GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)
Constituency Operations Work Team
23 April 2010 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team teleconference 23 April 2010 at 13:00 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-constituency-ops-20100423.mp3

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

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli – NCA – Work Team Chair

Claudio Digangi – IPC

Chuck Gomes – Registries Stakeholder Group

Tony Harris – ISPCP

Debra Hughes – NCSG

Rafik Dammak – NCSG

Michael Young - Registries

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund

Glen de Saint Géry

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies

Victoria McEvedy - IPC

Zahid Jamil – CBUC

 Krista Papac – Registrar SG

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening

everyone. Thank you for joining. I sent out a proposed agenda

yesterday. It's a little bit different from what we have been doing in the

last call. But the reason that I proposed the revision of the draft document that David sent was just to have the feeling of the whole group if we are okay with that approach.

As we are meeting every week, I thought that perhaps doing another call just for that working team could be a lot of workload for some of us participating. So, this is why I include it in the first part of the call. But, I don't know if Debbie is on the call? Do we have Debbie on the call?

Gisella Gruber-White: No. Debbie's not on the call, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: ...and apologies from (Victoria) McEvedy won't be able to make today either.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I couldn't hear. The last part of your comment, it was no sound. She sent her apologies?

Gisella Gruber-White: Victoria sent her apologies. Correct.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria. But what about Debbie?

Gisella Gruber-White: No. Debbie's not on the call and I haven't heard from her.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No problem. So, this is why I propose (it), but as she's not on the call, we may leave that maybe for later if she joins. She proposed a very good and concise document with some ideas to start, and just wanted to check with the group if we were okay with that so we can start the work with (that) too.

Any comments about that?

Chuck Gomes: Well Olga, the - I mean her approach looks very good, if that's what we're looking for. I mean, I think that...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...she has laid a foundation there that is really good for the sub-group to start working on and present something for the full working team. So, if that's what we're - the purpose, I think that's - that she's done a great job.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I totally agree. I sent her some comments included in it, but just small additions that only - include some other ideas, but I do agree with you Chuck that it's a very good approach. And just - it's not a very long document. Wanted to check with you if we are okay with that. And in my opinion we are, so we may start working with this - the working team. That was only the purpose, and perhaps Debbie could add some comments. We may wait for her to join the call.

Chuck Gomes: And Olga, what you did in terms of adding new ideas - I think what she set up is a format to explore ideas. She made a good start. You added more. And the sub-group, each of the members can add more too, and then you guys can start working on those, in terms of writing it up. So, I think it's an excellent start.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you, Chuck. Any other comments?

Okay. Thank you. Okay, so let's start with (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes? Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Just a - not about the content itself, but if we should forward that document, follow the same format like others. So, it just will - to make it more clearer.

Chuck Gomes: Rafik, this is Chuck. I think you're right, but I don't think that's what the purpose of Debbie's document was. I think it was more to get the discussion going. I like the format of our report on Task 1 that Julie did up, so I totally agree with your point.

I don't think this is intended to be the document itself, but - and maybe I'm wrong. We'll have to let Debbie answer that. But, this is a way to get some ideas flowing on that. So, we'll have to hear from Debbie. But totally agree that we want our - ultimately, we want the format to be like the one that we're working on for Task 1.

Tony Harris: Morning.

Chuck Gomes: Morning.

Olga Cavalli: Tony.

Tony Harris: Hi.

Olga Cavalli: How are you?

Tony Harris: Fine. The first and critical question, do you have an echo on my line?

Olga Cavalli: We always have problems with line from Argentina. We should complain our two telcos. It always echoes. Always noise.

Chuck Gomes: I hear one from Olga, but I don't think I do from you, Tony.

Tony Harris: Oh. I am lucky today, then.

Olga Cavalli: I hear echo from Tony now, but maybe it's me.

Tony Harris: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you Tony for joining. We were just starting our conversation.

Yes. I totally agree with Rafik and with Chuck. So it's just kind of starting point from Debbie, and then (unintelligible) - sorry. The echo is very strong. Gisella or Glen can we check if maybe Tony can go on mute? Oh, it's me.

Hello?

Debra Hughes: Hi, Olga. This is Debbie. I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, Debbie. Welcome.

Gisella Gruber-White: Tony was on mute, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. The echo is very strong. I'll go ahead. I'll manage.

Okay Debbie, we were just talking about your excellent first approach. And what I wanted to do is to have a sense from the whole working team if we were okay with that approach, and we agree that it's a very good starting document.

What Rafik recommended is that we should stick to the format that we already have used for Task 1, which we think it's a good format. But, yours is a - it's a preliminary document. It's a draft document, so the formatting we can manage later with - surely, Julie will help us with that.

So, I interpret some comments (small edits in your document) and I encourage the members of this working team to review in this document that Debbie sent - and, I don't think that it - Debbie, do you think it could be necessary to set up a conference call? I didn't push for that because we are meeting every week, which is a important workload for all of us. How do you want to proceed?

Debra Hughes: Thanks everybody. You know, I - what I would think would be easiest for us is if you could just send me your comments and I can work with you know, Julie to kind of - making sure that I'm capturing everybody's comments, and just send them - you know like whatever version we're on, you know we get that out before the next call. But, I don't think we need separate meetings.

I guess the main thing that I was just trying to - here today is am I on the right track? I mean, this is my first venture out there with this stuff guys, and please feel free to edit liberally. I'm just trying to make sure

I'm in the right field with this stuff. And, is there something big that I'm missing?

This document was really kind of intended to be a download of what was inside my head when I'm thinking about this issue. And, I just want to make sure that I'm thinking about at least all the right things, and then we can start talking about you know, drafting the specifics.

Chuck Gomes: Debbie, this is Chuck, and I thought it was a great start. Now the way I interpreted your document wasn't that you were trying to create the ultimate document that we were going to present, but rather getting the thought process going. We can deal with the formatting and the style later on. Am I correct on that?

