

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work
Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday, 27 January 2010 at 19:00 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 27 January 2010, at 19:00 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-20100127.mp3>

On page:

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

(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
S. Subbiah – Individual
Alexei Sozonov

Staff:

Marika Konings
Ken Bour
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:

Caroline Greer
Marilyn Cade

Coordinator: And the call is now being recorded at this time.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's PPSC Work Group on Wednesday, the 27th of January.

We have J. Scott Evans, Iliya Bazlyankov, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonne Soininen, Alexei Sozonov, Avri Doria.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Ken Bour and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Caroline Greer to all the Wednesday calls.

And if I can just remind everyone to state their names when speaking. Thank you.

Over to you J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: All right. This is J. Scott Evans. I don't - just to let everyone know, the only comment that I received on the call for consensus -- and I had asked, if you may remember, that you only give any revisions that you sought or if you disagreed with the call of consensus on the text for putting it out for public comment -- was from Caroline Greer.

She sent an email dated this last Monday, the 25th, in which she went through 13 point. And so I would like now to just quickly go through her email with the text, if that's all right Marika.

Marika Konings: It's up on the Adobe Connect as well.

J. Scott Evans: So the first thing she has is in point - her first point is, "Who is responsible for writing the charter?" And she says that, "This needs to be expressed up front." And I thought it was. Oh, I see you've got it up. Okay.

I thought it was up. But if that could just be a footnote, couldn't it? Where we just state the chartering organization, which is typically going to be GNSO, but could be any other group. Right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes J. Scott. I think that the term chartering organization is very self-evident.

J. Scott Evans: And we could put a footnote in Marika and just clarify that that would typically be GNSO, but that's not the only group that could be a chartering organization.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Ken?

Ken Bour: Yes. Hi. This is Ken. I wonder if she might be referring more to the word writing than responsible. It's clear that the chartering organization is responsible. But I wonder if she's asking whether or not the procedure sort of needs to say -- who in the chartering organization; or how does the chartering organization go about getting it draft and written?

J. Scott Evans: You know, my personal - and I - of course I'm - can advocate a position; is that's drilling down to far too much detail.

I mean, it seems to me that the chartering organization should be able to have the freedom to decide whom or how it wants to do it, so long as they follow these guidelines.

Ken Bour: And maybe that's all that needs to be said then.

J. Scott Evans: So maybe we need to say - and then the sentence it just says that, "It is the responsibility of the chartering organizations; that through it's own internal processes to determine who will be responsible, who will be charged with drafting the charter for approval by the chartering organization" or something to that effect.

Anybody disagree with that?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just a question. Are you happy for me to add it as a footnote in Section 6.2, which is Working Group Charter Pamphlets?

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) there who's - who need to use the pamphlet basically.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Woman: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Second point. "Reference the third bullet in the first" - oh.

I'm sorry Ken. You agree, okay.

"Reference the third bullet point in the first paragraph's Section 2.11; suggests that the announcement should not only be sent organizations for that expertise knowledge, but also organizations may impact it by any work produced. Edits made. See also Section 6.1.1 where the same occurs."

So can we look at 6.1.1? Marika can you throw that up on the screen?

Marika Konings: (You) should be able to scroll himself to the relevant section in the document now. And as well, you are able to enhance the document.

On the top page you see a stamp page and a bar that you can move, so you can make the document larger if necessary.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Ken Bour: Marika this is Ken. You may be aware that the bottom - there's a little button called Sync. And if you click that, then you will control it. And then you can un-sync it when you're finished.

Marika Konings: Yes. No. I'm aware but...

Ken Bour: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...it is more convenient for people to scroll on their own leisure. I am happy as well to go there directly if you prefer that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, 2.1.1 is Announcement of a Working Group. Let's look at 6.1.1.

Woman: Oh, sorry.

J. Scott Evans: Six point one point one. Announcement of Working. After (unintelligible) work and circulate call, volunteers who are responsible...

So I assume that what she's saying is in that bullet point that we've left out of this particular one groups that would be impacted. And I - and so is she the one that's put in this interest?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I read it that that word interest was her edit.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that it made it to be duplicated into 6.1.1.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And I think that's absolutely fine. Does anybody disagree?

Man: No.

J. Scott Evans: Then let's go to - let me see her email again. Okay. Three, "Is SOI different to a DOI? This caused some confusion. In some cases, they seem to be interchangeably and sometimes different."

So I guess we need to clarify the difference between a statement of interest and what was - what's DR? The declaration of interest?

Marika Konings: It's closure of interest.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: And I spoke to this - about this with Judy Hedlund, who is responsible for (OSC); because I actually had the same question, you know, what is the actual difference.

And she explained to me that the statement of interest is more what you provide at the start of a working group. Just a general overview like, you know -- what you do; what your interests are; why you're involved in this.

And a disclosure of interest is more relating to specific decisions that may affect a relevant party judgment, or be perceived to affect a relevant party judgment on an issue that is under review, consideration or discussion. So it's more relating to specific decisions that a working group is taking.

And you're expected to disclose your interest and, you know, the reason why...

J. Scott Evans: And I think if we just - if you put a footnote to explain that when we first mention disclosure of interest.

Marika Konings: Yes. I'll check as well with the responsible (OSC) team if they have some kind of definition that they're using, to make that we're in sync.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. "Section 2.1.4.2 covers the election of working group Chair. If this working group decides to have co-Chair as advisors, how would those be elected?"

You know, it's very difficult, in my opinion, to define specific criteria, given breadth of subject matter that will be covered.

I mean, I think we've given some general principles, with regards to leadership qualities someone should have, but I don't know if we can far beyond that.

Does anyone disagree?

