

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work
Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday, 25 November 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT) meeting on Wednesday 25 November 2009, at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but **should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:** <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsc-20091125.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#nov>

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

Present:

J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair
Avri Doria
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
S. Subbiah - Individual
Iliya Bazlyankov

Staff:

Marika Konings
Ken Bour
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies:

Caroline Greer

Coordinator: ...moment. You're welcome. Excuse me, I would like to remind all parties this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time, you may begin.

J.Scott All right Glen, if you would take roll call.

Glen De Saint Géry: Pleasure. On the call we have J. Scott Evans, Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and for staff we have Marika Konings, Ken Bour and myself Glen De Saint Géry. Thank you J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. I see Subbiah is signed into the Adobe room but I haven't heard him on the voice.

Glen De Saint Géry: Iliya has just joined.

S. Subbiah: Hello.

Glen De Saint Géry: Welcome Iliya.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, Marika I'm going to turn it over to you because I think you can guide us through the PDF that you have here on the screen, the red line version.

Marika Konings: Yep, that's fine, I'll just focus on the elements that have changed.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, please.

Marika Konings: If there are any other issues that people want to talk about I'll pick up on, they can just mention that. You know just on Page 1 there's a footnote which we just point out that the objective is that the once the document is finalized that we'll integrate into the charter guidelines and into one overall document, probably titled something along the line of working group guidelines.

Then the first change is on Page 2, and Section 1.4 and we changed corporate committee to GNSO council for consideration and please contact the GNSO secretary for further information.

An additional paragraph has been added here which I don't know if we want to leave into the document or might go with the cover notes or how we're going to forward this to the PPSC basically on the methodology going forward on how to review and update these documents.

And we spoke about to have a commitment to have an annual review of these documents and that that review would determine that it would be timing appropriate to make changes, that an ad hoc committee should be formed to make proposals for such changes.

S. Subbiah: I'm okay with it.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I think it should stay in and if the council or the PPSC when they review this along with the other document believe that it needs to be removed or just a footnote they can make that decision.

But right now I think it should stay in, but I don't have a vote, so - but that would be my opinion.

Woman: I agree.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, that's Subbiah and Cheryl that seem to agree, how about you Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'm okay.

Iliya Bazlyankov: I'm okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay Iliya, thank you. Let's move on.

Marika Konings: Okay, on the next section is one Page 3, Section 2.1.2, membership application. This is some change of the wording, (unintelligible) the expression of interest to participating working group, coloring submission of an expression of interest to GNSO secretary who will verify the submission has been received from a real person.

If the expression of interest has been made on behalf of a company or organization, the primary point of contact will be required in order to the adage alone for working group membership.

So basically it is including the verification of the person or individual that's applying to become a member. And also dealing with the issue when it's a company or organization wants to be a member of a working group.

S. Subbiah: This is Subbiah. I'm okay with it, but I thought there was a discussion - I don't know where it is in my (unintelligible) document, but I remember there was a most particular type of instance that was also a - someone had suggested the idea of a backup, you know if it was a company then they should have someone else that takes over.

I'm just seeing the name of a backup, is that still somewhere there or is that something you wanted to (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: I think that's easily added just to say a representative and an alternate representative. Can you add that in Marika?

Marika Konings: Individuals a primary point of contact or alternate.

J. Scott Evans: And an alternate.

Marika Konings: Okay.

S. Subbiah: In the case of when it's an individual and the person doesn't respond okay, they are off the committee immediately but if it's the case of a company that's an issue. I mean the guy doesn't (look) one, but the company is on the basis of which you have clout to join in a sense.

So then you need to be able to contact them.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I think that's - I mean it's just because is it an entity and at least in today's economy, entities are quite fluid, it's always best to have a primary point of contact and an alternate.

So we ensure that we're doing the best we can to make sure they've identified enough people that they don't fall off the list or miss something.

I think that's easily added in Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, go ahead.

Marika Konings: So then moving on just highlighted here that the statement of interest needs to be updated once an operations work team has actually finalized the language for that.

