

ICANN Geographic Regions Drafting Group Teleconference

TRANSCRIPTION

Monday 25 August 2008 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Geographic Regions drafting group teleconference on 25 August 2008, at 14:00 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-geo-regions-20080825.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Participants present::

Olga Cavalli - Group Leader - NomCom appointee
Chuck Gomes - Registry c. Council vice chair
Philip Sheppard - CBUC
Tony Harris - ISP
Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

Absent- apologies
Ken Stubbs - Registry c.

Staff:

Rob Hoggarth
Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: This is the operator. At this time this call is being recorded and you may begin.

(Olga): Okay thank you very much. Thank you Glen. Good morning. Good morning for Argentina and for the States to everyone. And for Glen it's afternoon and (Phillip) it's also afternoon. How are you? Glen, could you do roll call for us please?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, thank you (Olga). We've got yourself, (Chuck Gomes, (Phillip Sheppard), (Tony Harris), (Rob Hoggarth and (MySelf). Have I missed anybody?

(Olga): Okay great. Thank you Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Well hello?

(Olga): Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay?

(Olga): Okay, before we start I would like to ask you something the next Monday it's a holiday. We want to think about perhaps moving the day to (unintelligible) want to change it or keep it in the States? And that we should think about if we are going to make another meeting next week if we need it.

Philip Sheppard: Okay it - (Olga) I would be hopeful that we can almost complete our work today and do the rest by email.

(Olga): I totally agree. I totally agree. I just wanted to raise the issue because maybe I forget. I have it in my to do list here. I totally agree with you (Phillip) that we are quite done with the documents but just we should

keep this in mind.

What I did ask for our call is that I changed the document, the draft document, and I put all the principles and placements under one document that I take it - I already sent it to (Rob). He made some changes and he added some introductory text.

And then I rephrased it again and sent it to the list on Friday evening I think or Saturday morning.

(Tony Harris): (Olga), this would be something you sent on the 23rd then?

(Olga): Sorry (Tony).

(Tony Harris): You sent this on the 23rd of August right, just to make sure I have the right document open.

(Olga): Yes, it was one document I sent after exchanging some ideas with (Rob). And then (Chuck) sent a document like two days ago (Chuck)?

Chuck Gomes: Yesterday.

(Olga): Yesterday, you're right, with some changes which I think they are quite good and then this morning, early morning I did for me, (Phillip) sent another document. I really had no time - I had time to review (Chuck)'s changes but I had no time to review (Phillip)'s document. And I had no time to compare because it's not changes over the previous document. It's a new document which I think it has the same - kind of the same content.

Philip Sheppard: Yes and (Olga)?

(Olga): Yes?

Philip Sheppard: I could also speak for it. What I did was took your document with (Chuck)'s edits and just really did a, you know, a final revision on that taking out areas of repetition, turning statements into principles and making that classification between the two types of principles.

So I was not introducing any new materials, just hoping that the phrasing was clearer than what we got to with the other ones. Now we've seen that first useful grouping you did of all our principles together.

Chuck Gomes: And (Olga), this is (Chuck). I'd like to suggest that if there's agreement by others that we use (Phillip)'s version as the takeoff point for our discussion this morning because I think he did a really nice job of organizing it. And it will allow us to I think proceed more quickly.

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

(Olga): I totally agree with you (Chuck). But I must confess that I didn't go in deep comparing all the two versions, the one that you modified that we prepared with (Phillip). I agree that he did a nice job.

So if we all agree we could use (Phillip)'s document for discussion today. If there's anybody wants to say something about this?

Philip Sheppard: It's okay. I found it. It sounds reasonable to me.

(Tim): Yes. I agree. This is (Tim).

(Olga): Okay (Tim), how are you?

(Tim): Good.

(Olga): Have that document (Tim)?

(Tim): Yes I do.

(Olga): Okay. So let's - and - so if we all agree let's go - do you think we go reading it sentence by sentence? It's not that long a document. I think we can review it in (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I think that's a good idea because like you said, some people haven't had a chance to look at it.

(Olga): No. I must confess, I look at it. I thought it looked good but I didn't go through it in deep. So I would start from - well we all agree and the title, we like it. The title, we want some changes? No, it's the title just for working, sorry.

We have introduction which is A, this text was prepared by (Rob).
Thank you (Rob) for this contribution.

This I checked and it's in (Chuck)'s document. And the text suggested by (Rob) is the same. And it's the same that (Phillip) included. So I think we can - you want me to read it or we can just accept it like it is?

Chuck Gomes: You don't need to read it but I do have a comment (Olga).

(Olga): Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: And it's not so much about the wording because I think the wording probably comes from the motion. But it got my attention this morning when I was going through this that it says the CCNSO to appoint a community-wide working group.

If that's the way the motion is worded we probably need to it leave that way. But we may want to at some point in our document talk about that. I'm not sure it should be the CCNSO that appoints a community-wide working group. But I'm curious as to what others think.

Man: Yes, you've got a point there (Chuck). But it does say on a proposal by the CCNSO to a point.

Chuck Gomes: No, I understand that but that doesn't mean that they would appoint that community-wide working group.

Man: Perhaps we should say on a proposal to the ICANN board.

(Olga): Would you suggest any change (Chuck)...

Chuck Gomes: Well, you know, I just caught this a few minutes ago because I just looked at (Phillip)'s...

(Olga): But do you think - I think you're making a very important comment. And...

Philip Sheppard: I think we just...

((Crosstalk))

(Olga): I can't hear you all together, sorry. Who was first? Who wanted to talk? (Phillip), you said something?

Philip Sheppard: Yes, that's all right. I'm saying I think in this case it's just a question of accuracy.

(Olga): Yes.

Philip Sheppard: If we can just all (roll up) to (Chuck)'s words, the original resolution and to - and to record that correctly. I think it's probably just the way it's phrased. And I think we're expecting the board to appoint the community-wide working group based on a proposal by the CCNSO.

But essentially it doesn't matter what we think. What matters is what the original proposal said because that's what we we're acting to. So (Rob) can check the accuracy of that.

(Rob Hargov): No I will listen.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and if it is accurate then I think a comment would be in order that our expectation would be that the board would appoint the community working group, not the CCNSO.

Man: Right.

Man: And that's - in detail that's what the resolution, one of the whereas clauses does provide (Chuck). So I think it's a matter of just

substituting in that ICANN board language.

