair expect to resolve these differences as well, or refer these to the Council as a whole?

J. Scott Evans: So our first thing is you as a working group member disagree, you go to the Chair of the working group, opting the working group explain why you believe it's in error.

If the Chair disagrees - we say, "Still disagrees." So maybe what we should say is -- if the Chair disagrees with the complaining member, they will forward the appeal to the chartering organization liaison. The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainant. The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainant and to the liaison.

I kind of see what they're saying here. It looks like we keep making the affirmative obligation to further the appeal on the decision makers. Is that the way we want to do it?

Like, example, Cheryl is the working group Chair. Jonne goes to her and he says -- I disagree that there was consensus. And we say, I notice here in the (Sheppo) language under, "If rough consensus, strong support, no consensus." We need to change that sentence to look at if - so let's go - after "divergence" we need to change "rough consensus" to "consensus" - if consensus, no consensus or divergence...

I would - I - no just - I would just put -- no consensus. Okay. No consensus for strong support, or divergence -- either way. Is a (unintelligible). And is to facilitate is encouraged to - why don't we just - why don't we change that to the working group Chair should encourage the submission of minority viewpoints? And then our state and recorder take that out.

Just if it's a - so we say it - we say that it's not just one person. We said, "If several participants disagree." So in two, it should say -- if the Chair disagrees with the complaint or the complainant -- one of the - one way or the

other, okay. Chair forward appeal to the CO liaison. Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainant and the liaison.

If the liaison supports the Chair's position, comma - so do we want it - make it the - then the liaison's obligation? The liaison shall forward - will. Will is fine. Appeal to the (unintelligible).

Liaisons must explain their reasoning in the response to the complainant.

Okay. See, I think this is where we've messed up, because I don't - if the Chair - if the liaison and the Chair agree, then the liaison should just explain the reasoning in the response to the complainant.

If the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Leave off escalate.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Not escalate.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct. That's where I think we've not made it clear.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. That - okay. So the Chair disagrees with the complainant, the Chair will forward an appeal to the COs. So again, is it the - if the Chair disagrees with the complainant, we probably should at that point have it escalated up to the liaison to get one person removed from the fray.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Forward it to the liaison. The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainant and in a submission to the liaison.

(Unintelligible) that Marika?

Marika Konings: Sorry. I'm not sure where you are.

J. Scott Evans: I'm in the second (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: First sentence - or second sentence, Number 2.

J. Scott Evans: The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainant and in the submission to the liaison. If the liaison supports the Chair's position, they will forward - I think this, when we change it up, we get rid of that, "Will forward to the CO."

Marika Konings: Oh. Oh, but now don't get rid of it just yet. If they support the Chair's position, then it goes back to the complainant.

J. Scott Evans: That's right. The liaison will...

Marika Konings: And we just...

J. Scott Evans: The liaison will forward the (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right. And then it just goes back to complainant. If the liaison and the Chair disagree, then the liaison will forward the appeal to the chartering organization.

J. Scott Evans: That's right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So we need to add in, not take anything away. That was Cheryl for the record.

J. Scott Evans: I - okay. If the liaison supports the Chair's position, liaison will provide...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...complainants. The liaison must explain the reasoning in the response. If the liaison disagrees with the Chair, liaison will forward the appeal to the CO.

Jonne Soininen: This is Jonne. Can I ask a stupid question? Don't we have appeals process for this? Are - if there's kind of like disagreement about the consensus, you go through the appeals process, and not the...

J. Scott Evans: Well that's - this is the...

Jonne Soininen: ...we just refine everything again here.

J. Scott Evans: This is an appeals process that's a little bit different. We have an appeals process that has to do with behavior.

Jonne Soininen: Oh, right, yes. We have many appeals processes now, don't we?

Avri Doria: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And with an open group, you need them.

Jonne Soininen: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because this can all happen outside of the formal thesis of the work group, so it doesn't necessarily slow the flow.

J. Scott Evans: If the liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the chartering organization. Yes. I think we can take out that last sentence, because we've said it twice already. We've said that each time there has to be an explanation.

Marika Konings: So if you've just got one, you want us to take it out? I'm sorry.



J. Scott Evans: That last sentence that says, "Liaisons and Chair must explain their reasoning in the response." We've already said that.