Moving down, Section 2.1.3, we mentioned there including of any relevant historical data with the relevant background information for the working group to consider at it's - before the first meeting.

Moving on, Section 2.1.4.2, that's just a correction I think of a misspelled word. Another addition as well that the newly elected chair will act on a provisional basis until the chartering organization has confirmed the appointment to make sure that a working group doesn't wait until the chartering organization hands down the confirmation of a chair.

Section 2.1.4.3, we just added there that one of the things to be discussed as well at the first meeting is a decision making process, as well just here is a note that we've updated the names of the documents that are going to be integrated into one document that you know we're going to refer to other documents if it's all integrated in the same document.

And then a note that the working group chair may use a check list and (unintelligible) for details and we'll get to the checklist later, departments going to (unintelligible) some items once you finalize this we can add the items there that are validating.

So moving on, for the questions in Section 2.2 on Page 6, we just moved around the suggested procedure to conduct elections from the bottom of the section to the top of that section.

I don't think we made any other changes there. Then if you move down to the bullets for staff, we decided there that ICANN staff performs the two following basic functions for any working group, namely secretariat, (unintelligible) support function covering logistics and policy liaisons.

Support function providing working group assistance in a (unintelligible) manner including drafting if required which is (unintelligible) the deliberations of the working group.

And then in addition ICANN staff can perform the following distinct roles for a working group as requested and appropriate.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Sounds good, let's move on.

Marika Konings: So moving on...

J. Scott Evans: Two point three.

Marika Konings: Two point three, use of sub teams, an additional paragraph there that it's recommended that the sub team appoint a coordinator who heads up the sub team and is responsible for providing regular progress updates to the working group.

And there's no need for formal confirmation by the chartering organization or working group of such a coordinator and the life span of such a sub team should not extend beyond that of the working group.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: Moving on in Section 3.4, individual group behavioral norms, we discussed there, so then the (klexar) has been deleted and separate case with the appropriate names in which the principles can be found.

And we added as well a footnote referring to some other best practices and there - I haven't received any further feedback. We've included the (unintelligible) respectful online communication.

And I don't know if there are any other documents or references that should be made here, or for now that's the only one.

J. Scott Evans: Unless someone else has some suggestions I would leave it there. We could put note in since this is going to go up to the PPSC that this could be supplemented with any other appropriate documents or links, just to leave it open.

And as long as it's in draft form that that's not a exclusive list.

Marika Konings: Okay. Then there's also added in this section and there's also added into section and paragraph on - should also be taken into account that as a result of cultural differences and language barriers, statements may appear disrespectful, inappropriate to some although not necessarily intended as such.

No comments, then moving on to...

J. Scott Evans: Well I do think - yeah, I would suggest here should not be intended as such and there should be something that says and for this reason, you know efforts should be made to I don't know, to adhere to a code of conduct, or you know what I'm saying?

That sort of is to be a non sequitur the way it's stuck out there to me. I understand where you're going but I think you need to - I don't know, tie it up

at the end with yeah, it can be considered so you need to take the appropriate - I don't know.

But I would after such - who was that speaking?

S. Subbiah: This is Subbiah here, would the word flexible help in there somewhere? That's all.

J. Scott Evans: I know, but do you see what I'm saying Marika, I just think there needs to be a little something. It seems to be hanging out in the way.

Marika Konings: Efforts should be made to respect the principles that are outlined for in this section.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, that's fine. Something that sort of brings it back to the point you're trying to drive home.

Marika Konings: Should it be something like however, it is expected that working group members make efforts to - something like that?

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Okay. So I'm moving on to Section 3.5 and rules of engagement, a line has been added here, as we created our separate section on the fields procedures, so a line has been added here, the restriction is subject to the right of appeal as outlined in Section 3.7.

And Section 3.6, some methodology for making decisions and we changed the - we took out the minority view and added that at the bottom saying it indicates or represents a strong support or it is possible that a minority viewpoint or viewpoints are stated under (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: Moving down, here in the 3.6 where we go through the procedure...