I mean, you start drilling down in too much detail and then it's not relevant to a broad swath of potential applications, which I thought this was supposed to have.

I have no problem with changing it to working group leader as a Chair, since we talk about various types of leadership structures you might choose to have.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I'm happy with the edit. But I also agree. I'm a little concerned about being too prescriptive in terms of criteria.

J. Scott Evans: Being...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because then you get into the argument of how is it measured and how is it weighted, and, and, and.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. So I disagree that we should get any more detailed than we already have.

Do we have consensus that that's okay?

Or you can you use little check if you don't want to talk up Avri and...

Oh, there we go. Avri...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...check from you.

Avri Doria: Yes, yes. I can't find the button. You got a check.

J. Scott Evans: It's down at the left-hand corner. If you touch the down arrow you'll...

Avri Doria: Oh, yes, yes. Now I see it. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Eleven hours, it's a lot of time.

Avri Doria: Yes. How about I'm a sender. But anyway...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a wonder she can see the screen, let alone the little man at the bottom left.

J. Scott Evans: "Reference the" - this is Number 5. "Reference the last sentence, Section 2.1.4.3. Change advisable to required."

Does anybody have a problem with that?

Marika Konings: No. I can live with it.

J. Scott Evans: Jonne is very happy with it.

Woman: He what?

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible) just says...

Jonne Soininen: Yes. I was just trying these things out. This was cool.

J. Scott Evans: Boys. All right. Oh, and look it's Cheryl. It's passed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry.

J. Scott Evans: Second, in the first paragraph, Section 2. "This document include skills and qualities that are common to a leader of working groups. The charter then add to the common qualities and skill sets that are specific (unintelligible)."

I mean, I don't have a problem with the charter sending out if we want to add something to - the charter can specify specific skill sets that would be required for a leader, because the chartering organization then - that allows them the freedom if it needs to be someone that like has, you know, an in-depth knowledge of (5P) protocol.

You know, delegation because this is a specific security question that J. Scott Evans wouldn't know anything about, so he's obviously not the right Chair. I mean, I don't have a problem with that.

Does anybody have a problem if we put in a sentence that just said that the chartering organization can set out criteria?

Marika, you raised your hand.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I actually still had a question about the previous comment; that if we include required, the question is then -- and how do you want to require that?

And what do you do if it's what you - doesn't develop a plan. Is it something then that you want to make, you know, require as well as part of the charter?

Or do you tell the (unintelligible) work team that they should put that in the bylaws as a requirement or...

J. Scott Evans: One of the things you could do is you could say -- is it advisable. And in the event a work team chooses not to have one, they have to present a justification to the chartering organization for why they wouldn't have one.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So in other words, you don't have to have one that's advisable, because you've got to explain why you don't have one; which means 90% of the people will have one.

So what about this question about putting in a sentence regarding the leadership that says that the chartering organization can put together a list of criteria and toward the leaders of a working group that if feels are necessary?

I feel much more comfortable with the chartering organization looking at a specific issue doing that, rather than these general guidelines setting it up.

I see Cheryl...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree.

J. Scott Evans: All right. "Seven, reference the second section of 2.2 -- statements of qualification submitted (unintelligible) WG leadership is careful to accept." So I'm not sure because I don't have the document in front of me what she's speaking of.

Marika, can you speak to that? Number 7.

Marika Konings: I can pull the document up. It's...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: It's - what did she say? Two point two?

Marika Konings: Two point two, yes. She's - they're on Page 9. The bullets.

J. Scott Evans: It suggests we do (unintelligible) licensed nomination (unintelligible).

So who - I'm a little unclear as what's a statement of qualification and who's it coming from.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The candidate.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was reading it as a candidate.

J. Scott Evans: Well maybe we should say the statement of qualification from candidate. We okay with that? We just add -- from candidate.

Woman: Sure.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Where are we? We're on 8 on her email, which is, "Reference end of Section 2.0." She said, "The addition of add function liaison with other staff." She says she made the edit.

Can we go back to the text? Staff, I can (unintelligible). Yes. I don't have a problem with that. Does anybody have a problem with that?

Woman: Which one is it?

J. Scott Evans: So like she's added a bullet of what the staff roles are. And she says...

Woman: This is fine.

J. Scott Evans: But I think it should be...

Avri Doria: What number are we (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's just about item 2.3. The additional point of liaison with the staff of (experts) has been added.

Avri Doria: Okay. Liaison with other staff (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: I don't have a problem with that, because that's functionally what they're going to do.

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Nine...

Man: Yes.

Jonne Soininen: This is Jonne. I think that it's a little bit maybe (unintelligible) but it is okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Let's see here. "Reference 2.3. Are the terms sub teams and sub groups interchangeable?"

We need to see that again -- 2.3 -- Marika. I don't know if I have the ability to change the screen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. Marika is in charge. She's the only yellow one. We've got to be the right color to have control J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: That is oh so deep I'm not going there. As a white male, I think that would be very improper to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Very dangerous, indeed. Discretion is better part of valor.

J. Scott Evans: And maybe (unintelligible) sub teams and (unintelligible). And what she want to know if...

Marika Konings: She changed at the bottom of Page 10. It originally said, "Sub group" and she changed it to, "Sub team" which, I think, makes kind of sense. We talked in the previous...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...sub team.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. You don't need to keep going back Marika. I'll go - I'll read it from my email that I've got up. And if anybody needs...

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. But that way we won't have to keep flipping back and forth.

"Reference Section 3.6. This section is lacking in guidance as how a working group should get the point of making decisions. Different working groups may use different approaches, but providing some alternative approaches could be useful for given working groups to consider.

Also, regarding levels of support, is upon how would the level of support be determined? Could the council voting thresholds be used as a guide?