Philip Sheppard: Okay. Okay.

(Olga): Okay. I suggest that I could check myself and (Robert) could check these documents, the CCNSO working group document and the board resolutions.

Or perhaps what you could do is only mention it, the ICANN board resolution and not saying anything about the CCNSO because it's a request by the board. What you think?

We can do either. I'm more than happy to follow-up on that. I think my draft language was somewhat in artful in that the CCNSO still asks for that to happen.

But you're correct, the actual action would be by the board to appoint the working group.

Chuck Gomes: (Rob) can submit a proposed fix to the language on the list. It should be easy to read (unintelligible) okay.

Man: Yes.

Philip Sheppard: Okay, just a clarification on this call. Should we now assume that (Rob) is going to be the pen holder for our changes?

(Olga): Sorry, I couldn't hear you very well (Phillip). What did you say?

Philip Sheppard: Just a clarification as we go through my document. Shall we assume

that (Rob) will be the pen holder for any changes that we make?

(Olga): If you want I can do them or (Rob) can do them if he wants.

Philip Sheppard: It's up to you (Olga). You're a volunteer. (Rob) gets paid for it.

(Olga): I would write down like I did before all the changes and proposed text and then we can review it with (Rob) in the areas that he committed his self in making adjustments and changes if you all agree.

(Rob Hargov): And I'm also making notes as well.

(Olga): Okay, great. Okay then we have the - (Chuck)'s comments about the introductions which I think is a very interesting comment. I didn't think about it.

(Dennis)'s board would appoint the working group and no, no. This is my comment. The (GNSO) strongly supports the formation of such a community-wide working group and will provide volunteers to serve on the group. Do we agree on this sentence? Okay?

The GNSO supports...

Philip Sheppard: Okay, just one correction. It's a typo.

(Olga): Yes?

Philip Sheppard: Community-wide should be hyphenated.

(Olga): Okay.

Philip Sheppard: It is in the first paragraph.

(Olga): Community-wide. Working group also (Phillip)?

Philip Sheppard: No just community-wide, should be a hyphen between the word community and wide.

(Olga): Okay. The GNSO supports geographical diversity in the ICANN community and supports efforts to restore improvements to the definitions of region.

Geographic regions are relevant to the GNSO with respect to creating an implementation mechanism for the diversity of GNSO council members. Do we agree?

Great. Then there is a title that says GNSO reform. The application of diversity based on regions will need to be addressed in the context of the forthcoming new structure of the GNSO council.

In that new structure the GNSO recommends that the balance between regional diversity goals and effective council membership is considered.

Chuck Gomes: Shouldn't it be considered? (Phillip)?

(Olga): I'm not in English speaking. Your comments are welcome.

Chuck Gomes: I mean the way it's written, shouldn't it be considered?

Man: Yes. Yes.

(Olga): Executive council membership. (unintelligible). Okay so it says now in that new structure the GNSO recommends that the balance between regional diversity goals and effective council membership be considered. Is it okay?

Regional diversity goals and effective - I think there is some missing word but I'm not an...

Chuck Gomes: Well you could put a should in there that it wouldn't hurt.

(Olga): I was going to say should, should be considered. Do we agree?

Man: Yes, should be considered, absolutely.

(Olga): Now it says GNSO recommends that the balance between regional diversity goals and executive council membership should be considered.

Moreover, the goals of geographic diversity should be considered in working groups model for policy development.

Chuck Gomes: A couple of minor edits. I think it would be helpful to have a the...

Philip Sheppard: I agree.

Chuck Gomes: ...inserted before working groups. And then I think - I don't think the S is needed in the working groups although I think it's probably a minor point.

(Olga): I totally agree with you. So my English is not so bad. I have the same doubts that you have.

Moreover, the goals of geographical diversity should be considered in the working group model for policy development. Do we agree?

Now we have...

(Tony Harris): Yes, the new (thought) hasn't thought about this before. But I don't see there's anything wrong with it. But I'm wondering how that would work.

(Olga): I don't know. I couldn't understand what you mean (Tony). Can you clarify?

(Tony Harris): But of course since the working groups apparently are going to be the star performer in the new GNSO perhaps it's wise to put that in on (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes, you're right (Tony). It is a new thought. When I was looking at this yesterday morning I realized that that's an important area. I don't think it has to be a showstopper or terribly difficult, but certainly I think in the working group model we're going to want to do best as we can without making it too rigid, you know, encourage geographical diversity in the working group as well.

(Tony Harris): Right. It should be a non exclusive kind of...

Chuck Gomes: Right, yes.

(Tony Harris): ...philosophy right? If we can't - if it can't happen, well we'll go ahead and...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. You can't force it, yes.

(Tony Harris): That's exactly what I'm saying.

Man: So something we need to consider when we define the working group model that - how that will be defined is yet to be seen. So there's no commitment here other than to consider it.

(Olga): What you're saying? Let me understand if I follow you. You say that working groups may not have a geographical diversity?

(Tony Harris): You may find it - and may not find the volunteers cover all the areas. That's what I'm thinking.

But we're not going to talk about that here.

(Olga): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Right, right.

(Olga): We leave this sentence? We agree?

Philip Sheppard: I think - I was happy with what - basically what (Chuck) had written earlier. And I think it just says that it's just basically, you know, putting a marker down to say we need to think about it as well for working groups but we don't need to go into detail now.

(Tony Harris): Yes, that's fair enough.

(Olga): So we agree in having this sentence?

(Tony Harris): Yes.

(Olga): Okay. We have...

Man: Yes, it looks good.

(Olga): ...introduction. We went through the introduction. Now we go through Point B which is principles for consideration by the community-wide working group.

Community-wide here has a hyphen. And in the other community-wide it doesn't have a hyphen. What we should use? What do you think?

Philip Sheppard: We put in a hyphen before.

Man: So it's consistent now. The title's fine.

(Olga): GNSO recommends that as the working group begins its deliberation it first adopts a set of principles that will help guide the group's work. And then we have a title, principle of the relevance of regions.

Man: Before you go there I want to talk about that sentence. I do have a comment on that introductory sentence.

What I'm wondering is - by the way I agree with the sentence so stay with me here.

The - I'm wondering if we should specifically recommend that a charter be established in advanced that it includes the principles. Or do we, you know, should we just leave that alone? I don't have strong feelings but I kind of - it's another thought that I had.