Debra Hughes: That's absolutely right. Like, I wanted to make sure am I drawing from the right areas? And, are we - am I thinking about the right question when I think about this issue, Chuck. That's exactly what I was trying to do. And, I was hoping that those of you who have been more engaged with this could give me some thoughts on - "Debbie, you might want to think about this over here, and that over there," because I certainly want to make sure this document connects with any other existing you know, comments or governance documents that exist so that we're speaking with one voice, right.

So, that's kind of what I was trying to make sure that I'm at least on the right page before we start doing the heavy drafting.

Chuck Gomes: Well, my opinion was you made a great start and you're on the right track.

Debra Hughes: Okay. Thanks so much, Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck. I totally agree with Chuck. I sent you some smaller additions to your document. And, I encouraged those from the whole working team if they want to, to suggest some other additions to Debbie, so we may start with the - from working team. Debbie, do you think we should set a specific conference call for us, or you think that we may work in the list?

Debra Hughes: Well, I guess what I would really ask is for the people who have volunteered for this sub-working team, if they could particularly take a hard look at the two questions that were the two sections that I posed, and really mark it up heavily. Because what I'm willing to do with the help of anybody who wants to, is once we've got all the thoughts about generally what the questions are that we should be asking and thinking about, then we can maybe start dividing up all the - you know, the two questions and start you know pounding out the actual language.

But, I wanted to first make sure that either the broader group or any other groups wanted to at least weigh in and say, "Okay, you guys need to be thinking about these things when you talk about Task 2," before I even started drafting any you know, particular language. So, I don't want to burden anybody with another meeting quite yet, until everybody's had a chance -- I think -- to really take a look at the document and provide just their general feedback.

And then maybe after our meeting next week, we can take a look at whether or not we need to do any smaller meetings. I don't know. Does that make sense to everybody?

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a good approach.

Okay, so let's have in mind to review the document at the whole working team level, and suggest big, big things that may want to add to it. And then, we can maybe in our smaller list we can figure out how to move forward, and then we check in the next call.

Debra Hughes: Yes. That sounds good.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments?

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio. I just wanted to say I joined the call.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio, how are you?

Claudio DiGangi: Fine.

Olga Cavalli: Good morning for you, right? Yes.

Claudio just very briefly, we just were encouraging everyone to look at Debbie's document. We all agree it's a very good start. And please tell here if you think that something should be added, and so we can start working in our working team. That's was mainly the first conversation we had today.

Okay. Any other comments?

Great. We have a big document for Task 1. Let me find it, because I have so many things opened. Here, I think Julie did a great job. I don't know if you had the chance to review it. It has the organization that we

agreed in our last call, which is an Executive Summary. And then - which is Point 1, and then there's a bit of background. I'm reviewing the document right now. And then it's recommendations. And if I'm not mistaken, 2 and 2.1 is the document prepared by this working team leaded by SS. Is Julie on the call?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Olga. I'm on the call.

Olga Cavalli: Hi, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: (I just actually) - everyone got - I sent around yesterday with Olga's agenda both the document from Debbie and also the Task 1 document that includes Chuck's changes, or I mean (unintelligible) revisions.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Julie. So correct me if I'm wrong please, the .2 recommendations - 2.1 is the content prepared by the sub-working team, leaded by SS, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct. And, I think as Chuck points out, I'll add just a brief paragraph for each of these - I think you know, in each of these sections. And, I guess I would ask the work team, is it useful to include in that intro paragraph who were the sub-team members for this item. Is that necessary for that intro paragraph or just perhaps a brief note on what other recommendations from the BGC with respect to this particular section. I'm not quite sure what should go into that intro paragraph.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Which intro paragraph are you talking about Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Well, I think actually what I'm asking Chuck -- this is Julie -- is for each of the intro paragraphs that you suggested, I'm just asking for a little bit of guidance on what you would want in that - in each of those paragraphs. These are the paragraphs that introduce each of the sort of recommendation topic areas. What had formerly been each of the sub-team working group's sub-tasks, and now are incorporated as - actually in the recommendation, Chuck's suggestion was to include an introductory paragraph at each of the sections.

So for instance at 2.1, Participation Rules and Operating Procedures, there would be text immediately following that, which would be a brief introduction of that section of recommendations. And, I was asking for some guidance of what we could put in that introductory paragraph.

Chuck Gomes: Let me explain my thinking here. As I was going through this document, I noticed that we jump right in - in each case - in 2, 2.1, and 2.2, and so on without any transition. All I'm looking at was just - all I was suggesting was some sort of transition other than - another way to handle that too, Julie, that I'm just thinking of right now. Instead of an intro - a brief intro -- and I really am talking brief, a couple sentences probably -- for each one of the categories of recommendations - the tasks that we call them, right. Sub-tasks I mean. You could actually do an intro between 2 and 2.1 that outlines the categories of recommendations. And again, I'm just talking about a paragraph or so.

And then, maybe you don't need the individual recommendations. You follow me?

Julie Hedlund: Chuck, this is Julie. That makes sense to me. I don't know what others think.

Chuck Gomes: All right. What really jumped out at me when I got down - I think it was the 2.3, and we jumped - and we - let's see. Let me get to that point, just a second. You know, the group membership database, and I - because I know you know that was one of - that was Sub-Task 3, I knew why we were doing that. Somebody totally knew looking at this document - you know, it just jumps in talking about database architecture and there was no transition, okay.

So, that's the point I'm talking about. All I'm talking about is to make it easy for the readers who are not familiar with our group, which will be most of them, to - so it flows easily. That's all.