Also, would majority support be better than strong support?"

I think we should use the term majority anywhere, because majority, in my personal opinion - but I'll defer to Avri, and Cheryl and Jonne to do

consensus in other areas. But in my opinion, that by implication and - says voting.

And there's a difference between a majority and strong.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. That fits comfortably with my assessment of it. And strong support does not mean that you've put any particular numerical measure via vote on it.

J. Scott Evans: I think we just leave that as it is. To just change the last...

Marika Konings: Sorry. Sorry. Can I just have a clarification? So you want to leave it as Caroline changed it, or you want to leave it as...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Strong.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So strong.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: I just think...You know, I'm not so sure I'm happy with the word required either, because - I mean, that almost looks like you have to - at least a false positive, because you're requiring someone to obtain something whether...

I mean, I - in my experience, majority voices are going to speak up. Especially if you give them the opportunity do so.

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Require, because you got somebody out putting something in there just because it has to be there, rather than because it's somebody's - a viewpoint that needs...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think encouraged is a strong enough word in there. And I think if memory serves, we did go over this in fairly fine detail at the time.

J. Scott Evans: I would stick with encourage.

How about you Avri? As...

Avri Doria: Definitely encourage.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So I'm deferring to that. So Marika, that will stay encouraged.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: "Suggest changing the last paragraph -- 4.1 -- to cover teleconferences that are recorded and (unintelligible) transcribed directly." Four point one.

I'm scrolling down so I can see.

Marika Konings: Just above 4.2 when she just changes and/or transcripts.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There's also the addition of should and may where cans were before in the paragraph above that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. It's the chair should (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm ambivalent on should and may versus can and can. So I'm happy to have should and may in there.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. That's fine with me because I think that's what we meant. And I have no problem with and/or.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Man: It looks good.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. (Unintelligible). We're plowing through guys.

Woman: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: "Reference 6.1. Where is Section II?"

Marika Konings: I think that's a remainder from a previous...

J. Scott Evans: Draft.

Marika Konings: ...draft. So yes. I need to clean that up...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Like that answer.

"A reference Section 6.1.4. It is possible and likely, but liaison may also be a working group member; otherwise, it may prove difficult to put a liaison. Therefore, we should distinguish between..."

I don't think that liaison - I don't think your concept, as I remember hearing it, was that the liaison is a member. I think the whole point was the liaison to sort of be separate, apart from. Sort of an observer. Is that not correct? Because they're going to be involved in dealing with disputes. Right?

Woman: That's right.

J. Scott Evans: They shouldn't really be a member because that gives them, I think - it could lead to conflict of interest.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. Sorry. I was distracted.

J. Scott Evans: No. But what do you think?

Avri Doria: Yes. That's what I mean. I was distracted.

J. Scott Evans: I think we just - I don't think liaison should be members. I think that that's a...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. Yes. Just thanks for repeating the question because I was so distracted I didn't hear the question.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Should a liaison be a member of working group? And she says that it would be difficult to recruit liaisons; that we need to structure this where they would be a member. And I think that's a mistake.

Avri Doria: Yes. I do too. I think that that's - and I think it will take time. But I really think that that's one of the roles of council members as management; that, you know, they take on this liaison role in things where they are interested. But not advocates and champions who need to be members, because it really confuses the role of being both responsible for finding consensus and one of the arguers. So yes. I'll agree.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Marika you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I mean, I don't disagree with what has been said but, you know, just talking from current practice, I believe that liaisons are participating as well as members of the working group. And often, you know, those - some do indeed, you know, switch hats and say, "Now talking is a council liaison. I think this, you know, should be the approach. And now I'm talking in my capacity as a working group member."

And I, you know, I do have one concern that it's, you know, we normally don't get that many council members to participate in working groups, but it is really appreciated because they do bring with them, you know, specific set of knowledge and information.

So in one sense I, you know, I would regret if wouldn't - would lose that participation as working group members since, you know, we - as in the current state, we don't have that many, you know, don't - that many members to choose from in the different working groups.

J. Scott Evans: My problem is - and I just throw this out for discussion by the group; is I think it's very difficult in a - in my experience, a universe that is constantly arguing about process, to put together a process where an individual serves as a decision maker in the event of a breakdown within the working group to be sort of the trier of fact, then to also be an advocate. And I think that raises at least the appearance of impropriety, if not the exact impropriety. And I think that that would be suspect. And (unintelligible) a good point.

(Unintelligible) and I, we've (unintelligible) and we had a (unintelligible). We'll break that. But we may (unintelligible) step further.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. Good point (unintelligible). And (unintelligible). Is that the current (unintelligible) council members (unintelligible) can actually be participants? And (unintelligible) be defined (unintelligible) from being participants.

That's just saying that a person that is the liaison shouldn't be one of those, because this actually comes out (unintelligible) more (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: I hate to tell you this Avri, but about 45% to 50% of what you just said was lost due to audio...

Avri Doria: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I could say it again.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, would you please?

Avri Doria: Okay. There was nothing in what's being said here - I mean, some people might argue it. But nothing being said here that says a council member can't be a member. So...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Avri Doria: ...encouraging that. It's just saying that the one that carries the token of liaison does not function as a member.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Avri Doria: And so those are different things. So I think in terms of Marika's point it's - it actually encourages more participation because it brings two in. One that sits

there with the objective eye. And one that sits there with, you know, as a participant.

J. Scott Evans: I see we have - I saw next we had Cheryl's hand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks J. Scott. What I was going to say just reinforces what Avri said in triplicate actually, because it double echoes and then the restatement.