One of the things that seems to help us in the GNSO a lot is that it's a well defined charter in advance to guide the work.

(Olga): I think it's a very good idea. So we should propose them to have a charter and we're proposing some ideas, that's what we should say?

Man: Well what we could do is change this to say the GNSO recommends that a charter be approved in advance that includes a set of principles to help guide the group's work.

Does that work? I mean (Phillip), you can probably word it better than me bet...

Philip Sheppard: Well, let's use the words terms and reference rather than charter.

Man: That's fine.

Philip Sheppard: How about the GNSO recommends that the following head of principles be adopted into the group in terms of reference?

Man: I'm okay with that.

(Olga): Oh, could you repeat it to me?

Philip Sheppard: The GNSO recommends that key - the following set of principles.

(Olga): After following.

Philip Sheppard: Set of principles be adopted into the working group's terms of reference.

(Olga): So now this sentence says the GNSO recommends the following set of principles be adopted into the working group terms of reference. You don't say charter. That's okay (Chuck)?

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

(Olga): Okay. So we did the other version?

Man: Yes.

(Olga): Okay, great. Go on. Okay, now we have titles as principles on the relevance of regions.

Number 1, we like the title? Do we agree? Number 1, ICANN regions should take into consideration the very needs and concerns of different regions? Comments?

Number 2, ICANN regions should provide the opportunity for those needs and concerns to be (unintelligible)?

Man: That one - I highlighted that one because I had some thoughts when I was reading it. And it actually ties into one down below that I thought was really good in terms of representativeness.

Number - if we look at that and Number 5, they kind of go together. So let me jump ahead to 5.

In making such selections, ICANN body should require that any individual select from a geographical region is indeed able to represent the interests of that region in a relevant way.

I think those two are connected somewhat. Maybe they should be grouped together. I don't know whether we've want to change the order or not. The thoughts on that?

(Tim): This is (Tim).

Man: You're linking 5 to which point?

Man: To 2.

Man: Oh to 2, okay, sorry.

(Olga): (Tim), you wanted to say something?

(Tim): Yes, just if we're going to talk about 5 I just - to me 4 and 5 seem to conflict with each other at least in my intent and some of the principles I tried to express.

Man: Yes, and they can. You're right.

(Tim): Four says the geographically climate should be based on measures - for membership to ICANN body should be measured by citizenship and

then 5 says in making such selections the individuals should be able to represent the interest of that region in a relative way.

So that those seem to conflict because citizenship isn't the measure of whether someone is able to represent the interests of the region in a relevant way.

And what my point was that I was trying to make before was that, you know, it may make - 5 may make sense for appointments by the nominating committee. But 5 does not make sense for geographic considerations that might be needed to be made by the GNSO council. For example, the constituencies and who they select to be on the council or with the GNSO council and how they might try to put together the working group models.

And so that's why I suggested that citizenship be the measure. But certainly if the nominating committee is filling out the board or the nominating committee is filling out the council, then they may want to take that geographic requirement a bit farther as 5 indicates and looking for people who are able to actually represent the interest of the region.

I just don't feel that's a practical thing to expect at least the GNSO council to be able to do. And maybe other ICANN bodies besides the nominating council that could, but I just don't think it's practical for the GNSO to be required to do that.

But I don't know how we reflect that in there but that's - it seems to get lost here a little bit.

Chuck Gomes: I understand the practicality and it's a very important issue. So I wonder at the same time one of the issues I was originally trying to raise, sometimes our citizenship requirement is pretty artificial in terms of really achieving the goals of geographic diversity.

We get somebody that's got dual citizenship somewhere and frankly that's all we could do.

(Tony Harris): To me, I could be a representative for Europe because I have a British passport. And I could also be - or Latin America and I have an Argentina passport.

Chuck Gomes: And maybe (Tony) could really represent Europe quite well. So but at the same time, maybe he couldn't do that very well. And so we fulfilled the letter of the law but we really didn't accomplish anything towards the objective of - one of the real goals of geographic diversity.

Now how do we - (Tim) raises a really important concern because citizenship is simple, clear, makes it real easy to measure. So that's good in that regard.

So maybe the goals of this representativeness of the regions become more of a best practices rather than rigid requirements, that we use citizenship but that in - within that we encourage that principle be - the principle of representativeness be applied. Thoughts on that?

(Tony Harris): Well you could combine citizenship (Chuck), with a requirement to demonstrate that the person is active in some institution or activity in the region.

(Olga): I was going to suggest exactly the same that (Tony) said. I think that it's both. Its citizenship and it's the involvement of the person with the community and with the issues related with the...

Philip Sheppard: (Unintelligible) related to the application of the principles rather than the principles themselves. I mean I think going back to (Chuck)'s earlier comment, I actually think that 2 and 5 are quite close in meaning and objective. And it may be we're sufficient in simply keeping 2 and deleting 5 here.

(Tony Harris): This is (Tim). Just, you know, to kind of answer (Chuck)'s suggestion, you know, kind of take it to the extreme. Personally, I don't think that there should be any geographic requirement on the selection of council members or on the council selection of board members.

I think that the constituency should select the best representatives that they can select for the council. And I think the board should select the best board members that they can possibly select for their - for the board.

And geographic diversity might be some, you know, best practice if possible kind of thing but not a requirement and that in my mind and the nominating committee sits back and looks at the makeup of the council and says how do we add some geographic diversity to that? And they're the ones that take care of that issue or in their selection of nearly half the board, they can take care of that geographic issue.

But for the council or for the constituencies to be concerned, you know, in maybe depth with that I think is a mistake because then we end up sometimes, you know, with a very small candidate group from which

we can select someone for the council or for the board.

And I don't think that's a practical thing for us to do and the time we, you know, we may end up not selecting the best candidate simply because we're not allowed to.

So that's what I was trying - is I would like to leave that door open so that as we're looking at restructuring the GNSO, you know, we can have a lot more flexibility in that regard than what we do right now with the current bylaws.

Chuck Gomes: Can I get in the queue (Olga)?

(Tony Harris): Yes, I'd like to talk (unintelligible) (Chuck).

(Olga): Okay (Chuck), go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. By the way (Tim), if - I like what you just said. I don't know if we can get at the fly within the ICANN world.

But if that was indeed the case then we wouldn't even need Number 4 except - at all except maybe combined with Number 5 for the nominating committee.

And that would take care of the issue of getting the best qualified and those who are able to serve on councils, et cetera and on the board. And I think that would be good.