Ken Bour: Excuse me, Marika, this is Ken. I just wondered, do you want to say it is possible that in that sentence where it deals with rough strong or no? I'm just wondering what message is being delivered there.

It is possible that (a viewpoints) are stated and recorded.

Marika Konings: You mean as opposed - it's a possibility, it could be that it represents a strong support, that's just what you have. It is possible that some parties want to make....

J. Scott Evans: Why don't we say encouraged? Why don't we say in the case of rough consensus, strong consensus and no consensus, the chair should encourage minority view points that would be stated and recorded or something to that effect.

This looks like...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, but what about (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: That's fine with me but I think it should be something that looks like we're trying to - we want those things in the event we have these things rather than something that says, so facilitate is fine, should it facilitate the drafting and - the drafting of minority view points that would be stated and recorded or something to that extent.

Subbiah did I hear you jump in there?

S. Subbiah: This is Subbiah here, in principle I think that's a good idea but basically you know kind of state that it's not just a possibility in that sense and that it is to be encouraged because that means ICANN in a better position.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, so if we could just wordsmith that a little bit Marika. I'll get it some day, I promise.

Marika Konings: So moving on to Page 10, a comment is made here once we have finalized this that procedure, the proposal is to have a kind of flow chart that would depict how this would go.

So to point to a phrase that's been added, it says charter and organization liaison disagrees with the chair, forward that (feel) to the chartering organization the liaison and chair must both explain their reasoning in the response.

And to Part 3, a line has been added, if a chartering organization does not support the chair and the liaison position, what should happen then, we want the working team to fill in.

J. Scott Evans: Well Avri what would you think? I mean it looks like at that point you might have to go to the ombudsman.

Avri Doria: Well no, I think it's the CO that has to support the chair. I think the (unintelligible). They're kind of like the boss and I think that they should recommend remedial action to the chair.

As they basically - the try to recommend (unintelligible) or they should you know get involved (unintelligible), I don't quite have the phrase, but it's basically at any point in an appeal chain, it could be the liaison that brings with the chair what happens.

The liaison basically tries to negotiate the difference between the chair and the group trying to make it right. So I don't think it goes to the ombudsman, the ombudsman is a completely different kind of (trend).

J. Scott Evans: Okay, so the chartering organization should then become involved to resolve the situation.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: How about that guys, will that work?

S. Subbiah: Yeah, but I think that perhaps they - despite what Avri said is that's the one that should happen. But I think that there should be some language there.

I mean in any case if anyone suggested completely then we can say anything, right? I mean that's one of the reasons why the ombudsmen exist and you know what I mean? Set up with the whole thing, right? In that case...

J. Scott Evans: But I don't think we have to say go to the ombudsman, I think Avri's right, that's always out there. This is how to deal with the management structure within GNSO.

S. Subbiah: Yeah, I agree with that, but the only thing that I'm pointing out is, is there room for a statement there just to say that - not that this is a means of actually solving the problem within the GNSO.

But to remind or tell the person who's maybe reading this, you know a person who is in trouble who has this issue, right, has gone to this level of fighting with everybody, right, will certainly be reading this document.

And at that point is it worth it in our interest to say look, you know just remind that person that if you are really - you know they've also outlined the possibility of going to the ombudsman, but to suggest that they even exist as opposed to saying that's the procedure or way to do that.

That's all, you know.

J. Scott Evans: What I would say to do is Marika, let's go ahead and change the language the way that Avri has suggested and then let's summarize Subbiah's point and put it to the list.

Because this is too small a group I feel personally as chair, it's too small a group to make that decision. I think it's good to note it, that this has been coming up and this has been stated and that we need to consider it.

But I think it's too small a group for us to put it into text form.

S. Subbiah: And I just want to make the point again to say that I'm not saying that this is a procedural way of solving the problem. It's just a line added to say hey, there's something called an ombudsman exists and if that's something that might not be meaningful in this context, but that they exist.

Avri Doria: Can I make a comment?