I think that the original text is fine because the edited text does nothing but add the expectation that the role may be one that is a single person acting in both capacities. I think remaining silent on that, and just making it quite clear that the liaison role is expected to be a mutual one, monitor the discussion, solve and, and, and is all that needs to be said at this level of document.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I agree. I think - Marika did you take your hand down now?

Marika Konings: Yes. And I was just looking for a clarification then on where that leaves us with the text. What are we...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: We're going to stay with the original text. We'll have to remove Caroline's edit.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So it would read now, "The liaison expected to play a neutral role, monitor the discussions of the working group, and assist and inform the Chair and the WG as required." And take out the - all of her blue text. Okay.

That is the last of Caroline's comments. We've considered them. We'll make the revisions to those where we've - we have consensus that revision needs

to be made Marika. And we will leave the original text where there was consensus that it should stay.

So with regards to that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry J. Scott. Just one minor edit point.

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I put my hand back up but you may not have noticed it going up and down, sorry.

We just need to double check - just me being a peasant obviously. With the edits we had a blank Page 11. That would need to be disappeared.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. If I can just add as well. I know this is while back from other words, but I, you know, added it throughout the document that I think I just more, you know, (unintelligible) I (unintelligible). Maybe people want to have and take a look at the whole document and make sure that they're happy with those.

I'll put out...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Marika.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Marika if I may. Cheryl. From my point of view, you know, it was a where, when. We said when and it was wrong anyway, so that was grammar checks.

So I didn't see anything other than what we've discussed that was, you know, could be considered, you know, a typo or better grammar.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: But I would like you to -- before we put this out Marika -- make the changes we've talked about and circulate it one more time just for editorial review. Not from a revisionist. Just to clean up anything that might take place so we can see if - Avri is your hand up?

Avri Doria: Oh, no. Is it?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Avri Doria: It is. It's only because I forgot to put it down.

J. Scott Evans: So...

Marika Konings: J. Scott, would you like me to put out that check changes version - or a check change version and a clean version so people can see that...

J. Scott Evans: I would like both.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Check and clean, yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Now, do we have the questions Marika that were sent to us by the - I think we had four questions we were going to consider on this call today?

Woman: They were on the wiki. And seeings as even I managed to do my homework, we better deal with them.

J. Scott Evans: I...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: I'm not trying to circumnavigate anything. I was just wondering if we could put them up on the Adobe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just a second. This is Cheryl. Did you make changes on the wiki?

Woman: I did.

Marika Konings: Then you need to give me a second to actually upload that in Adobe Connect though.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: But maybe we can talk about something else. Just be for a second.

J. Scott Evans: We'll have a (unintelligible) report interlude. La la la la la la la.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Maybe we can talk about Nairobi or...

J. Scott Evans: That's what - okay. Why we do that in the interim.

Just to let you know, our original thought was that we would have a public comment period. And then depending on the comments we've received, I think we decided by like February 10 or so -- Cheryl if that's not correct -- we were going to consider whether we were going to have a public meeting,

where we would take in comment, because we had not felt like we had received robust comment in a written format.

My company is not letting me go to Nairobi because of security concerns. So I am happy for us to proceed with having a meeting in Nairobi. I will have to pass the baton to another person since I will not be there.

I will try my damndest to be online.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Remote should work.

J. Scott Evans: I'm hoping. And we are working ICANN to give a seminar to the intellectual public constituency members, because a great majority of them, their companies will not let them go. So we're - so they can participate remotely.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: We're doing that ahead of time. Who is speaking?

Jonne Soininen: This is Jonne here. I don't know whether Gisella got the email that I sent some time ago. I actually got myself into a terrible car accident. I'm not walking now. And...

J. Scott Evans: Oh, my goodness.

Jonne Soininen: As of January 1, on New Year's Day. I sent the email actually. Anyway, it isn't that - I don't think, at this rate, I'll be able to go to Nairobi. I mean, I'm...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jonne Soininen: ...expected to walk eventually, but...

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Well I'm so very sorry to hear that.

Jonne Soininen: Anyway, so that's part of the reason why I haven't been following with any of this talk. Basically, we're in the final draft. Is that correct right now?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. We're in a draft. It's going to be the final that will be put out for public comment. What we've decided on this call -- in case - because I know you had to drop off at some point -- is we are - that Marika is going to make the few tweaks that we discussed today.

And she's going to send out a clean version and a comparison version so that we can look at it just to make sure that there - we're not going to be looking for substantive changes, just editorial comments, such as -- there's incorrect grammar; we need a comma; those kinds of - there's a blank page where there shouldn't be a blank page. Those kinds of things.

And then we're going to put it out for public comment.

I guess also we should talk about here, how long a public comment do you think we should have? I am going to ask Avri and Cheryl to give their opinions first, given that they are more experienced within the ICANN sphere with this particular process.

So we'll start with Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Certainly not less than the normal three. And if that's stands our ICANN meeting, that three should not count the ICANN meeting. So that would make it at least four.

J. Scott Evans: When you say three or four, you're talking weeks?

Avri Doria: Weeks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: From that last perspective, we have fought for 45 or more for a long time. When we say that it's days not weeks. When we see that there is an issue with a 30-day public comment period, we then reserve the right to have it extended to 45. So I would suggest that running it with a 30-day comment period, which is actually the four weeks that - and close it after the four weeks that Avri was outlining is ideal as a staffing point.

And if community bleat loudly enough, then there's the option to extend it to 45.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. What I would suggest is we do 45, because we're going to have an ICANN meeting in the middle of it. And since that ICANN meeting will end at just about the 45th day, that we're not going to get any analysis or summarization of public comment the week or so after and ICANN meeting. And we might as well use that dead space to take in comment.

So my vote - or what I would propose, since I don't have a vote, I'm sorry. My - I would propose to the group and seek consensus from the group on we do 45 days.