So I think maybe what we need to decide then as a group would we support that kind of a recommendation because that is a change from

the emphasis on geographic diversity requirements as they exist today.

(Olga): Thank you (Chuck). (Tony)?

(Tony Harris): I just want to say with all due respect (Tim), I have to disagree with you. Experience when ICANN was being put together in the days of the white - of the international formal white paper we - there was no rural Latin American region. We were just the Americas.

And I don't think that that's - to go away from some sort of constraint as far as - or obligation would be the word, to respecting some geographic diversity, you would just end up with a board full of European and North American members.

I mean it would be inevitable because you - the people will be there - they are - who are brilliant, who are well known all over the world. And of course they will occupy all the seats.

(Tim): I don't think so. I think what you'll end up with is the supporting organizations electing the best candidates that they can. And then you'll have the nominating committee filling out the geographic region requirement.

And, you know, and I know this isn't something we should be debating here. All I was asking was that the requirements, that the principles be stated in such a way that it leaves that door open.

It seems to me 5 sort of negates 4 in that it says, you know, that there should be more representativeness being able to be demonstrated where right now it's pretty much citizenship, I'd like to keep it that way

so that if we do have - if we are stuck with the geographic requirement, for selecting council members or board members that it remains as a citizenship because that still leaves some flexibility in there.

So 4 I don't mind. But 5 seems to kind of contradict that and say that there should be, you know, more representativeness demonstrated than what 4 indicates.

(Tony Harris): Well but in our previous discussions we all agreed. I think (Chuck) was - came forward with that motion early in the game which was let's not tie our hands to such an extent where the constituency really can't solve this because they don't have the diversity in their membership. I mean we agreed on that.

So - but where we - I guess maybe I misunderstood you (Tim), but it seemed that you were sort of leaning towards let's do away with geographic diversity in the GNSO as a concept.

(Tim): Yes that's - yes (Tony), that's what I would prefer to do sure. But I'm not saying that we can reflect that in these principles. I'm just saying that I'd like to leave a little bit of flexibility there. And 5 seems to close the door on that.

Philip Sheppard: This is (Phillip) here, a suggestion. I find that 2 and 5 are quite similar. Two is more generic. Why don't we keep 2 and just delete 5?

Chuck Gomes: Well, you know, one of the problems with that -- and I may support it by the way -- but is that it's not so much the ICANN regions themselves that provide opportunities for needs and concerns to be represented as it is the selection of people that come from those regions that really

determines whether there's going to be good opportunity for that or not. So...

(Olga): I wouldn't delete 5. I think it has - I understand (Tim)'s concern. But I think it's kind of in theory. Because in reality it doesn't work too well.

(Tony Harris): (Olga), could you speak a little louder please? I can...

(Olga): Yes sure. It's my phone.

(Tony Harris): ...barely hear you.

(Olga): I'm so sorry. I said that I agree with (Tim) that it's kind of a theoretical situation. Because in reality I agree with (Tony) that some regions of the world are never considered. And OS, all the representatives come from developed countries.

I like 5 . I wouldn't delete it. Any changes?

Chuck Gomes: Well what if we change 2 to something like this? ICANN regions and geographical regional requirements should provide the opportunity for those needs and concerns to be represented.

Man: That's a good phrase.

(Olga): ICANN regions and geographical regional requirements should provide the opportunity for those needs concerns to be represented.

Philip Sheppard: Well how about ICANN regions and selections based on them should provide?

Chuck Gomes: That's better.

(Olga): Could you repeat it (Phillip) please?

Philip Sheppard: ICANN regions...

(Olga): Yes?

Philip Sheppard: ...and selections based upon them that provide dot, dot, dot.

(Olga): ICANN sorry...

Philip Sheppard: ICANN regions and selections based upon them.

(Olga): And then?

Philip Sheppard: Then existing wording of 2 and we delete 5.

(Olga): ICANN regions and selections based upon them should provide?

Philip Sheppard: Yes, everything stays the same from there on.

(Olga): ICANN regions and selections based upon them should provide the opportunity for those needs and concerns (represented) and selection based upon - and you say deleting 5 (Phillip)?

Philip Sheppard: Yes, that would - that puts into 2 the essence of 5 without being overly predictive.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay (Tim)?

(Tim): Yes, yes. Because 5 right now just seems to like almost reference 4. And it's like saying you're making such selections in driving - what was suggested works great.

(Olga): Okay (Tony), what do you think?

(Tony Harris): I have no problem with that.

(Olga): Okay. So we have Number 2 that says ICANN regions and selections based upon them should provide the opportunity for those needs and concerns to be represented. And we delete 5? That's the idea?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Olga): We agree?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

(Olga): Okay, 5 is gone.

Number 3, the makeup of ICANN regions must be considered in the wider context of the geographical region requirements imposed on all ICANN organizations.

Philip Sheppard: (Phillip) here. Just two typos for consistency we should change must to should...

(Olga): Should.

Philip Sheppard: ...and the last word, organization to bodies.

(Olga): We consider the wider context of geographical region requirements is always imposed on all?

Philip Sheppard: ICANN bodies. It's just changing two words for consistency with the rest of the text.

(Olga): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and on this one my concern is that -- and I know we're just talking about principles and I suppose representatives on the group could drive this home -- but I really hope that the terms of reference actually include the geographical and region requirements and not just the definition of the region.

It's not clear right now that that was the intent to do that. But I think it's very important that that be included in the terms of reference.

So I'm not sure that we will accomplish the goal with just the statement of this principle as it is but maybe that's something that has to be reserved for our working group members.

But actually the terms of reference will probably already be defined before you ever get to the working group. So that's my concern there.

(Olga): Would you suggest adding some other principle about this?

Chuck Gomes: Well, let me think about that.

(Olga): Because I think...

Chuck Gomes: that's was one of the reasons why I used the word must. But I -
(Phillip), I agree with your change of wording there for consistency.

We could possibly add a second sentence there, parenthetical maybe after that that says the terms of reference should include geographical region requirements. And I don't know if that's the right place to have that or not but.

Philip Sheppard: And I don't know if it's necessary (Chuck). I mean we're already saying up top now that we want these principles into the TOR. So that's sort of happening.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, maybe you're right. Okay, I'm okay. You get my point. I think this is really important that they not just define regions in this working group but they actually look at the geographical requirements and suggest any modification to those as well.