Julie Hedlund: Chuck, this is Julie. Thanks for that explanation. I actually - for myself, and I'm interested to hear what others think, too. I think maybe perhaps that it might be useful to have both a very brief introduction right after the recommendation -- that is the sub-header to Recommendations -- that talks about what the three areas are. And then maybe as you say, also one to two sentences after each of those - the following sub-headers like after 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.

Because, I think that if you do both, as you get to say 2.2 and 2.3, you probably do need -- as you point out -- a little something to say okay, these recommendations - this area has to do with you know, this, or whatever. You know, just a brief transition.

Chuck Gomes: Right. That sounds really good to me. And then this was my idea, but I'd welcome feedback from others.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I think it's a good idea what Julie proposed recently, that first some paragraphs explaining the whole recommendation issue, and then smaller paragraph after 2.1, 2.2, 2.3. I think that will be more clear.

And someone wants to talk, and I couldn't hear the name.

Maybe I was - someone want to talk about this? Any comment?

(Michael):   I move support of it. Personally, I think that's a good - I like the format that Chuck and Julie suggested. So, I'm comfortable with that, and I think it'll read well.

I only think it's good to give you know, two or three lines of very minimal orientation, get to the point of the argument and then build in more detail. Because then you know, some people are familiar with the entire you know area, and the recommendations are going to make sense to them right out of the gate. They don't need to do any further reading.

But for those that want more background and more material, they can jump past the bulleted recommendations and go into a little bit more detail. So, I think that works.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Michael). Any other comments?

Okay, great.

Chuck Gomes: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I have a suggestion to make - to throw out for consideration so that we don't get too bogged down in the same edits over and over again, and we get like we did on the Wiki to so many edits that it becomes (untenable) for us. If it's possible today, if we could go through the edits I suggested and make sure we're in agreement. A large percentage of them are just editorial, which probably we can just skip right over, I think, unless somebody sees a problem with them.

But if we could do that, then we could accept those edits and create a clean document that others can add their edits to and it becomes less confusing, if we can do that. That's just my suggestion. I can go either - whatever way the group wants to do.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a good suggestion. What do others think?

Man: I agree.

Man: Agree.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. So thank you Chuck for the idea. And so, about the paragraph explaining and all that, we agreed. And so, Julie, you get that. So, you will include it in the new version of the document, right?

Julie Hedlund: Right. Olga, this is Julie. So what I'll do is after today's meeting, I will draft and insert those paragraphs, and then also of course incorporate any of the changes that we agree to today and send them over (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. That's great. Okay.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio. Go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: Just following up on Chuck's last point. If we had additional comments along the way, should we add those in now, or do you want to just sort of stick on going through Chuck's comments?

Olga Cavalli: Let's go through the document, and if you have something to add, just do Claudio. We're revising this new version of the document. So, Chuck made some comments and edits, but maybe - I don't know if we'll do other things. But if you have some comments to say, just use the - we have the call for this.

Chuck Gomes: And just to follow-up on my thing Claudio, because you raised a good point, and I'm fine with what you're suggesting, too. But as we go through, let's indicate to Julie which - you know, if there are changes that can be accepted, let's accept them so that the next version she creates, we don't look at those same changes again.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: The new ones, absolutely (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck. Thank you, Claudio. Any other comments?

I'm starting now in Point 2, Recommendations. The comment about paragraph explaining it, it's already done. Claudio, any other - have any other comment about this section? We already agreed in the content of this section a while ago. Chuck has included some edits, but just the formatting edits, which I think are good.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. Actually, the paragraph above the recommendations, the first sentence in that paragraph that states the concept of stakeholder groups had not yet been introduced in the initial set of recommendations. That was a section I had a question on, because I thought that that was part of the initial - I took a look at the - on the GNSO Improvements Web page, and it seemed like the concept of stakeholder group structure was introduced in the draft BGC report, and it was also listed in some of the preliminary questions that they had put out before they put out their draft report.

And so, I'm either suggesting we clarify - you know, I either get clarification on that, or we just strike that sentence, because I'm not sure that's correct the way it's (printed) out.

Olga Cavalli: Which sentence are you talking about, Claudio?

Chuck Gomes: He's talking about the paragraph that says when the BGC working group made its initial recommendations. It's just the last paragraph before Section 2.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And Claudio, you're correct that they did indicate that there was going to be - you know, that they were looking at this concept of stakeholder

groups and so forth, but it hadn't been implemented yet, and the whole idea of the GNSO structure hadn't been dealt with yet.

So in their actual recommendation, everything they recommended related to just constituencies. And what we're trying to say here is, is - and maybe we can clean it up a little bit to deal with your concern. I don't know. But, their actual recommendations always said constituencies; didn't say stakeholder groups. And when we started our work, all of the sudden now we have not just constituencies but stakeholder groups.

You're right. They did anticipate that, but in their actual recommendations, they didn't use stakeholder group, and the purpose of this paragraph is to say hay, the recommendations say constituencies, but we're apply them to stakeholder groups too, because those have now been implemented. Does that make sense?

Claudio DiGangi: It did. Yes, that does make sense. I just had a different recollection. I actually recalled the term stakeholder group being used in their...

Chuck Gomes: It was. No, I was agreeing with you. It was, but in their - not in the precise recommendations that they stated. It was in their document, yes. But when they said, "We recommend that there be - that participation rules and operation procedures," you know, there'd be some common elements of those and so forth. They always used just the word constituency in those - in the specific recommendations.

And consequently when we first started our group, you'll recall if you were involved then, that we were just using the word constituency as well, because that's specific the way the recommendation was worded.

Claudio DiGangi: I see what you're saying. Okay. That's fine. I understand your point.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio (unintelligible)...

Julie Hedlund: This is Julia. I'd like to just make a suggestion. I understand what you're saying Claudio, and perhaps a better way to say it is that we could simply say when the BGC workgroup made its initial recommendation, they applied only to constituencies. Since then, stakeholder groups have become an essential element to the GNSO Council along with constituencies, and - you know, I mean and then so on. I mean, I just wonder if we could just rewrite that first sentence.