And Marika, do you think we can have this out of here by February 1? Posted for public comment by February 1. That's 28 days in February. And that would take us to - 12 would be 40, 17. So that would be like March 17, which is three days after the end of the ICANN meeting which means we would probably have some summary by end of March.

And I hear resounding silence.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She might be on mute.

Marika?

J. Scott Evans: She refuses to participate. She's on strike.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, dear.

J. Scott Evans: Well, I'll just...

(Tim): No, this is (Tim).

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

(Tim): She just jabbered me that she got disconnected.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

(Tim): She's dialing back in.

J. Scott Evans: Okay so Avri, are you okay with 45 days?

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, yeah, yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Cheryl, are you comfortable with 45 days?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm delighted with 45 days.

J. Scott Evans: I mean, my whole point is, if we say 30 days from the 1st, it's going to be March 2. We're not getting anything those days, between March 2 and March 15. So we might as well allow the time to be there to take in information...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree.

J. Scott Evans: ...rather than setting up false deadlines that will be extended anyway.

So, okay, all right.

Marika, you back?

Marika Konings: Yeah, sorry.

J. Scott Evans: That's okay.

Marika Konings: I pushed the wrong button and disconnected the lines.

J. Scott Evans: We have, I believe, reached consensus that we would have a 45-day public comment period.

And my question to you, and you were not here to answer is, can we get this posted by February 1?

Marika Konings: Yes, but it will give people only one day basically to review the add-ins we've made today.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Can we get it posted by February 5, which is next Friday?

Marika Konings: Yeah, I don't have any problems.

J. Scott Evans: Why don't we do that? And if you can get those drafts out, we'll have a hard stop as of 12:00 pm GMT, Wednesday which is what, the 3rd - February 3? Is that correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: So anybody that wanted to submit editorial revisions to Marika would have until 12:00 pm or I guess, 2400 GMT, UTC, or whatever.

Avri Doria: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So I don't know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: To make it easy, we can just make it flow to business wherever people are.

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

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: That's fine. And if you will just put that in your cover notes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That spreads it over a 24 hour period, of course, remembering you've got some of us (unintelligible) from the other side of the hemisphere.

Avri Doria: There's really no problem with that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: That way everybody knows that whatever the date is, that's when they have to get it done.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

And then you'll - that'll be fine. I have a feeling there will be very little that we'll have to do.

Marika Konings: And all I'll have them again, as well, to announce when they draft, so people have another time to just, sort of, look at that comment.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, super.

All right, let's look at these.

Marika Konings: All right, let me just confirm quickly for Nairobi then again - so you want to have a public workshop meeting time.

J. Scott Evans: I think we were going to make a decision.

What's the three weeks, Cheryl, you were talk - well, I don't know all the timing provisions because I don't have to deal with them everyday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The 15th is the pre-Nairobi deadline for (TRO)s to be available so that they can be considered. But if it's going to come to, I think the - wasn't if it's a GNSO - if it's going to be stuffed in a GNSO meeting, it would have to be earlier in February? So it came back to something like the 5th or the 8th.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Well, the reality is, all we...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The 5th should be fine.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I think so.

And I think we would just - I think we've got - I believe we have a space set aside tentatively on either...

Marika Konings: We're still working on the schedule. So that would be, I'm assuming, on the Monday to Friday schedule.

We already have the time set aside for PPSC and working discussions on the, I think, the Sunday which is another question I have for the group, how much time people think they would like to discuss there.

But we're talking now about a meeting workshop time in the Monday thru Friday agenda.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, and I think that, you know, I have a feeling we're not going to have a lot of public comment before Nairobi. So I do think we should have an opportunity for people to make a comment on the report at the Nairobi meeting because some people won't ever put in comments, but they might stand up at a mic.

So what do others think?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think it's going to be an important part of the process and when we're running a comment period over a public ICANN meeting, it's silly not to do that.

I would suggest that we probably need to look at unconflicted time that might be offered in the, sort of, Wednesday/Thursday part. I can assure you that some of the (ACNSO) Chairs, at least from the GAC and the ALAC, will become rather loud and grumbly if we see things taking up unconflicted time on the Monday that is not seen as incredibly high priority community cross-consultation requirement that is time critical to the meeting, which is not.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

So I would suggest, Marika, we look at that.

What's the time difference between the US and Nairobi? It's awful, isn't it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nairobi's pretty close to UTC.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Well that's not too bad.

Marika Konings: It's...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's plus two or three, yeah.

Marika Konings: I think it's plus three. I think it's plus three because I think it's two hours later than (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay well, you know, like I said, I'm not going to be there but I'm happy if I can get in remotely to share it remotely.

Marika Konings: So (unintelligible) latest in the afternoon possible, maybe.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Marika Konings: That would make it easier for you.

And how much time do people think we would need -- an hour, an hour and a half?

J. Scott Evans: I would do an hour but I just don't think we need...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I was just going to say, having just done it today, it's like giving yourself jetlag without having to get on an airplane.

J. Scott Evans: Well why don't we say an hour? Is that okay with everybody?

Is that a yes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, yep.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Because there's...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I'll see what's available then, on those days and I'll let the working group know it's (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay, all right.

Let's do these questions now.

Let's look at these questions.

Marika Konings: Can I still ask one other question?

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Marika Konings: I'm sorry.

As well on the schedule for discussions of the PPSC, I don't know if you already had any further discussions with (Jeff), (unintelligible). Another issue we have there is that the membership needs to be updated at the PPSC. So, those are some issues that will need to be addressed for the agenda on Sunday.