J. Scott Evans: Yes, please Avri.

Avri Doria: Basically I would be very much against anybody putting a (unintelligible) on the ombudsman. On the other hand, if we put a notation that you know ICANN does have ombudsmen, conflict resolution methods, I mean there's at least two or three.

From the board, external committees so they're going to be adding whole bunches of new ones through all this accountability stuff, we don't want to predetermine that one does go to the...

S. Subbiah: I would be okay with that.

Avri Doria: So if anything put just you know there are other methods to resolve, but certainly not (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay, that's what I would suggest we do but I still want to put it to the larger group and I would suggest it go in a foot note. So Marika if you would just notate that and let's - when we circulate the next draft, point that point out to the group.

Marika Konings: Okay, and maybe if Subbiah has some recommended language, I'd be happy for him as well to circulate that to the list.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, and if you'll circulate it, and I'll help you Subbiah, if you want to circulate to me we can work on getting it to Marika by...

S. Subbiah: Yeah, I'm actually pretty much okay with exactly what Avri said, that would work.

J. Scott Evans: All right, Marika I'll try to send you something this weekend.

Marika Konings: Okay, I noted down what Avri said so (unintelligible) as well as the footnote then.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, thank you. All right, so we're at 3. No, that's what we just finished.

Marika Konings: No, just about 3.7 and it is the role of the chair to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce its designation to the working group and members of the working group should be able to challenge the designation of the chair as part of the working group discussions.

However if disagreement persists members of the working group may use the above noted process to challenge the designation.

J. Scott Evans: I'm sorry, I had to step away for a second, what was just said?

Marika Konings: Nothing, I just read out the paragraph that deals with the chair designation of the level of consensus and members can challenge that.

J. Scott Evans: A lot of this is codification of what we've already done. I mean I've been in meetings where Avri has done this. She has said okay, do we have consensus? I think we have consensus.

This is a call to those on the phone and to those in the room. If you want to challenge consensus this is the time to do it, right Avri? I mean I've heard you say that.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, no, calling consensus is already a process of trial and error and (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Subbiah did I hear you say something?

S. Subbiah: Yeah, that's perfectly right, I wish I had been on committees where Avri was saying those things. I have been on committees where that was never done.

J. Scott Evans: Well Avri is pretty good about making sure that we keep to the deadlines. Okay, I think this looks okay. You have a note here about work team to discuss whether further details need to be added.

I think it's pretty good, but...

Marika Konings: No, that's the deleted section that was there before and asking whether we should have labels and examples so that's actually the deleted text that was there from before and we decided not to have that included.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right.

Marika Konings: Then Section 3.7, the appeal process, it's a new section but part of the language comes from an earlier section and we decided to move that to a separate section.

So it reads any working group member that believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or discounted or wants to appeal the decision of the working group or chartering organization but first has to discuss the circumstance with the working group chair.

In the event that the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the working group member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the chair of the chartering organization and I just made a note here that the working team should discuss whether further details need to be added on the process on whether this is sufficient.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, any comments anyone? Moving on.

Marika Konings: So then I presume I can take that out, people feel that it's sufficient?

J. Scott Evans: I didn't hear any complaints.

Marika Konings: Okay, so moving on, Page 11 we just added instead of one day we made it ideally at least 24 hours in advance in relation to circulating the agenda for a working group.

Moving on to Section 4.2, just added a note here saying that the applicable recommendations made by other teams which is the OAC communications team may be added once available as appropriate.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, would you bracket that just so it stands out as a note?

Marika Konings: Okay. Do you want it as well in a separate paragraph or just between brackets?

J. Scott Evans: Brackets is fine, maybe bolded, something that just makes it jump out and look like it's - any time we note it should be just - I don't want to sort of look to

anybody that stumbles across this document like that's part of the included text.

I want to clearly define it as this is an editorial comment to explain something to the reader.

Marika Konings: Okay. Section 4.3 on Page 13, here we also added the note that additional recommendations made by other teams or committees such as the OC communications team or the project participation committee may be added once available as appropriate.

So I'll also bracket that and...