Because you're correct; the concept is there, it's just that that concept had not been implemented in the structure. And maybe, that's the part that's confusing.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Instead of saying introduced, we probably should say had not yet been implemented, because he's right. They did introduce the idea of stakeholder groups in their document, but they didn't use it in their specific recommendations.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So, if we changed introduced to implemented, that might cover it.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. That's a good idea.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. If I may, I would like to make a suggestion. Why don't we use this paragraph as a footnote for the first sentence of 2.1.1, when it

says, "All stakeholder groups/constituencies, and in paragraphs herein after called groups," maybe there we can add a footnote with this paragraph?

Julie Hedlund: I don't know. This is Julie. I guess - and I'm not you know part of this work team, but my initial thought with that is that people probably aren't going to - they may not be as likely to pay attention to a footnote. And, I just - I wouldn't want someone to wonder why you know - who might be familiar with the BGC work group report, you know why these would be applied to stakeholder groups and constituencies. I don't know, you might want to call that out more prominently. But obviously, I'll defer to the work team.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Just an idea, so, are we okay leaving the paragraph with the changes proposed?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great.

Julie Hedlund: And Olga, this is Julie. I've captured the change. And so, the word introduced at the end of the first sentence has been changed to implemented.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Julie. Okay. About 2.1, the text - agreed by this working team and reviewed by the team. Any comments, apart from the edits made by Chuck, which are (unintelligible) edit, on revising the (unintelligible)?

Do you have a comment Chuck, in 2.1.3? Let me review it. It says - does this necessarily have to be in the bylaws of charter, as long as they are (public deposed it). You're referring to...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Olga. And what I - I don't know if people got my - the basis of what I was getting at there. If we require them to be in the bylaws or charters, it becomes much harder to change them if they need to be changed, because the bylaws and the charters have to be approved by the Board.

So what I was thinking there is, is that really important to us? And, I'm honestly asking the question for the group to answer. If not, keep in mind one of the general things that the GNSO is trying to do with regard to procedures is to not have so many things in the bylaws -- the PDP in particular -- because those are very hard to change. We've got to get an amendment to the bylaws. We've got to get Board approval, et cetera.

By wording - the way this is worded here, we're saying that the - these things have to be in their - in the bylaws or charter of the particular constituency or stakeholder group. For example, I don't think the registry stakeholder group in our charter, we have those in there right now, but we do have procedures. So all I'm getting at, if we require them to be in the bylaws and the charters of the stakeholder groups and constituencies, then keep in mind those have to be approved by the Board; and therefore, any changes need to have to be approved by the Board and it makes the process less flexible going forward.

I am totally supportive of these kind of things being spelled out and being publically available for all of the group membership. But, I'm just

questioning whether we really want them in the bylaws, and whether - it's okay if they have them there, but I don't think we should require that.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck, this is Olga. Maybe a more general word. Do you have a suggestion if the - just instead of bylaws or charter?

Chuck Gomes: Well, we could say all groups should establish and publish a consensus building model or process that is publically available to their membership and the community.

Olga Cavalli: Comments?

Claudio DiGangi: I'm okay with that, Olga. This is Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Other comments?

Debra Hughes: This is Debbie. I agree as well.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, me too.

(Michael): It's (Michael). I agree as well.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Michael). So, hearing no objections - Julie, did you get the new wording suggested by Chuck?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie. Actually I got it, and that applies in two areas, so - in the first instance earlier in B, we have after process model or processes publically available to their membership and the community. And then further down also, it says whatever consensus building or

process a group used, the group must describe the process and - and I would say and ensure that it is -- let's see what we want to say -- and ensure that it is publically available to their membership and the community so it's visible and transparent.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And, feel free to use better wording than I suggested. You have the concept I think, so...

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So, this point is done. Any comments to 2.1? No comments from Chuck. Any comments from group?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I should point out that what I tried to do for 2.2.1 Term Limits, is as we discussed in the last meeting is to break that up into three separate paragraphs, because of the fact that we were dealing with - well, just to avoid confusion and because we're dealing with the Executive Committee members differently than the Officers and the Councilors. So you'll see that three separate paragraphs, each with similar wording.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Julie. Good idea.

Julie Hedlund: Also, I should note the Tony has gotten off the call. The operator tried to get back to him, but hasn't been able to reach him. I don't know if he'll rejoin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Julie. Any comments to 2.2.1?

Chuck Gomes: Don't think so?

Olga Cavalli: Hearing none - okay, 2.2.2, Executive Committees, then we have
                  Committees. We have a comment from Chuck in 2.2.3, it's to the Point
                  E. It says it recommended constituencies publish to the group
                  membership, and going forward. And, Chuck is asking publish what?
                  And...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. This sentence didn't make sense to me. It is recommended
                  constituencies publish to the group membership, and going forward
                  maintain...

Olga Cavalli: Going forward and maintain...

Chuck Gomes: Publish what? I'm not clear. There's something missing, or I'm missing
                  something.

Olga Cavalli: Maybe in so many edits, the problem is having all the edits and all the
                  changes in the same page sometimes.

Julie Hedlund: Actually -- this is Julie -- I think it's just awkwardly worded, and perhaps
                  we can change it. The subject is a list of all active and inactive
                  committees and their final decisions, resolutions, and final work
                  products. I think what's confusing is the fact that the subject is at the
                  end of the sentence. You know...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I wondered if that was what it was supposed - in other words...

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I know. What are they publishing? You asked the question what is
                  published; the published is a list of all active and inactive committees

and their final decisions, resolutions, and work products. So, this needs to be reworded.