J. Scott Evans: You know, I think that, as far as I'm concerned, our group is just going to submit its written report.

Marika Konings: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: And our status is going to be, this is out for public comment. As soon as we take the public comment and digest the public comment, we will then submit our finalized draft for PPSC approval - consideration and approval.

Marika Konings: Okay.

So you don't require any face-to-face time of the PPSC?

J. Scott Evans: I don't think so.

Did - Cheryl, do you - I don't - I think our words speak for themselves.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Okay, fine.

J. Scott Evans: And I think that frees Cheryl from having another meeting on her agenda on Saturday and Sunday.

All right, additional questions for consideration by our work team: how should the GNSO council deal with recommendations that are not consensus recommendations that have rough consensus or strong support?

So Caroline - and I'm going to let those that are on the phone take theirs. I'll be Caroline, today.

I think the council would need to examine which situation - each situation that's on merit. It would obviously therefore be important that a working group provide enough details to the council so that the council has as much information as possible to make that informed decision.

I think that goes without saying.

Let's go with (Subbiah) since your comments are next listed.

(Subbiah): Yeah, I think we discussed this once before.

And I'm okay - I think I, you know, in our last discussion, I think Avri also had something to say. And I think both of us converged on a suggested path here which is just that, you know, that when there are - when there is no consensus - I mean, when there is different opinions, then we just simply state the different opinions. And that's about the best we can do.

J. Scott Evans: I would tend to agree.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah.

Something close to that, I guess what the council needs to do is in its due diligence, look at it, see that everything was considered, see that every attempt was made, if, you know, because they're removed and, you know,

that they see something that wasn't tried, they see, you know, a suggestion that wasn't looked at, well then certainly they should be free to send it back. It also really depends on message or theme that comes through my answers is, how balanced was the group, were all the possible viewpoints represented et cetera.

So it really is a complex management task - test - task to see that due diligence was done. If due diligence was done then yeah, proceed with it.

J. Scott Evans: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm echoing a great deal of what has been said.

But one of the additional points I wanted to make which I hope was clear in my attempt at the homework was that I only would be concerned that with all due diligence and due care that a principle wasn't set in motion that sending things back, having things come up to the council (unintelligible) just strong support not clear consensus becomes a mechanism.

I think it should be certainly seen as the exception rather than the rule that a workgroup's outcome shouldn't come up without every attempt to make a full consensus outcome.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I think it's - I mean, I'm not expressing - I'm just giving my opinion here, but I think it would be unrealistic and foolish to say that you couldn't go forward with strong support. Because what you do then is you hand a small minority, if I understand strong support correctly, or at least a minority veto power.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: And nothing ever gets done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly.

J. Scott Evans: We never go anywhere.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: And I think there has to be a mechanism to say, you know, while we appreciate and understand, we believe that as the managing group of this process, GNSO council, that every effort was made, due diligence was made and we are going to move forward. We understand it is the minority. We wish there could be clear consensus, but we're going to move forward.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So, Marika, at this point I want to go all through this so that we can discuss in case someone has a huge problem. But I am inclined to just send what we have here to the group, where they see these different things and they can coalesce. And if they want clarification or anything, they can come back to us.

But that would be my - do other people agree that we just - this thing that we have here, it's off the Wiki, that we just send this on to the folks that ask the questions?

That's what we're going to do then.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

J. Scott Evans: Silence is...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...needs to be public.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, does or should it matter who is supporting those recommendations, that is, if there's a rough consensus between all constituent stakeholder groups but is only two individual members of the team not representing anyone by - of itself; should that be given different weight when being presented to and considered by the (GNSO) Council?

(Subbiah)?

(Subbiah): I - well, my answer to this is either we formally, you know, (unintelligible) do anything between is kind of silly. Either we simply say, well, you know, if somebody is a member of the council, then there are some kind of special rights. I mean, you know, basically make that very clear, you know, that - or we do not really care at all, and it makes absolutely no difference. And it should just strengthen their arguments.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

I don't - okay, Avri, you're next.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I guess my view is that it didn't matter. So, I guess this is similar to (Subbiah)'s answer, too. It didn't matter where the comments came from.

What's special about constituency is, A, their participation and the management; B, the invitation that they've got to put in statements early in the process to basically shape a lot of the discussions and the issues that will be discussed on something. And if that's the end of the - again, a process that due diligence has went through the right steps and did that and had public comment and people read it and facts, you know, then I see going forward.

J. Scott Evans: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Jay Scott.

I should think the level of representativeness and quite specifically whether or not there has been a genuine and healthy bottom-up process that's boarding aggravated and agreed views from constituencies or representation over into workgroup activities is a very important thing and then may indeed need to be some weighing, if not weighing in the debate, some recognition in the reporting of whether or not a value is an individual's view or a representational view.

And I equally think that that inclination, part of that set of facts, should be taken into account in the council's deliberations on the outcome.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

I think that we should present all these views because personally I tend to agree with Cheryl's point of view that part of the due diligence that should be conducted is to see how representative the view is. I mean, if it's just one person representing one personal view for their personal company, that's very different than if it's someone from ALAC standing up and they can demonstrate that they are acting on a...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...viewpoint or position that has been demonstrated through a process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly, right.

J. Scott Evans: And - or, the intellectual property constituency or the registrars who have a huge (unintelligible) group and may be one day so will the registries, rather

than an individual. And I think that that has to come in. But I think that's part of the due diligence.

And so I think that's sort of laid out here, and so - okay, I think we're all sort of saying similar things in different ways.

So Number 3: in making the assessment between (unintelligible) consistent strong support, should the working group share a factor in the difference between a vote that represents the whole constituency or stakeholder group and that of an individual?

(Subbiah?)