J. Scott Evans: Yes, I'm sorry Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, it's just an editorial note in the bracket, that kind of note as opposed to a tape - you know (unintelligible) note. So if you just say editorial note that's probably fine.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, when we get to 4.4 Caroline Greer had submitted some things to the list in writing and I'd like to look at that so just let me know when we're ready to go there.

Marika Konings: Yeah, I think we're at 4.4.

J. Scott Evans: All right, let me get to - so 4.4, she says that she put out an earlier email and then a second email that said that she thought this should go in 4.4.

But basically I think this has do to with seek input from self informed groups and she had some language Marika, I don't know if you've seen this.

It's an email that she sent out on Tuesday, so that would be yesterday. And she says you know it should be there and she just says additionally a working

group may at any stage throughout its deliberation decide to seek input from self informed groups and/or individuals with the aim of further informing working group members about matters that fall within the remit of the working group.

And which are of interest to the ICANN community and I think it's just an affirmation that they can do outreach if they feel like it would better inform them of the issues.

And she thinks that that should be here in this section. It doesn't offend me in any way.

S. Subbiah: It's fine with me.

Avri Doria: I'm happy with that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, so let's stick that in Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay. Then in Section 5 we just add self assessment as one of the output sale products of the working group and we also made that note under the examples noting that that's something that will need to be developed.

And then we just have annex one that's your checklist and I think that's to be completed (unintelligible) and that will be based on the note that we made in Section 2.1.4 which talks about the first meeting of the working group.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, Marika do you want to discuss with the group the email that you and (Jeff) had sent around to me I believe it was yesterday afternoon about the questions that had come up in the PDP WT?

Marika Konings: Yes. The DBT work team met last week and has started discussing and divided up the PDP and a number of different stages, so we have arrived at the voting and implementation stage and the first question they have been

debating is how - what options does the GNSO council have to deal with the recommendations of a working group?

And a number of issues and questions were raised and the DBT working team is wondering why there (unintelligible) discuss those or would like to discuss those and possibly include additional language or recommendations around these issues in the guidelines.

Or alternatively it's going to be the PDP working might consider some statistic recommendations or guidance on these issues as part of PDP working group.

Some of the questions they raised were how should the GNSO council deal with recommendations that are not consensus recommendations but have rough consensus or strong support.

J. Scott Evans: Here's what I would suggest Marika, is that we didn't really find out because I had held off on this, and Cheryl you correct me because you have a great memory, but I believe this was the question I asked (Jeff) was, was it within our remit to consider this?

And he said yes, in fact it was. I was not certain that is was. And in Seoul he said it was. Given that reality and the fact that we have not discussed it robustly within our group, is there any way we could post these questions as part of the cover email with the next draft Marika?

So that we can discuss this and then have everyone consider these questions between now and our next call? Because they haven't seen these questions and I would like them to see them and possibly those of you that have time to get some discussion going on the list, Avri I'm trying to do as I saw your email to (Jeff) to use the electronic tools we have to get discussion going.

So if we could do that and just make sure it's highlighted some way and pointed out to them so that they know that there's something more than just a normal cover email for them to look at.

And see if we can get some discussion.

Marika Konings: Do you want me for now to put those questions up in the Adobe Connect so people can see them there?

J. Scott Evans: That would be great if you could do that. But I don't want to have a discussion about them now because our group is so small. What I really want to do is make you aware of this, to make it where it is within our remit, they are seeking some input from us.

I do believe we should give it to them, but I want it to be one - I want it to be more than a discussion that you just learned about them today.

I want it to be a thoughtful discussion so I want to do it next week, and too is I want more people involved in the discussion so that it is a diverse discussion with many viewpoints.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I recommend that they go in the Wiki instead of Adobe Connect and then we could maybe even add notes to them.

J. Scott Evans: That's absolutely - I think she was talking about in the immediate, but yes, I think putting them on the Wiki is absolutely appropriate. I may make you teach us a Wiki class one call.

Avri Doria: Okay.

S. Subbiah: So are you expecting...

J. Scott Evans: I'm sorry, go ahead Subbiah?

S. Subbiah: I'm just wondering, this discussion on these questions to clarify, are we expecting to do this on email, or on the Wiki?