But I'm okay with that.

Philip Sheppard: Okay we also need to consider that we are -we're sort of doing a lobbying job here. And the more high level wonderful the principles sound the more likely we are to be successful in getting them adopted.

Chuck Gomes: Yes like (unintelligible) said. And I'm okay with what we decided to do here. But there's also the risk then that something like this gets

ignored. And that's what I was trying to avoid.

(Olga): Okay, so we are not adding any new text?

Chuck Gomes: No. No. We're okay. I'm okay.

(Olga): Okay. And the should, you're okay with should instead of must?

Okay. That was 3. Now we go to Number 4, geographic requirements relevance to membership of ICANN body should be measured by citizenship.

(Tony Harris): Well that's where I think maybe we can consider including what (Olga) and I have thought of.

(Olga): Yes, I like it.

(Tony Harris): Our citizenship and our demonstrable activities in an institution within the region on institutional body or whatever you want to call it, entity.

(Tim): Well, then that creates a problem in my mind in that I don't think it's practical within the GNSO constructs to expect that.

If you want to say - you know, if you want to split this up and say well, you know, the (people it should) apply to the nominating committee and possibly other bodies where it's relevant, but to the GNSO we want to restrict it to measurement by citizenship.

But I think it as soon as you -at least my opinion is as soon as you put it beyond that you've made it a very complicated and difficult situation

for the GNSO and for its constituencies.

Chuck Gomes: If we do what you're suggesting (Tony), that's like putting 5 back in.

(Tim): Exactly.

(Olga): Yes somehow, yes.

(Tony Harris): Now okay, I won't go to war with that point just perhaps (Tim) has a point.

Chuck Gomes: Idealistically, you know, you know, I think that, you know, what we said in 5 and what you just said (Tony) is a good goal to work towards.

And that's what I was getting at earlier when I was suggesting maybe that that particular issue be encouraged as a best practice without being a requirement.

Because I think (Tim)'s right. I mean we in the registries already have problems even meeting the citizenship thing the way requirements are defined now.

If you add on to that that you not only need somebody that is a citizen, but somebody who is demonstrably representative of that particular community, it would be even harder.

You know, in some cases we've had one person that we could only identify one person that could meet the geographic diversity requirements. And if we had to then make sure that person was representative we would've had no one which is unfortunate because

you really do want that representativeness.

(Olga): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: That's why it's a best practice I think.

Philip Sheppard: I agree. This is more of a non com thing than a generic thing.

(Olga): Perhaps we could add some wording about the non com candidates?

Chuck Gomes: I'd be okay with that, adding a - you know, a separate principle that talks.

(Olga): (Unintelligible) the same one saying that in relation with non com candidates or...

Chuck Gomes: What if we convert the wording in 5 to be focused just on the nominating committee participants?

Philip Sheppard: Yes, not introducing issues to do a nominating committee which...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's true.

Philip Sheppard: BC will have...

Chuck Gomes: Should we do that or we should...

(Tony Harris): That's probably out of scope.

Philip Sheppard: I would recommend it. But let's stick to GNSO matters.

(Tony Harris): Yes. (Phillip)'s right.

(Olga): Okay. Yes, (Phillip) is right. So...

(Tony Harris): But perhaps we added something to say that due to the unique characteristics of the GNSO and then, you know, I mentioned the citizenship thing.

So we would be saying that we consider this a solution unique to the GNSO.

What do you guys think?

(Olga): How would you say that (Tony)? It's Number 4 with the change?

(Tony Harris): I'm sorry?

(Olga): Were you suggesting changes in principle Number 4?

((Crosstalk))

(Tony Harris): I mean he was trying to say that the nominating committee should handle this type of thing. And this is just another way of saying well, we do it differently in the GNSO but it's time for it.

(Olga): (Phillip), you were saying something?

Philip Sheppard: Yes I was saying it's got to be the case for (CCSO) as well that citizenship's got to be the key. I wouldn't specify it to the GNSO.

(Tony Harris): Okay, no problem.

(Olga): Okay, so we leave it as it is?

(Tony Harris): Yes.

(Olga): I will read it again, geographic requirements relevant to membership of ICANN body should be measured by citizenship. Okay? Okay. We go to new Number 5.

ICANN regions should seek to balance three goals, diversity of representation, ease of participation and simplicity.

Comments?

(Tony Harris): I lost the meaning of this. Can somebody explain the rationale?

Philip Sheppard: Will this - I put that in because unless it's one of our principles to change later to do with participation (Olga) had mentioned didn't really have any context. It was making an assumption which we haven't specified.

And what I'm saying here is that there are in fact three goals, I think potentially competing goals, the diversity representation. That's the one we're mostly talking about. But also there was (Olga)'s point about participation the regions do in some way, the choice that regions can make participation easy or harder.

And there's also the one that administers to simplicity, that is having

one system that works all of ICANN versus a tailor made different set of regions every ICANN body. I thought it was worth just mentioning those three competing goals exist and therefore balances acquired.

(Olga): Any comments?

(Tim): No. This is (Tim). I like that. I think it makes some sense.

(Olga): I like it also.

(Tony Harris): Yes, it's Okay with me. (Tim). I understand now (Phillip). Thanks.

(Olga): And (Chuck)?

Chuck Gomes: I'm fine.

(Olga): Okay. Number 6, ICANN regions should emphasize - oh, this is difficult, emphasize both existing and future users. Comments?

(Tony Harris): Well it's a hard sentence to object to.

(Olga): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And an important one too, because it'd be really easy to focus on one or the other, you know? And there needs to be a balance.

(Olga): Right. So we go for Number 7. ICANN should avoid wherever possible - should be almost here, making geopolitical decisions in the designation of regions.

(Tony Harris): Well why?

(Olga): (Tony), you said why?

(Tony Harris): Yes, I mean ICANN as a body itself is an interesting exercise. It doesn't look like the ITE or the OAS or anybody else I can think of. So regions could possibly fall into the same, you know, oddball category. Why not?

Chuck Gomes: This is an abstract way of saying that if possible they should use some predefined geographical regions. And (Tony) raises a good question there. I mean it may not even be possible.

Philip Sheppard: Yes I mean that's why (phrases is) wherever possible. But it struck me as a worthwhile base principle because any discussion about that in terms of allocation of this country to this region or that territory to this region et cetera is, you know, pretty remote for my accounts main mission.