(Subbiah): Well, you know, I think that on this one, you know, I'm - pretty much what I have said that it's not - you know, if we're going to just go along the way right now of just saying that everything is equal but essentially no real distinction should be made, then I think we should stick with that general thesis.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Now, I guess I'm still tipping the most toward the idea being the most support. So, first of all, going along with if it's not a vote, process should be the consensus of again full consideration and it's the points of views that count, not necessarily how many prescribed to an idea.

So, I guess - I mean, I'm kind of agreeing with, yes the representative, but people participate in the working groups pretty much as individuals even though they come out of a constituency or a stakeholder group. So there may be 20 some what constituency or only one and does that mean something at a certain point? And I actually don't think that it does.

So, I really think one has to be careful to look at the expression of ideas and how they come together or don't come together, which makes it harder.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think what we need to remember and to some extent it's indicative of what Avri's just outlined as an expansion of her written word and that is that the workgroup is the place where the discussion, the discourse, the (unintelligible), the modification, the views, the debate goes on. And that is clearly got a lot to do with the skill set of the individuals within the workgroup.

That said, that's how you build consensus or at least strongly supported outcomes. And I really don't think this whole concept of vote and weighting the vote has a place in the workgroup.

J. Scott Evans: I would tend to agree with everyone's viewpoint here.

I think that this is where ICANN's going to have to get more mature in dealing with public comments and to take a consensus view and then have the public comments put in by groups that are representative of huge numbers of people needs to weigh into this consensus. Not so much as in the consensus but in evaluating that consensus.

And so, Marika, I would like to add that comment into this section, that I believe that at the working group level, there should not be necessarily any weight, there should be due diligence to make sure that processes were followed and then that we need to be more mature and better defined on how we deal with public comment in evaluating consensus. And that needs to be taken into consideration at the council level when moving forward.

(Subbiah): I just wanted to add something though.

J. Scott Evans: Of course, (Subbiah), please.

(Subbiah): On all these things that consensus are (unintelligible) questions here, we are basically saying, "Look, there is - should be no distinction between different people, and it should be simply based on the merits of the argument."

And I guess, you know, we all know this but I think that I just want to make a point of it again. We should say that that simply means that, the emphasis on making sure that the workgroup itself is balanced and represents, you know, many different possible viewpoints...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

(Subbiah): ...it becomes important. And then that's where you're going to have the check and balance.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Well and I think - I think that's correct.

But I think Avri and I, at least from my perspective -- and Avri, I'll call upon you to say if you disagree, but -- most of the discussions I've been involved in have, sort of, this loosely based working group motto we've been using over the last 18 months to two years. Most of the constituency folks in the room have a general sense but can't speak for their constituency anyway...

(Subbiah): Right, right.

J. Scott Evans: ...because there's not been time to go through whatever processes their constituency and/or groups may have to make them a clear cut representative. And in every comment majority, you get disclaimers...

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...that show that's where the public comment comes in. That's where you're going to get the hard and fast rule of the constituents.

(Subbiah): And the - but, you know, there - but there's a second point I wanted to add to make this, you know - one was the fact that, you know, they need the constituents be given the opportunity to be - to create a valid group.

Secondly; it - that minority views are reported.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

(Subbiah): I mean those ways we're going to come to the fact that individuals may end up having, you know...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

(Subbiah): The whole point here is the individuals may have too much power. So, that's the...

J. Scott Evans: But a minority report, if put together well, would make great hay, I would hope, as an advocate of their representativeness in order to say, yeah, we may be minor report on this, but in reality we're a much bigger group.

You know, so, you know, advocacy - we can't tell people how to be better advocates, but a minority report should be crafted in such a way as to persuade that it is very important.

I see Cheryl has her hand raised.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I only just point out that of course minority reports will -- and I will support the fact that they should -- also come through from the inevitable squeaky

wheels to not broad scale representativeness beneath them. And that's equally important...

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...that that is recognized, that right for the voice. And if one can be articulate enough in one's argument, then it gets the right sort of attention by the audience.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, Number 4.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just like to think that it actually happened in the workgroup space, not just in the vote forum at the council level.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Okay, Number 4: should the working group guidelines provide any guidance on what represents a balanced working group? And should a working group or Chair provide his view on whether it feels the recommendations are made on behalf of a representative working group?

A member list might look representative, but in practice many do not actively participate.

Caroline says, the working group ought to be able to evaluate its own representativeness both with regard to individual participants or the working group as a whole. And of course, a balanced group on one issue may look completely different to another one working on another issue because the impacted parties will vary according to the subject matter.

Therefore I think it could be a - very difficult to provide guidelines of what balanced group might look like. A working group can only reach out to all

stakeholders and encourage them to sign up. It cannot force them to get involved.

I think group representation is something that the working group pair should opine on by way of a side note when submitting the working group's recommendation.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, I mean, I'm agreeing that working guidelines are good. I think that a working group Chair should not only work at recruiting a balanced group but report the degree to which he thought the group was balanced in this operation -- and again, though, pointing out that it's representative relative points of view, that all points of view will expressed, not necessarily groups or size of groups. Does that determine a balance?

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Avri Doria: Obviously, (unintelligible).

Okay, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Jay Scott.

I believe that the reporting from the Chair, the responsibility of the Chair in a working group, means that such reporting and the recording for due diligence purposes of the interaction, reaction, and balance that business points and decision nodes in a work group's life is way more than a side note. I think it should probably even have a set of stage reporting points, but that's another matter, perhaps.

And back to that end, we've got to remember that we're working with volunteers. We clearly have to be flexible. So to have general guidelines is

fine, but I think it falls to the workgroup Chair to strive for as much balance and engagement as possible.

And certainly something that a good Chair would do, in my view, is find out when underperforming engagement is becoming obvious from a member of a workgroup which goes back to answer Caroline's points of, you know, a list versus the actual interaction.