(Michael): Julie, should it just read it is recommended constituencies publish the group membership? If you drop the (to), the sentence all the sudden makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: Well, it sounds like it's more than the group membership, then, and that's what I getting at, (Michael).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes. It's also publishing the membership of the committees too, right? And who's active and inactive on committees. Is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. What the subject - what's being published is a list of all active and inactive committees and their final decisions, resolutions, and final work products. And...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: But - and, I think you've picked this up elsewhere Chuck, is that in some cases we say it is recommended, but these are all recommendations. So, we don't really need to say it is recommended. We could just - we just need to say - and I also notice here too, this should be groups, not constituencies, so got a couple of errors in this one.

So, this will probably read groups - yes, groups should - groups shall maintain a list of all active and inactive committees in their final

decisions, resolutions, and final work products, and publish this list to the group's membership going forward.

(Michael): Julie, I think you can actually - have you - changing three words I think fixes the sentence likely. If you switch constituencies to groups -- as you said -- and drop the word to after publish, and then drop maintain, and then read it that way. All the sudden, it makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: And, we delete the it is recommended, right?

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: But, I think that - but (Michael), maybe I'm wrong here, but if we take out maintain, then we lose the requirement that they maintain the list going forward.

(Michael): Well, that's implicit if they have to publish it. So, you just basically...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's right.

(Michael): Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So, wouldn't it say groups shall publish to the group membership a list of all active and inactive committees and their final decisions, resolutions, and final work products.

(Michael):   Exactly. That's what I was getting at, Chuck.

Julie Hedlund: I see. But what about the going forward aspect, because I remember
                 we discussed that fairly extensively that we didn't want to you know,
                 somehow go ahead and - we didn't want them to have to feel that they
                 had to capture all previous active and inactive committee members.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Put the word current in. Groups shall publish to the group membership
                 a current list of all active and inactive committees and their final
                 decisions, resolutions, and final work products. I guess we also wanted
                 a historical record going forward, didn't we? But not going backwards.

(Michael):   Chuck, if you start the sentence with going forward, groups shall - then
                 you're okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Thanks. That's good.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Great. I've got that.

Chuck Gomes: And Olga, I'm going to - you'll see some comments later. Julie rightly
                 pointed out that I started realizing that in some cases we say - notice
                 that in 2.2.3A, we say groups shall. In E, we say it is recommended, so
                 it's kind of like A is a must and E is a do it if you want kind of thing, and
                 I don't think that was our intent.

Olga Cavalli: No.

Chuck Gomes: You say in the beginning of the major sections we're in that these are recommendations okay, so we don't need to repeat that anywhere now.

Olga Cavalli: No.

Chuck Gomes: The OFC will decide whether they approve them and forward them on, and ultimately the Council will decide. But ultimately, they're going to be, I think in most cases shalls rather than shoulds, or it is recommended.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, can I get in the queue on that?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Claudio, go ahead, please.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I agree that - I think the terms, because of sort of the framework how we're presenting this, they're interchangeable. I had basically suggested that we use the word should just because I had looked at some of the other GNSO improvements work products that had been approved, and it looked like - just to keep it consistent with those, it looked like the language there was using should throughout. And so, I had just suggested that. I think in a way it makes it a little easier to digest when you're reading it. And just sort of the tone of the document I think is just - you know, it just sort of easier to take in sort of the recommendations that way.

So, that was basically my suggestion just to use should throughout, and it wouldn't - you know, my intention was not that it would really have any effect on one requirement being mandatory or not, but just sort of to keep it uniform.

Chuck Gomes: In the - Claudio, in - I think that some of the other documents refer to using - at least some other GNSO documents sometimes refer to the definitions of shall and should in as used I think in the IATF, and there is a difference.

(Michael):   Yes, there's a big difference. Shall is must - is mandatory and required for conformance or compliance. Shall is highly recommended but not a necessity.

Claudio DiGangi: So, that's...

Chuck Gomes: That was should.

(Michael):   Sorry. Should. I meant to say should. Thanks, Chuck.

Claudio DiGangi: So, that's when they actually defined the terms themselves within the document?

(Michael):   Yes.

Claudio DiGangi: Okay. Yes. Because - yes - no, I guess it's - sure, if you define them out. I mean, I was thinking we really just wanted to - we really wouldn't define it. When I looked back at the BGC report, and they don't use like shall or must in any point in their recommendations. So, I was sort of just trying to mirror that a little bit as well.

Chuck Gomes: Well, we should decide as a group whether we think that - you know, I'm assuming that we're putting these - the things we finally agreed on were things that we expected all constituencies and stakeholder

groups to follow unless we state otherwise. Like, we could use a should in some cases if we want to make it optional.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Chuck, I mean I just want to spend - and just - and I know this is sort of out of my place, but I think we have used in this document may - the word may when we have wanted to indicate that something is optional, and shall when we want to indicate that something is required. So, changing shall to should would not be consistent with some of the other language we - I think.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Claudio DiGangi: Well, I guess - I don't recall - I thought we were sort of recommending you know, all of these elements. I didn't really recall that - like for example if we look at you know, 2.2 3B, it shays should. To me, that - you know, the intention there was that rule would be followed just along with our other recommendations.

Chuck Gomes: In the use of the word should in the community more broadly though, should is somewhat option, whereas shall is not. So, there's a distinct difference in the meaning that we need to - and if we mean should, or may, that's okay. We can agree to say that. But if it is an expectation that this is something that constituencies and stakeholder groups would be required to follow, then we should say shall or must, or one of those words.