I think it's worth, you know, discussion review of regions just having a focus back to ICANN's mission. That's what I was trying to say with that phrasing.

And but it's (gotten) to wherever possible. It's got a, you know, recognition that indeed it might have to take a decision as it does currently in its decision to say, you know, the America's are the ones - the UN region is insufficient for our needs. We're going to have two which I think was a good decision. So, you know, it happens.

But, you know, I don't think ICANN should be discussing if Guadalupe

says they want to be in region A or B and, you know, we don't want to have community-wide discussion about that.

(Olga): (Tony) would you...

(Tony Harris): I'm not comfortable with it but if everybody else wants to leave it in I'll go along.

(Olga): Do you have any suggestion or deleting it or changing it?

(Tony Harris): I - no, I wouldn't do - I wouldn't say it. I would eliminate it completely. But it's just my opinion. And as I said, if everybody wants to leave it in I'll go along with it.

Chuck Gomes: It's one that I can live with but I also wouldn't be terribly bothered if it was eliminated.

One of the reasons for that is that it, you know, how do you define making geopolitical decisions? I think it can be talked about that it's going to be probably interpreted differently by various folks.

(Tony Harris): Precisely.

(Olga): Any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: And I can't believe that ICANN - that there needs to be some flexibility with regarding - with regard to defining geographic regions that best need - that best meets the needs and the near term needs in ICANN as we know it today.

Now that may change and have to be adjusted in the future. But there may not be any geographical division definitions that really fit the needs of ICANN very well.

Now again, the wherever possible handles that.

(Tony Harris): So what does (Tim) think?

(Olga): (Tim)?

(Tim): I guess I'm in the same - the same feeling (Chuck) does. I, you know, I could go either way with it. I don't have a problem with it being here with the qualification, you know, wherever possible.

(Tony Harris): (Olga), you haven't said what you think.

(Olga): No, I think that wherever possible (less) chance to avoid it or not. So I would go for leaving it. But that's my opinion.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I'll back off. Just leave it.

(Olga): Okay. So we have Number 7, ICANN should avoid wherever possible making geopolitical decisions in the designation of regions.

And now we go to another site so that says principles on the change of region. Number 8 says any change to ICANN regions should improve on specifically item (unintelligible) imbalances. Comments?

No comments? We leave it. Number 9?

The goal of participation will be easier where ICANN regions will respond to regions defined by an existing international authority. This goal should be balanced with the goals of diversity and simplicity.

Chuck Gomes: I disagree with that. And this goes back to the last one in the previous section that we just been talking about.

(Tony Harris): But I think actually this was a point that (Olga) made on a previous call. And really (Olga), correct me if I'm wrong but I think it refers to participation when you're in a government entity. It's easier if they are - if you do this.

But the GNSO is not peopled by government representatives. So I think with respect to the GNSO, this might not be appropriate.

(Olga): And I think that Number 5 includes this concept that Number 9 also raises is that geographical requirements relevant to membership this should be measured no, Number 5.

ICANN regions should be (stick) to balance three goals, diversity of the presentation, ease of participation and simplicity. And I think there (Phillip) could include my comments.

Philip Sheppard: Okay so you're right. We could delete...

(Olga): I have no problems deleting Number 9. Okay? Do we agree?

Chuck Gomes: So let me make sure I'm clear. So we would delete what was 10.

Philip Sheppard: Yes, we're deleting existing 10 (unintelligible).

(Tony Harris): Yes that's - that would be fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Olga): Then no -well now for me it's 9. The goal of participation will be easier. That's the one where we are deleting?

Man: Yes.

(Olga): Okay. I already deleted Number 5. My numbers are different. Okay, a single set of designated regions for ICANN as today at the simplicity.

A single set of designated regions for ICANN as today adds to simplicity. But this goal should be balanced with the evolving needs of ICANN support in organizations and other bodies. I think we have a problem.

Philip Sheppard: But possibly the language needs some tweaking.

(Olga): Yes.

Philip Sheppard: The concept seems to be okay.

(Olga): The concept is okay. We need - I think we need an - a comma or something in the middle.

(Tony Harris): As it stands today or as it is today possibly right and then a comma?

Philip Sheppard: Yes. (Unintelligible) a designated region for ICANN as it is today.

(Olga): It is today comma at the simplicity. But this goal should be balanced with the evolving needs of ICANN support and organization.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, you don't really want a comma there.

Philip Sheppard: No, well you have two commas.

Chuck Gomes: Well you either have two commas or not - but not just one. Yes.

Philip Sheppard: I have a comma after ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: As it exists today.

Philip Sheppard: And then you have as it is today comma.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay.

(Olga): So a single set of designated regions for ICANN comma as it is today comma.

Philip Sheppard: As it is today comma.

(Olga): Comma, adds to simplicity. But this goal should be balanced with the evolving needs of ICANN supporting organizations and other bodies. Now it's better because now the comma was...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Olga): We agree on this wording?

(Tony Harris): Yes.

(Olga): All right. So the following one, there should be nothing sacred about the number of ICANN regions remaining at five. Okay. Where there is uncertainty in the relationship of countries to region there should be a mechanism for resolving that uncertainty. And there is simplicity and the relationship in those two regions. There should be a mechanism for resolving that uncertainty.

Comments? Okay, we go to the last one. ICANN regions should be reviewed with appropriate regularity. To that end, ICANN should have in place means to understand the evolving needs and concerns of different regions.

(Tony Harris): Can we go back to what as Number 13 because I was thinking on that before we jumped to the last...

(Olga): Tell me how it starts because my numbers are...

(Tony Harris): Where there is uncertainty in the relationship of countries to regions.

(Olga): Well there is uncertainty in the relationship of countries to regions comma, there should be a mechanism for resolving that uncertainty.

(Tony Harris): I think basically the mechanism - one mechanism that could be suggested perhaps there's not - there's no agreement on that is that the - let's say a country wants to change -let's say I don't consider myself belonging to this region. We could take into account what RIR they belong to.

I mean there is a definite relationship between the RIRs and everything else in ICANN. It's IP addresses.

Philip Sheppard: I thought we're talking about this last time. Because I - this is a generic version of my original suggestion that in fact the CC country managers should decide which was pointed out well, there could be other authorities like the RIRs.

(Tony Harris): You're right. We did discuss that. I'm sorry.

Philip Sheppard: So I thought we'd just agreed to leave it...