The good Chair should find out what it is that needs to change to get greater participation and more valid interaction from all of their workgroup members. And if there is a mismatch, if indeed a group has sent someone who they thought they could represent them but cannot make that commitment anymore, then it needs to go back to the group that the person's representing to make sure that they're aware and that a replacement is found. And when it affects just an individual then I guess that's just the individual's choice.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If it's bigger than that, then it's an issue.

J. Scott Evans: What I'm hearing here is - I'd like to put in an extra section and you can put it from me, Marika, which improvises that this is a constant monitoring that needs to go on. And it needs to take place both from the working group leadership and that includes the liaison. It needs to be a constantly monitored situation, that if there are gaps that that needs to be reported during the process to the council and also to the groups that may be underrepresented.

I think also that it should be - there should be some report out on the view of leadership with regards to representativeness and that there should be from

all members solicited, a viewpoint of representativeness in the self-evaluation that each group does at the end of its business.

(Subbiah): This is (Subbiah).

Man: Go ahead, (Subbiah).

(Subbiah): The - I wanted to take a flipside view of this which is to say, "Look, when would people be happy in general, you know, if a working group is balanced or not. I mean, you know, when would that outcome happen that - where people say, "Hey, this is a balanced working group."

Well balanced necessarily happens when there's nobody whining, right? There's not group out there whining that our position is not being considered, or we're not part of the group, right? So perhaps one thing will be - that, sort of, a guideline would be that when a working group is formed or, you know, while it's in process in the early meetings or something that there should be - one should be looking out for whining groups.

I don't know how to say that in better terms. I mean, if there's a group that's saying, "Hey, look, you know, we have a position. We want to be in this decision."

So as long as all the different whining groups are - at least one voice on the working group, then I think you will have, you know, at some level, met the criteria for a balanced working group.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I think that's true, but I think it's so subjective on what's a balanced working group in my experience to date -- Avri, you correct me if I'm wrong -- we've not had much whining on the working group level as far as representativeness.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Where there's been whinging is weighted voting.

(Subbiah): Well, no, what I mean is, I'm talking from a bitter experience where we've been for a year, waiting to go to a working group that we're never allowed to join, you know? And then (unintelligible) for me, you know, so.

Avri Doria: Right.

That wasn't in a GNSO working group, though.

(Subbiah): What was that?

Avri Doria: I don't think that was GNSO working group.

(Subbiah): It was a working group under the GNSO. (Unintelligible) at the very end. It was like two or three meetings.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I mean having no experience with that, if you want to...

(Subbiah): Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...go to the Wiki and put in your personal experience with that and put that comment in, I'd be glad to have it because I think that's the kind of stuff they're looking for.

And then I would offer your contact details through Marika. I'd just say, "If you want to talk to me personally, you can talk to Marika. And she'll give you my - and you can - you know, or something so that - or post your email address -- it may already be up there-- or refer them to your email address that's on the Wiki, and they can contact you individually because I think that kind of demonstrative evidence of what they're looking for gives them context around what (unintelligible) idea in theory.

With that, I think we've gone through all of this.

And Marika, you've got a couple of edits to this but otherwise - and I would give (Subbiah) some time to flesh out his one last point that he made on Question 4. And then we'll send it on to them.

So (Subbiah), if you could get something, let's make that the 5th as well, that we'll try to get this to them by the 5th as well. So that gives you a little over a week to tippy-tap out something in addition to what you've already put down.

Oh, you don't have anything on Question 4, so if you would submit something with regards to Question 4. And then we'll send it on.

Is that okay with everyone?

(Subbiah): Yes.

Marika Konings: Just so we're - this is Marika.

So, you're happy for me to add in the few things that you mentioned, and I can send them to you, the (unintelligible)?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) whatever you wanted to say.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: All right?

Nice. Do you see the - does anybody see the light at the end of that tunnel, because I see a little bright pinpoint.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'm trying to get excited but I think, you know?

J. Scott Evans: Hey listen, we're going to be the first one to public comment and to hell with the rest of them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: True.

J. Scott Evans: So, I really appreciate everything that everyone's done. I know that this has been a longer process as is always is, right, and that we had originally envisioned, but I'm working - so far, we've done a great job.

I'm hopeful that we will get some public comments that will assist us in refining this further. And perhaps we'll get some public comments that will make us think beyond the box that we've created for ourselves, and that's always good.

I would hope that - I would suggest that we have just a brief call, let's say not next Wednesday, then it's the 10th. How about we do a call on February 17 at this same time just to, sort of, structure how we're going to run the session in Nairobi?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, by that time schedule should be slightly more fleshed out, and we can discuss it. And so let's say everyone, people if you're still here, that we'll be 7 - February 17, which is a Wednesday at 1900 UTC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay, thank you.

All right, with that I will say meeting adjourned.

We actually did it with 17 minutes to spare, congratulations. And with Cheryl and I who like to talk, that is fabulous.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: So you all have a wonderful day, wherever you are; morning, night or evening, and we will talk to you all again on the 17th.

We're looking for, Marika, the redlined and the clean version so that we can have any editorial revisions in by close of business your local time on February 3 to then open and submit post for a public comment on February 5.

Also we will try to have looked over these additional submissions to the answers that we've been presented with here and have those submitted back to the group to ask questions on February 5 as well.

Ken, thank you for your continued diligence and looking over our shoulder and making sure we don't go too far field.

And I'll talk to you all on the 17th.

Woman: Thank you, bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Take care, (Subbiah).

Man: Bye-bye.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, (Subbiah) take care. We're thinking of you.

(Subbiah): Okay, thanks. Good-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you for calling the digital replay service.

END