Marika Konings: So just take out the whole sentence?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. But I think what we need to do is - should we put in too, in Paragraph 2, a last sentence that says -- should the complainant continue to - should the complainants disagree with the liaison's support of the Chair's determination, the complainants may appeal to the Chair of the CO or its designated representative? That work?

So you got the Chair disagrees with the complainant, then the Chair automatically sends it to the chartering organization liaison. The Chair has to explain his reasoning back to the complainant, and also when they submit it to the liaison.

If the liaison supports the position of the Chair, they provide a response to complainant, and must explain the reasoning in the response.

If this liaison disagrees with the Chair, they immediately send it to the CO.

And if the complainants disagree with the liaison support of the Chair's determination, complainants can go to the CO.

And I would just take out C. I would eliminate that introductory prepositional phrase.

Marika Konings: Which one?

J. Scott Evans: Three. We say, "If the CO supports the Chair and liaison's position, attach the segment of the appeal.

Marika Konings: You want to take a whole sentence out?

J. Scott Evans: Well, I mean...I guess we should - oh. I'm sorry. Now I understand it. It's the chartering organization; if they support...

The only problem with that introductory prepositional phrase, it says, "If the chartering organization supports the Chair and liaison's position." But what if the liaison's - what if they're - what if the liaison's position is they disagree with the Chair? We don't answer that do we?

So we say - I mean, I'm just trying - I hate to be so difficult. But we say, "If the Chair disagrees with the complainant, then the Chair will forward the appeal to this liaison, and they must explain both to the complainant and the liaison their reasoning."

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: "If the liaison supports the Chair, the liaison will provide the response to the complainant."

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: "Liaison must explain their reasonings in response." So it goes back to if we agree there's consensus, or we agree with whatever labels been put on there...

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: If the liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the chartering organization. Should the complainant disagree with the liaison's support of the Chair's determination, the complainant may appeal to the Chair that - of the CO or their designated representative.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just the word directly?

J. Scott Evans: You can put directly. I mean, I'm...

If the CO - what - so let's - you have to sort of matrix these out. So the - in the first scenario, Chair says to the complainant -- no, I think I'm correct. They send it to the liaison. The liaison says -- look it over; I agree with the Chair; the original label is correct. So at that point, they tell - they explain that to the complainant. And the complainants can go forward.

So that's what that prepositional phrase says. It says, "If the chartering organization supports the Chair and liaison's position," that's when everybody lines up. All three agree. Then you have to attach a statement to the Board.

Woman: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: But what we don't cover is what happens if the Chair (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It doesn't line up.

J. Scott Evans: ...with the complainant, the liaison disagrees with the Chair, and it goes up to the Board, so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl here. Is it possible for our three to say that regardless of who agrees with whom, we should attach a note regarding an appeal that's happened during a work group activity to the Board report?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I think that's a better way to go about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that way the chartering organization is saying that -- this work group had this, this and this; oh, and this happened, and this happened and this happened to the Appendix. That's more transparent.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And the - so it should say -- in the event of any appeal...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...comma...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The COs have to catch it.

J. Scott Evans: ...the COs will attach a statement...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So it doesn't matter whether they support the Chair and liaison of the work group or not.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If it's gone out of the work group and to the chartering organization, the chartering organization confesses about it.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I do have a question, because there's only a Board report if there are recommendations for consensus policies. So are you saying that if...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But that's doing the report.

Marika Konings: ...there's no Board report, then there's no need to attach the appeal? Or should that also be included in the working group report?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: After you just take out the word Board and say reports.

Marika Konings: Should we maybe say -- working group; or and/or Board report? Can we...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. All right. (Unintelligible), yes.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And then I would move that second sentence to the end of two, beginning, "If the CO does not..."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That closes - yes. That closes that process off better.

J. Scott Evans: Put that up there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: So if this chartering organization does not...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perfect.

J. Scott Evans: And rather than saying the Chair and liaison's position, why don't we say -- if this chartering organization agrees with the complainant's position, because that's really what they're doing, right? You're agreeing with the complainant.

And the reason I want to go back to the complainant is because there is a situation (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Everything else's language that was...