J. Scott Evans: I'd like to do it on email and then as much as we can and then do a summary discussion next week.

S. Subbiah: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Because Caroline Greer has made it very clear that because of the time that is preferential for the entire group, she has a class at that time and cannot miss it.

So she will not - but she has been participating by email, so we get more involvement if we will start to use email a little bit more to have some discussion and I would encourage everyone to do that.

That way we - and as chair it's my responsibility that I make sure that if you don't make a call that those views are put forth during the verbal discussion so that your views are represented.

So it gives you an opportunity to participate.

S. Subbiah: May I suggest something regarding - I don't want to discuss the question but my suggestion is taking a look at this, it looks like the two extremes of this question, meaning for example if there's unanimous support we know what to do, if there's no consensus we know what to do, right?

So what we might - this is going to be a little difficult, especially I think to discuss in email, so maybe what we should focus on at least in the clear cut cases of the extreme, we at least have an idea what should be done.

And then focus on the middle cases where you know there's rough consensus or whatever. And you can get something out of it before we move to the next step.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, I think that's great.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika, if I can just add something as well to these questions because part of - you know the other side of the discussion that the PDP work team is having but probably important as well for the working group working to take into account, they're discussing as well like what options does the GNSO council have once a working group puts forward a recommendation?

Should they just give up everything or nothing? Can they make changes, can they take parts of it? And again there are other questions like how should they treat recommendations that you know are not consensus recommendations, might not have part support.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, well I just think we now have the questions I want us to all consider them thoughtfully. Marika do you think you can get something out by Friday to the group?

Marika Konings: Yes, no Thanksgiving here so I can put that on the list tomorrow on the Wiki.

J. Scott Evans: That would be great if you would and also send an email to remind everybody that we're going to have this discussion by email and encourage the email. And I will send something behind your email encouraging them to use the email and perhaps even taking a path that's giving my - although a neutral chair, sort of my path over what I think maybe to get some discussion going.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here.

J. Scott Evans: Yes Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll put my hand down now, and the point I was going to make is as a result of encouraging the email discussion and obviously capturing it on the Wiki as well.

If we also could put out to the group and really (unintelligible) a very specific block of time (unintelligible) discussion on the (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: I absolutely will, in fact my point, what I want to do at next week's call, and I'll ask you all - I'm brainstorming here but what I had intended to do was just concentrate on these questions on the next call to give Marika the opportunity to then begin pushing these two documents into one document. And then maybe in a couple of weeks we would sit down and look - start looking at the first path at the two combined documents.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, can I ask a question?

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Marika Konings: Would you like me as well together with the notes, and especially for those that are not on the call, just send out an updated version of this document based on our discussion basically accepting all the changes that everyone's happy with and just having track changes those - additional changes that we've discussed now and then before the next call, after...

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely.

Marika Konings: And before the next call after the next one I should be able to integrate the two into one.

J. Scott Evans: Great. Super. Because - okay, that's what I want to do. And at this point I think we can bring this call to a close unless I hear any other business.

I would ask that everyone on the call let's all make a commitment Cheryl, Avri, Subbiah and myself that we are going to work hard to use the email so that we can engage some of these folks that I think are interested but they're just very busy to see if we can get some robust discussion on the email list.

So I would appreciate it if we could all commit - I'll commit to do that if you all will commit to do that and let's - because these are very serious questions and these are very important, okay?

With that I will thank - oh and put it all on the Wiki as well, sorry.

S. Subbiah: And for all the US types, happy Thanksgiving.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, Avri?

Glen De Saint Géry: It's Glen J. Scott, just to check the next call is next Wednesday at the same time as now?

J. Scott Evans: Nineteen hundred UTC.

Glen De Saint Géry: Thank you very much J. Scott and happy Thanksgiving.

J. Scott Evans: Happy Thanksgiving all.

Marika Konings: Thanks, bye.

S. Subbiah: Bye.

Glen De Saint Géry: (Angela)? Hello (Angela)?

END