(Tony Harris): Okay.

Philip Sheppard: ...open.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, it's probably not for us to actually come up with the mechanism but rather to point out that there needs to be one.

(Tony Harris): Yes. Okay. Yes, you're right. I'm sorry.

(Olga): Okay. So we - and we go back to the last one, ICANN regions should be reviewed with (appropriate) regularity. To that end ICANN should have in place means to understand the evolving needs and concerns of different regions.

(Tony Harris): Magnificent.

(Olga): I like it.

(Tony Harris): Very good (Phillip) or whoever wrote it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, we also need to - there's a couple thoughts I have in terms of whether or not we've - it's complete. So once it's appropriate I'd like to ask a couple of questions.

(Olga): Okay, go ahead (Chuck). We have reviewed all the text and we agreed that the introduction would be reviewed by (Rob) and myself. And we would propose another text. And the rest we have gone through all the documents. So if you want to add something or say something that's...

Chuck Gomes: Well and I want to ask a question. One of the things that we emphasized in previous calls and even had some language in the document was with regards to the GNSO believing that there needs to be some flexibility with regard to applying regional requirements.

I'm not sure we've captured that in this. And maybe this isn't the place for it. I don't know. But I wanted to at least raise that question.

(Tony Harris): (Chuck) is right. I don't see it in this either.

Philip Sheppard: (Unintelligible) GNSO reform.

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me?

Philip Sheppard: This is one of GNSO reform in the introduction.

One and two for that matter.

(Tony Harris): Yes. (Phillip)'s right. There is some reference there.

(Olga): But I think that there was a principle about flexibility in our previous document. I'm trying to find it.

Philip Sheppard: Principle 3.

(Olga): ICANN regions should be considered in the wider context of the geographical region requirements involved in all ICANN bodies.

Philip Sheppard: And Principle 11...

(Olga): Eleven.

Philip Sheppard: ...which is (Olga)'s 10 or even (Olga)'s 9, a single set of.

(Olga): A single set of designated regions ICANN says it is very (unintelligible) with the evolving needs of ICANN support in organizations (unintelligible).

What I was trying to find in my early general documents after our call last Monday was we checked that (unintelligible).

(Tony Harris): I think I - (Chuck)'s point of a couple of calls back was what happens in the case of impossibility where you just can't produce the...

(Olga): Exactly. In fact and I think it's a very important point.

((Crosstalk))

(Olga): (Chuck), would you like to add a new principle perhaps we missed in the process?

Chuck Gomes: Well the areas that (Phillip) pointed out are certainly...

(Olga): Oh here. I found it. I found it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Olga): In relation with regions and geographic diversity requirements some flexibility should be allowed for representatives in the GNSO council. This was agreed in the last call.

Philip Sheppard: Yes, but I thought that that would be moved by either you (Olga) or (Chuck) into that paragraph on GNSO reform which is now in introduction section.

Chuck Gomes: The only problem there (Phillip) is that that issue may not be in the terms of reference then because it's included up above. And it may be an important term of reference for the group to actually focus on.

Now maybe and countering my own argument there maybe that is something that needs to be handled separately from this working group. I don't know.

But it's important enough that, you know, is it something that this working group should consider? And if so, it should be included in the terms of reference, in fact, maybe even repeated as a principle in addition to being included under GNSO reform.

Philip Sheppard: Hi - (unintelligible) to me the way that you had stuck to the paper I'd thought it was quite good because it was - the principles now are quite generic.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Philip Sheppard: So the other SOs and people involved...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think they need to be generic. So that's...

Philip Sheppard: So the group is going to be happy about adopting them. If it's - if the principles not getting sort of GNSO stuff.

Chuck Gomes: Well but it could be stated generically.

(Olga): So you suggest...So it's to - there should be flexibility in that GNSO - excuse me, in the geographical diversity requirements for all SOs and other bodies. It doesn't have to be restricted to the GNSO.

Philip Sheppard: But isn't that the -am I missing the objective for Principle 3s?

Chuck Gomes: Principle 3?

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

(Olga): The makeup of ICANN regions should be considered in the wider context of the geographical region requirements imposed on all ICANN bodies.

Chuck Gomes: It's certainly related.

(Olga): (Unintelligible) the same. Yes it is related but I don't think it's exactly the same.

Philip Sheppard: Well then maybe we should -we were three. I mean I thought that was its objective unless I'm missing something.

(Olga): But a suggestion is why don't we add the principle that we discussed last Monday in relation with the regions and geographic group diversity requirements. Some flexibility the should be allowed for representatives in the GNSO countries. And perhaps we can add something at the end and as a principle.

Chuck Gomes: I would - I think I'd prefer having it in there as a principle. Although I do see where (Phillip)'s coming from in terms of, you know, it's not very direct - directly stated in 3 and other places. But there certainly is - are some principals there that could be argued to support this.

(Tony Harris): I would support (Chuck), I mean if you want to make this more notable by having it in the principle it seems reasonable to me.

Chuck Gomes: (Tim), what do you think on this?

(Tim): Well I guess I'm still trying to understand exactly what the principle would be.

Chuck Gomes: (Olga), could you read what was in there before?

(Olga): Sure. And this is an outcome from our last call on Monday. It says in

relation with regions and geographic diversity requirements, some flexibility should be allowed for representatives in the GNSO council.

Chuck Gomes: And of course we could make the last part generic.

(Olga): Of course.

Chuck Gomes: So...

(Olga): Could go in Number 4.

Chuck Gomes: What I was getting at originally in that was is that I mean in fact one of the problems right now in the GNSO - and I'll be specific to the GNSO is that we apply geographical requirements on a constituency by constituency basis which makes - at least the way it's defined in now, that's fairly rigid and it creates some very difficult situations for meeting the requirements.

If there was more flexibility for example -- and I'm not saying we should get this specific -- but if the geographical diversity requirements were on a council as a whole rather than on a constituency by constituency basis it would create some flexibility where we could get geographical diversity on the whole council for example by using non com representatives and so forth without pinning a constituency down to a very difficult choices getting back to where you have to choose somebody that's really not the most qualified but they meet the letter of the law.

So that's...

Philip Sheppard: (Chuck), how about this phrasing. I'm coming down to your way of thinking. Changing three to read the makeup of ICANN's regions should be considered in a wider context of the global effectiveness of ICANN's bodies.