Keep in mind, we're - you're right Claudio. We are making these recommendations as we're recommending that here's the things that

are going to be required. Here's the things that are going to be optional. We can decide whether we want them to be optional or required. The Board is wanting some consistency in some areas across constituencies and stakeholder groups. And so in some areas, I think they're going to need to be shall; otherwise, we're going to be right back where we started, where everybody has the option to do these things or not. And, that's what they were trying to move away from.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I understand that. I mean, it's a fair point what you're saying, and I guess I'm just looking back to the BGC report, and there were clearly things in there that were - I think where I guess in Board's view essential elements, and they just - they didn't use those terms. And, I guess - so, that's just sort of what I'm struggling a little bit. It's just sort of the necessity to use the term. But, I hear your point. So, I'm open to you know, what others on the work team think.

Olga Cavalli: Other comments? I'm not an amazing speaker of English, and I find a big difference between shall and should, or may. I think one is mandatory and the other one is more soft. So, I think it's not the same language, and we should be clear in that.

Julie, I don't know if this is the correct question, but what about other documents that OSC has been reviewing? Do you remember some maybe more frequent usage of shall or should, or may, or something that you may recall? I know comparing documents may not help, but just a reference.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Actually, there's been only two outcomes from the work teams that have been approved thus far. One is the Toolkit of

Services, the subtask (four). I'll have to look back at that. But, I - as that was directed to staff, I don't remember if it was shall or should, but I think it was fairly clear that those things should be done. So, it was a little bit different in format from this document.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I know.

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible) was just approved this week is -- by the Council -- was the (CCT) report. And, that also is a little bit of a different type of document. It's not directing necessarily for constituencies or stakeholder groups to take certain actions. It's again, a different sort of recommendation. So, I'm not sure - and Chuck correct me if I'm wrong. I know you're familiar with these as well, if there's a direct comparison here.

But, I will add also that Claudio has pointed out something very important, and that is that we have not - I'm just glancing at this Section 2.2.3. I don't think we've been consistent here and elsewhere in our use of should and shall. I mean, in that - say 2.2.3A, we have groups shall adopt a standard set of rules, and then in the second sentence we say it should be published. And then as Claudio has pointed out, we say formation of all committees should be made known and should be open.

So, I think two things would help me in guidance from this work team is do we want to consistently keep the word you know shall, which from my understanding as an English Major, means it shall be done, as opposed to should, which from my understanding is it may be done. And I think that's a very important distinction, and we may need to ensure that if we make that change, that all others on the work team

understand that we're making that change. Because, I think it does change the way this document is perceived.

Chuck Gomes: But Julie, first of with regard to comparison to the other three sets of recommendations that have been put forward, they are different. Because like for example, the Web site improvements, it's more of a hey, here's what we'd like to have and if we can pull it off technically and within budget and so forth, let's do it. So, we would really like this to happen.

The same thing with the Toolkit of Services. We made a lot of recommendations, but we qualified it and we said if budget allows, and things like that. So, here's our dream list, and if we can do these things it'll really help. But, we understand there are other factors that come into play. So, they are kind of different.

Here, we're dealing with operating principals of constituencies and stakeholders group. So my recommendation - and it is a different situation. Now, these still have to be approved by the OSC and then by the Council as a whole. So, we may approve something as a shall, and maybe higher up it's approved as a should. That's a possibility.

My suggestion -- but this is for the group to decide, not me -- is that we use shall unless we specifically decide otherwise. And there may be instances where we think it's okay for it to be more optional, but I would suggest as a - to make it easy going forward, is that we change them all to shall unless we specifically decide that. Now when you make those changes in the next iteration, it'd be good that those are highlighted so that we can consciously agree or disagree to use shall.

Rafik Dammak: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Who was that?

Rafik Dammak: Rafik.

Olga Cavalli: Rafik, go ahead, please.

Rafik Dammak: You know, I am just following this discussion about shall, should, must. It's -- how to say -- my (technical) background - as Chuck said about other documents, they are more requirement and specification documents, so easily where you use word like must or - and it's some words with different level of obligation to which more mandatory requirements or optional requirement. So, maybe if we used (unintelligible) environments, we can at the beginning like an (NFC) paragraph to describe what is the difference between shall, must, and have or should, et cetera, so it can make more sense.

That can be helpful, but I'm not sure that if everybody agree. And so, we can say to the (unintelligible) shall in all the document and -- as Chuck said, he said we can change to should when it can be (unintelligible) to work to everybody.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's a good suggestion. So at the beginning, somewhere earlier on we actually suggest - and that is done in some GNSO documents sometimes, where they actually refer to the (IATF) definitions, and we state up front that that's the way we're going to use these intentionally. That's helpful.

Olga Cavalli: I think we're -- this is Olga -- I think it's a good suggestion, but I still have the doubt if we have to use the shall and should (in the way) we think it's more appropriate, and so we should revise every shall and should that we have used. Does that - I think it's a big difference saying shall or should, and we should be sure about it. I don't know if...

Chuck Gomes: Agreed.

Olga Cavalli: ...if there's - so, I'm trying think about how to do this.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I just suggested a way, Olga. And what I suggested is, is that Julie change all of the shoulds to shalls, but keep it highlighted so that as we continue to go through this document, then we can specifically see - okay, this was changed to shall. Are we okay with that?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Claudio, are you - what do you think about that?

Claudio DiGangi: Again, I understand - you know, I see both - I see the point being expressed. I mean - and I understand there is a definitional difference in terms, literally speaking. I think in the policy context, I think I can be implied at a (unintelligible). Again, I'm referring to like the Board of Governance Committee report, that I don't think ever have used shall or must throughout any of the document. But, it was probably clear that those were things they felt needed to be implemented.

My other comment or sort of question was because I know one of the other documents was the GNSO working group model, where they were tasked with implementing how the GNSO Council would implement a working group model. And, I think that might be a little bit similar to our tasks of...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. True.

Claudio DiGangi: And, that one I think again does not use shall or must. I think it uses should throughout. I think it just makes it a little easier to digest when you're reading a document and it says shall and must throughout. I just - I don't know, it almost comes across a little presumptuous that here are the rules that must be this way.