J. Scott Evans: ...on cannot agree. So I would just say if the CO agrees with the complainant position...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: ...comma, the CO should recommend a remedial action. And take out -- does not support Chair and liaison's position. And I'm only doing that because there are times that the Chair and the liaison may disagree. (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that's one language you can - that language...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: And however it gets to that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Then they're going to recommend to the Chair remedial action.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Meaning, if they find that the complainant are correct, that the original label, there's not enough support for that, they go back to the Chair of the working group.

Now we had a lot of noise in the comments about this optional requirement for the names associated with position.

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So what are people saying? Think. I mean, if all of the calls are recorded and everything is public anyway...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if you are a minority view, you tend to want to make sure that you - your name is associated with that minority view, or would complain.

J. Scott Evans: It was GoDaddy. I think it had a lot to say about that. Wasn't it? Was it GoDaddy?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: You take that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ICANN commitment to (unintelligible) transparency would prohibit any degree of anonymous participation in working groups. If are any privacy concerns, then the GNSO Council should consider providing a privacy waiver as part of the call for volunteers as requirement for participation -- what they said.

Avri Doria: Yes. So we're not still on the one in front of us now? I'm getting confused.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're on the one in front of us. But right at the end of the comment, GoDaddy -- the very last sentence -- raised - or the last two sentences.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Down, down, down.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Much scrolling to be done.

Avri Doria: Much scrolling. Oh, the listing participant's names.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: No way. No how.

J. Scott Evans: Why don't we just take out that, "Optional?" It says, "May request." And it's just if the participants that request. Take that out; the word, "Optional." It actually is optional, because participants may request. Doesn't say shall or will be. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. J. Scott which bit are you taking out under three?

J. Scott Evans: Parenthetical at the end of that that said, "Optional."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, okay.

Avri Doria: So I guess we're agreeing with GoDaddy in this case, is that correct?

J. Scott Evans: Oh no. But if you read the statement itself without the parenthetical, it's optional, because after the comment says, "Participants may request that their names be associated explicitly with each view/position."

So if I'm a working group participant and I put in something, it looks like I have to request that my name be associated explicitly with the view or position.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: See I would have it the opposite. I would say that working group participants will have their names associated explicitly with each view or position, unless requested otherwise.

J. Scott Evans: I'm fine with that.

Avri Doria: Why would we even allow them to request otherwise?

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Let's...

Avri Doria: Why is an appeal - a nameless appeal even allowed?

J. Scott Evans: Well that - no, no, no, no. This has nothing to do with appeal (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: Okay. I'm getting confused.

J. Scott Evans: ...these last three paragraphs up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. They're no longer linked with appeal. It's now talking about increases of convergence and consensus views as well.

J. Scott Evans: All of this seems to be talking about consensus in general, so it's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.



J. Scott Evans: ...really misplaced. So it needs to be - in the case of consensus (unintelligible) work should encourage the submission of minority viewpoints. Then based upon the working groups needs and the Chair's direction, working groups, whatever - that's these last three paragraphs should be moved up...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Higher.

J. Scott Evans: ...in the end of that, "In the case of consensus, no consensus divergence" language. And, "If several participants disagree," because this language doesn't have anything to do with disagreeing or not disagreeing. It has to do with whether (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. How they're marked.

J. Scott Evans: ...people in their initial report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Does that make it clearer Avri?

Avri Doria: Not yet.

J. Scott Evans: See where I've done; is because those three paragraphs did not relate to appeals.

Avri Doria: And those three paragraphs are all the way at the bottom.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Avri Doria: So nothing...

J. Scott Evans: So we moved...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Bottom, bottom.

J. Scott Evans: So if you look now, she's moved them. So now they're after...

Avri Doria: She's moved them. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So they're now underneath, "Consensus (unintelligible)."

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. Yes. Okay. Because I was looking for them downward. I see.

J. Scott Evans: I think they relate all to the bullet points, not...

Avri Doria: Right, right, right.

J. Scott Evans: So I think they need to be moved up. And I think Cheryl you need to dictate the language.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: With regards to the second paragraph that begins, "Based on."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. And we - well where it says, "Based upon the work group's needs and/or Chair's direction," if we have had new language that says -- work group participants may request that their names not be associated explicitly with each view/position, because that can only request that you cannot be associated with.

You can't request it - the exception - if the expectation is names will be associated; therefore, you would have to formally request that your name is not is what I'm trying to say without coffee.

So it's an automatic opt in. If you want to opt out, you've got to say so, and the work group has to know about it.