Chuck Gomes: That's good. I think you might also want to still keep in there the geographical regional requirements because I think those have to be looked at.

Philip Sheppard: But isn't that it?

Chuck Gomes: Well it is but I'm concerned about it being so abstract or vague that they missed the point.

(Tony Harris): (Chuck), can I make a comment? (Tony Harris) here. (Chuck), I'm not comfortable with this generic reform that you're proposing because in the ISPCP at least geographic diversity is being a good thing.

And so if you want to put something in about flexibility I would tie it to the fact that in some ways it's a - it should not apply where there is no availability of candidates or members or whatever you want to call them but not just, you know, it should be flexible and that's that because then well if it's flexible why have it? Why have a norm?

Chuck Gomes: Well (Tony), I can ask the same question. If the inflexibility creates situations where you don't have - where you don't end up with quality representation then why have it, you know? So I understand your point.

(Tony Harris): So we could debate on that. Yes. I mean - okay. It's debatable both

ways.

Chuck Gomes: Actually. And I fully understand and respect your point. So...

(Tony Harris): What I'm saying is I sympathize with what you want to point out. And I think we should have something in there but not - perhaps not to the extent where, you know, you change everything to a global GNSO representation basis.

So as long as you have let's say one person on counsel from the African region, well then we're covered. But I don't think - that's probably what I would prefer.

(Tim): I think there's a difference too between, you know, saying that there should be flexibility within the GNSO and if a particular constituency wants to have certain requirements, I would certainly think that would be, you know, their particular choice.

So I don't think the flexibility would necessarily mean that the IS - the - couldn't have a (structure) requirement because it requires that it be from different geographic regions or whatever.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not opposed.

(Tim): I think it's the flexibility that's important and then that assuming that, you know, some particular requirement can be written that's going to apply well to everybody within ICANN.

Philip Sheppard: Well then haven't we come full circle to our existing text?

(Tony Harris): And I'm not opposed to that - leaving the existing text. That's what I was going to start to say.

Philip Sheppard: Because we're covering off the GNSO point specifically in the introduction. And we're not overly diluting the regions and our principles. In my mind we've got a good balance then.

(Tim): That's true.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm okay with that. I wanted to raise it because I needed to think through it more myself. And maybe what we have is really the best we can do here. And then through our representatives on this working group and hopefully an approval of any terms of reference that are made and we can have some input there.

One other question - and this is kind of on a different line of thought. And that is...

(Olga): Excuse me (Chuck). Do you want - we leave it as it was?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Olga): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: One other question I want to raise is we don't have much experience in ICANN with regard to community-wide working groups. Should we say anything about that? We didn't necessarily have good experiences in the IDNC working group to say it timely. But...

Man: Or in the who is.

Philip Sheppard: What do you suppose we say that they're a disaster?

(Tony Harris): It couldn't be worse than the (Whois). Impossible.

Philip Sheppard: Yes. We could express our hopes and good wishes. But maybe it's better just to stay silent.

Man: It might be. It might be. But I at least wanted to ask the question. Do we want to just leave that one alone? I'm okay with that.

I would hope that the terms of reference would be approved by the community in total, in other words by the SOs and so forth and not just approved by the CCNSO. While certainly this is a really big issue for the CCNSO and I don't want to minimize that.

Man: Sure.

Philip Sheppard: To my mind, I think the boards recognize that (unintelligible) the mere fact it's gone out asking everybody to comment.

Chuck Gomes: Should - what about some sort of a comment that the terms of reference that there should be a public comment period on the terms of reference before they're finalized.

(Olga): That's a good idea.

Chuck Gomes: That's a fairly easy thing to do. It would add a little bit of time but at least give one more shot if the terms of reference really don't accomplish some of the things that impacted GNSO.

Philip Sheppard: Fine with that.

Chuck Gomes: And where would we fit it into this document?

(Olga): We had some (unintelligible) in the beginning.

Philip Sheppard: Introduction probably.

(Olga): Yes. We made a specific comment about (unintelligible) planning.

Philip Sheppard: I would probably put that in (Olga) just after our second paragraph in bold.

(Olga): Yes the GNSO strongly supports...

Philip Sheppard: Yes. And then just say there should be - the GNSO recommends a public comment period or the group's terms of reference will stop.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's good.

(Olga): The public...

Philip Sheppard: Yes, the GNSO recommends a public comment period on the working group's terms of reference.

(Olga): (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: And that's all I had.

((Crosstalk))

(Olga): Great. Okay. So what we have to do, we have to work on the first paragraph with the help of (Rob). And we should be finished with our document.

What I will do now is send it to you to the list right now with some marks in the first paragraph. And after we agree on the first final paragraph wording we could ask Glen to upload it into the draft document section. What do you think?

Man: Perfect.

Man: Good.

(Tim): Makes sense.

(Olga): So I will send it right now with some marks at the beginning that we have to rephrase the first paragraph. And we would not be - we would not need to meet on Monday right?

Chuck Gomes: Shouldn't have to. Now it would be good (Olga), if you or (Rob) sent a note once we've got it wrapped up. And I'm assuming that could happen in the next 24 hours that we notify the council that we have a draft.

Now it may be too late to really consider in the council meeting on Thursday. But it would still be good to notify them of that.

(Olga): What I can do is send it to you right now as we have worked all the

documents. We - I can - you can make any comments until tomorrow. And maybe by that time (Rob), we could perhaps finish the first paragraph?

Chuck Gomes: Could the first paragraph be finished in the next few hours and then just one document go out to the group?

(Olga): Well that's great. What Glen suggested is upload it into this draft document section and send the URL to the council.

Chuck Gomes: Right. What I was asking was (Rob), can you doctor that language in the first paragraph shortly so that it can be - so that this group of people can review the changes we made today and provide any final comment within 24 hours?

(Rob Hargov): Yes, I will do that right now (Olga). And we'll send that to you and you can then look it over and incorporate into these documents that you send to the group in an hour or so.

(Olga): Okay good.

Philip Sheppard: Good. Sounds like a plan.

(Olga): By the end of the day we could have the whole document finished. And then we (unintelligible) we say Glen to upload it into the draft documentation. And we send the URL to the council?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Olga): Okay. So let's stay tuned and see our final questions. Thank you for all

the work.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Olga) and (Rob) and everybody else. It's been a good productive group.

(Olga): Thank you.

Philip Sheppard: Okay, bye-bye.

(Tim): Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Bye-bye.

END