Again, I'm not trying to change - I know because we've spent a lot of time on the language, and I'm not trying to change any of the language that we agreed to. I just thought that if we used should throughout consistently, we could still get the point across that you know, we want all these to be followed. We're not picking and choosing certain ones over the other. This how we think things should be, and...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Claudio -- this is Julia -- I really do need to point out that the GNSO working group is guidelines, so guidelines are not going to be a shall or must type of thing. They're guidelines that you know, people can choose to operate by. And, I really - and this maybe not be my place to say, but I really think that if we leave these as shoulds, then - I mean, I think that there are other team members who may have concerns about that.

So, I think - I guess from my point of view, the guidance to me as staff, the suggestion to have these shown as shall, and have the shoulds changed to shall you know, will make it you know clearer that we can decide is that what we accept or not. Alternatively, we could change all the shalls to should. But either way, we need to highlight you know what we're doing.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I agree those are guidelines, but I mean I looked at it that they needed to implement the Board of Governance Committee's recommendations in terms of a working group model, and that's very similar to us implementing their recommendations for constituency operations. I'm not sure I see really the big difference there between our tasks.

Chuck Gomes: Well, the Board has recommended clearly that there should be some areas of commonality between - across constituencies and stakeholder groups. If we say should in all cases, we have essentially -- using the words precisely defined -- given each constituency and stakeholder group the option to do these things or not. And if we do that, then we have not fulfilled the Board's recommendation.

Claudio DiGangi: Well, I think...

Chuck Gomes: Now, we do have elements in our report that are going to be should instead of shall. We've clarified that in using other language. So - but, there are certain areas you know, where I think we've come to agreement; yes, this is an appropriate requirement for a constituency and a stakeholder group. And in cases where we thought there should be more flexibility, we have not said that. That's why we've had a lot of our disagreements.

Claudio DiGangi: Couldn't we say up front all groups shall implement these - you know, implement the following, and just put something up front where the shalls is up front?

Chuck Gomes: We can, but then we're creating confusion down below where we mix the - where we use different words. Why would we want to do that?

Claudio DiGangi: Okay. All right. No. Again, to me it was just - a part of it was just sort of a presentation issue, and - but again how you said, I'm not going to quibble over it at this point, so...

Julie Hedlund: This is Julia. I really apologize, but I do have to go on another call that I'm leading. I think I've understood the directions here clearly...

Olga Cavalli: Julie, - let me summarize so we can let Julie go, and then we have to finish the call by the way. So, thank you Claudio and Chuck for the reflection. I think it's an interesting discussion. And, I'm not sure about it, but maybe we can have - let's do the following. Let's change this to the shall and highlight it, and we revise it. Maybe in the week, we all take the time to revise the highlighted shalls. Is this okay? Is this a (unintelligible)?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And Julie what you're going to do, is you're going to create a new version of this, Version 2 or whatever we want to call it, that we'll accept the edits that are okay, and the highlight the new changes that we've made, including the should to shall and so forth.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you, Julie. And we came to a finish of our call. And Julie will send a new version. I encourage the members of the group to revise the document and include the comments like Chuck did so we

might find the - find our last version for - hopefully before June 1, which is the date that we have a compromise to submit to the OSC.

So, I encourage you to review it. I think it has a very good structure. It has the three main parts, then there is the minority recommendations, which is Point 3, and then it has an Annex, an Appendix with all the detailed analysis, which I think is very interesting to have, but as a separate part. So, if someone wants to review just the recommendations, goes to Point 2, and to see the background (and its selection), go to Point 1.

So, this is my proposal during the week. I won't be able to lead the next call. (Michael) has been so kind to say that he has the time to do that, so I may send comments and suggestions in the list, and we keep in touch on line. Any other comment?

(Michael):   Olga, just to let everyone know, I've built next week's agenda specifically around the progress that people make on their comments over the next few days, if that's alright with everyone.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. If you can - yes, and you save the document and review if there are new comments, and keep on accepting them. And, if it's - just also start to think about if you have minority reports to send and to be included in the document. That would be helpful. So, we can include them in the Part 3.

(Michael):   I think one of the things we're going to have to do if people can mull this over, and we can talk about it next week and confirm it, but we had feedback from the OSG that the original minority reports were on the

previous documents were (unintelligible). So, maybe we should put some guidelines around succinctness and - like (a) minority report.

Because last time, (remember) the minority reports exceeded the body of the actual recommendation.

Olga Cavalli: I know. I know.

(Michael):   Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, the OSC was quite (surprised). Also, maybe then we can have ten minutes for comment of the evolution of Task 2, and some feedback from the group, as we are not having a special conference call for sub-working team - the Task 2.

Any comments?

Debra Hughes: Yes, and if anybody could -- this is Debbie -- if anybody could just shoot whatever comments they had on that (high pressure) document, I - high level document I had before, you know like Thursday or so, I can combine all those comments and get those out to everybody. I'm working with Julie so that we could have that for the call.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Debbie. That will be very important. If you can review it, it's an excellent document. Very concise. Very easy to read. Thank you, Debbie, for that. And...

Chuck Gomes: And Olga, one suggestion before Debbie before we close.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Way back at the beginning of the DNSO, the predecessor of the GNSO, there were like five or six working groups created. They weren't working groups on the same template we know today. I don't even remember if they were called working groups. But there was one of them that was on outreach.

Debra Hughes: Oh, okay.

Chuck Gomes: And so what you might - you might send an email to - if you can't find it in the DNSO archive, I think it was Working Group E, or something like that. The - you might ask Julie if you can't find it to look that up, and you might want to get the report from that working group, because it might have some elements that are helpful. That was a long time ago. I mean, we're talking like 2000 or so, when this happened, so.

Debra Hughes: Okay. No, that's great. Thank you so much.

Olga Cavalli: Glen is on the call still? Or, maybe you can send an email also to Glen...