J. Scott Evans: And so I would take out everything after the new period Marika.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, exactly. And that fits under (Robert)'s rules, where you often have called to have your name recorded against something.

J. Scott Evans: All right. I just want to look at this appeal stuff again. I would suggest that at - that we only keep the first two, because we say you have to follow these steps sequentially.

The first step is to contact the Chair. So I would say we need to move - oh no. That's just getting too technical. We'll leave it the way it is. (Unintelligible) the reason (unintelligible) is the Chair's liaison for the (unintelligible). Yes.

Should the complainant disagree with the liaison or with the Chair's determination, complainant may appeal to the Chair, or the CO, or the designator (unintelligible).

If agrees with the complainant's position, the CO should recommend remedial action to the Chair.

Okay. Everybody okay with that? Cheryl you...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I am. But I've got my hand up for a reason J. Scott. Cheryl here. Of that part where we just finished talking about, "The work group participants may request that their name is not associated explicitly with," can we change the word, "Each view and position" to any view or position?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: And Avri, the only way I can see this happening is if maybe you are from a government that has a very oppressive...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I suggest that a very important - and a very important issue for some of my regional members, when we can leave it at that J. Scott?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I understand what J. said.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can - I understand what...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...not want to. And I could think of you might really advocate for something, but not want to be on the public records for political reasons.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think that's what she just said.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Okay. Let's - I think we're done here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is that the end of three?

J. Scott Evans: I'm not sure. I'm hoping.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I got all excited for a minute. Oh.

Marika Konings: All right. Last one. Last one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Marika. I really need coffee. (Unintelligible). Didn't we sort of sort that?

J. Scott Evans: Chair of the chartering organizations. Well, I mean, we have - in everything else, we've put the liaison. So do you all want to stick to - in the event it

cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the working members should first request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the liaison - the chartering organization liaison...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...and if still not satisfied...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They opt.

J. Scott Evans: ...with an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the chartering organization, or his - or their designated representative.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: May request an opportunity - may request the opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the chartering organization or their designated representative.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: How is that? Cheryl liked it. Avri had said that she thought it was okay to put the liaison.

Avri Doria: Yes, yes, yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I think that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: By the (unintelligible) was - yes. Anyway.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And Jonne is there, so I think that that's good. All right.

Avri Doria: Cool.

J. Scott Evans: We're done.

Avri Doria: I'm so glad.

J. Scott Evans: We've got four...

Jonne Soininen: Excellent.

J. Scott Evans: So we've got...

Marika Konings: So J. Scott, if I may suggest then that for the next meeting I do the same for the remaining comments, and use the last meeting to basically do a final run through or final, you know, have a consensus call on that last week with the final changes. Because I think, you know, there are not that many remaining there on the...

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Let's do that then. We'll have a call next week. Do we want to do 90 minute again, because we're running pretty...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes. I'd rather have 90 and end early, than...

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And then not have it and have something (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly. Marika that method worked really well. Can I - and I strongly encourage you to make sure that becomes a virally used method through all work groups wherever possible?

Jonne Soininen: Yes. That was fully impressive.

Marika Konings: We'll do our best. The only challenge is a little bit in this system, you know, that you can undo. So you can go back once you've taken things out. It's not

like track changes. But I agree. It's a good way to add documents and see what changes are being made.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: And they were.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. How often do (unintelligible) for this work group. Well done.

J. Scott Evans: I just think that really went well today. I thank everyone except Avri. The next time I get eight emails from you on the morning of, is that...

Avri Doria: They always send my homework at the last minute.

J. Scott Evans: I was like -- oh, somebody is doing their homework at the last...

Avri Doria: Hey, sorry.

J. Scott Evans: I do want (unintelligible) everyone for coming again, and everyone for being positive contributors. I think we made good progress. So we'll do four, five and six next week.

And then our last week, which is going to be difficult for me to make, because I will be at the INTA meetings in Boston, but I'm going to try. Puts me three hours ahead of my normal time, which is like 1 o'clock, or 2 o'clock in the afternoon. So we'll deal with that next week.

So next week -- same bat time; same bat place; 90 minutes. I would like to call this call to a close with a thanks to everyone. And we'll talk to you next week.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks everyone. Thanks J. Scott. And thank you Marika.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Avri Doria: Yes. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

Marika Konings: Bye.

END