Debra Hughes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...and she can help you.

Debra Hughes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck, for the comment. Very useful.

                So, have a nice weekend people and we keep in touch.

Claudio DiGangi: Thank you.

(Michael):   Thanks, Olga.

Rafik Dammak: Have a nice weekend.

Olga Cavalli: Bye bye.

Coordinator: (Hi there), (Clarice). Hello there...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery: (Louise), (Louise)...

Coordinator: Can you hear me?

Glen de Saint Gery: ...just, yes, (Louise), just before you go off -- is there something particular with the Argentinean lines, or...

Coordinator: I don't - to be honest, off the top of my head, I don't know. So, I'm going to have to go and have a (word) with (Nicola) about it. Because the thing is when he - originally when I pulled him off the call because of his echo, I said - I advised him I'll call him back. So, I took his telephone number and tried to call him back. The first time I called him back it took around two times to connect - to get his line to connect. I connected with him. It was fine. He had no echo on his line that time when he joined.

Then his line dropped, so I called him back. It took ages then to get a hold of him. It took around four to five attempts to get a hold of him to get a line. Finally managed to get a hold of him. He had quite a bad echo on his line, so I said, "Can you mute your phone?" And, he just advised he wanted to leave it. He wanted to leave the call.

Glen de Saint Gery: Oh. I see. Okay.

Coordinator: So, I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery: It's a bit of a -- yes. I don't know. Because, it's a bit of a problem because he is complaining bitterly that he can't contribute properly to the group because of the telephone connection.

Coordinator: Yes. Sure. I understand that.

Glen de Saint Gery: And that he gets cut off, you see. So, he did mention that he had an echo on his line, and you know, that you realized it. And then, he said the operator called him and he got cut off, and he got cut off again, and...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery: So, I just wondered if it was a general thing for Argentina, or if it was you know, just his line?

Coordinator: I can certainly look into it for you. I can get (Nicola) to give you an update about it.

Glen de Saint Gery: Please do.

Coordinator: Because generally, it's fine. Like with Olga's line. As soon as I called her back, her echo disappeared. So, it's (generally) when we call them back...

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: ...it tends to get rid of the problem. So, I don't know if it's just the Argentinean lines causing the problem. So, I'll speak to (Nicola) about it and I'll get her to get in touch with you, Glenn. Okay.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay. Thanks ever so much, (Louise). Thank you.

Coordinator: Okay.

Woman: (Louise)?

Coordinator: Hello there.

Woman: Sorry about that. (Louise), just to say I'm actually following-up with the person who's always told us to contact her. We've got a new problems -- (Maria Huckle). I'm not sure she's actually in the office because she's had travel problems, and (Michele)...

Coordinator: She's actually in Argentina, actually. (Maria) herself.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes. And, you - now can't you ask her, because she should know.

Coordinator: Yes. She would be the best person to ask. Of course, she'd know. We'll try and get hold of her.

Gisella Gruber-White: Hello. Excuse me. Hello?

Woman: (Louise)?

Gisella Gruber-White: Hello.

Coordinator: Hi. I'm still here. Gisella, go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry. Can you actually hear me?

Coordinator: Okay, yes. I can hear you.

Gisella Gruber-White: So, it's (Maria Huckle) has been copied in. (Michelle Sweet) who's part of the Customer Relations as well, as well as (Nicola) on the usual email, and I'll just bring up the problem. If you could just maybe give me the number that you dialed Tony Harris back on, which I'm going to put in the email...

Coordinator: Sure.

Gisella Gruber-White: ...and what we probably have - is follow-up with a test call by the Verizon guys - the techy guys to check on the line to see if there's anything we can do. And, I'll keep Tony Harris in the loop, but only once I've heard back from the Customer Relations service. What number did you call him on?

Coordinator: Okay. His number was +5411-4326-0777.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay. No problem. I'll just put that in the email so that they know which - what the line that was causing trouble. And, I'll also mention that Olga's line was causing trouble, but once she dialed back, actually hers was fine.

Coordinator: Yes. That's happened a few times. I've run a few of these calls now. But I think this week actually, we've had to dial back out to Olga, because she always dials in, and she always has an echo. But, I think she's aware. I think she knows that it's from her end, because she says it's her office phone, and that she's called the phone company. And then she said that they were going to sort it, but they haven't.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay.

Coordinator: So, I think Olga can - for the time being, she can be a permanent dial out if this needs be, to stop the echo.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay. What I'm going to do is I'm going to send you an email just to - in separate email just to her saying to give me her number please, and what we'll do is we'll dial out to her for these Friday calls, and - when she confirms her participation. And we will do that to Tony as well. But, I just think that it may be worth looking into the line.

Coordinator: Sure. Okay. That's no problem at all.

Okay, well I'll go and let (Nicola) know, and hopefully you should hear back from (Maria) or (Nicola) today.

Woman: Okay.

Coordinator: Okay.

Woman: Glenn, (unintelligible)?

                Olga?

Coordinator: Glenn's line is still showing. Is there a need for (unintelligible)?

Glen de Saint Gery: (Unintelligible) I put it down. Olga's off.

Woman: No. That's fine. I just wanted you to know if you were okay with what I've just said to (Louise)?

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes. No, that's absolutely wonderful. Thanks very much. Because unfortunately, we have to do something about Tony. But you know, it's also a problem that has been going on for about nine years anyway, so...

Woman: Well, what we'll - we're actually going to document it and we'll send him and email, and we'll get this (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...or do the test runs, and that's about it.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes. I think that's what we must do with this. Okay.

Woman: Okay. Glad...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery: Thanks. Bye.

Woman: Thanks. Please enjoy your week...

Glen de Saint Gery: You too.

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: Bye-bye.

Glen de Saint Gery: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

                        END