
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. This is the eighth meeting at 14:00 UTC on the 6th of October of the Work Stream 2 Support Organization and Advisory Committee Accountability Topic. And I want to start this call by noting that one of our co-rapporteurs, Steve DelBianco is, if not in the air, only landing with an airplane at the moment. So he should be listed as an apology at this stage. He will join us depending on the vagaries of airline schedule.

And I'd also ask if we can have identified the two phone numbers, the one ending in 62819 and 9626. It's possible for you to identify yourselves, as staff can change your number to a name. Or if you feel comfortable, you can right-click and change your own identity. That will make life easier for us as well.

With that, I want to ask if there is anybody who is on audio-only? Because we will take our attendance from the Adobe Connect room record. Particularly, once those two telephone numbers become names. Sounds to me that nobody is audio-only. Therefore, with the exception of those two number-only lists on the list we seem to have some 14 or so participants on the call at this stage, including a number of staff, who are welcome. If anybody is aware of apologies and they'd like to make them known now, if you'd type those into the chat, rather than us take the time to list anybody and staff will note that.

I'd like to remind everybody, if they could mute their [inaudible], unless they are talking. And mute your phone lines and microphones, unless they are talking at the time. That makes our feedback, an audio issue, is greatly improved for everybody. If you do need a dial-out, instead of

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

using the Adobe Connect room, and you do need a dial-out, if you can private chat to our staff and they'll help talk you through the connect method which most of you should be familiar with. But there is a button in the Adobe Connect room where you can request a call to the number of your choice.

With that, I think we have all the basic administrivia over and done with and I've allowed enough filibustering time for a few extra people to join us, so that is great. I note those numbers always confused and concerned about the Adobe Connect audio line. So that does mean that we have basically some 12 or 13 participants, including staff, who are on this call. A little low, but let's get on with our job.

At this stage, I'm not noticing that Farzi has been able to join us. So it looks like you're going to—

BRENDA BREWER: Cheryl, this is Brenda. Excuse me. I do have Farzi in the [Internet] Adobe room, she'll be joining us shortly. I just sent a message over there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN Hi, this is Greg Shatan. I've joined on audio.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Greg. We'll note your attendance and welcome. And we obviously, have a couple of people, Farzi included, who's full and [inaudible] of the changeover of most, but not all of you, of the Adobe Connect room to the partipants.icann1. So with Farzi joining me momentarily, I'll give her the opportunity to make any opening remarks. And following that, we shall start to get on with the job.

Let me move to Agenda Item 2 anyway. And I'll come back to Farzi for any opening remarks once she joins us. And she's talking, so she's in the AC room at least. Welcome, Farzi. I was beginning to think it was going to be a one-woman show here for a while. Not that that would be a bad thing, of course. In our last call the agenda has a link to the records of the last call, which is at Call Number 7 which was held on September 22nd. We progressed to some extent on a number of items. Probably the most important of which and the major action item for us all out of that meeting was to start drafting questions for the Advisory Committee and Support Organization. Hopefully, some generic and some specific ones. In a Google Docs format I want to thank everyone who has done that today. And we will be spending the majority of today's agenda time going through that document and finalizing those edits into the next iteration. So we won't spend time going over that right now in Agenda Item 2, because it's our next agenda item.

Farzi, if you're on audio now, do you want to make any welcoming or opening remarks? I see she's typing. That probably means she's going to say something in chat rather than take up the audio time. I'm going to assume that and move on. Okay. She thinks she might have some audio problems. So hopefully Brenda will be able to work with her to sort that out as well while I continue through the agenda.

The call-outs for anybody who wishes to raise any matters out of last call which was on September 22nd. Not seeing anyone raise their hands in the AC and not seeing anyone on audio.

[AUDIO BREAK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that was exciting. Was I the only person disconnected or did we have more general disconnections?

Farzi, I think it was a general failure in the Adobe Connect room. Certainly I was disconnected and I suspect others were as well. If I can just have a few green checkmarks to indicate that people are hearing.

GREG SHATAN: Hi, this is Greg. I was also cut off on audio-only. So it's not just the Adobe room, it was even more general failure than that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. So someone pulled the plug. That's a bit sad. But it looks like we do have at least a few people giving us some green checkmarks, those who had to reconnect. So we will continue on. Interesting that it was both the phone and the AC. It was probably the AC audio as well that went down.

Matthew, yes, I think you're here, too, because I can at least see your chat. Well, okay, with that resolved for the moment. I have no idea how

far through that was. I was, I believe, calling for anyone who wanted to raise any items out of last call which was Call #7 on September 22nd. When I said I couldn't hear anybody, I literally couldn't hear anybody. And I note Herb in the chat says the disconnection has cut him out about six times so far today, and the same thing happened yesterday during a meeting. Staff, can I suggest that if there isn't a note being raised about this from the other calls that it certainly needs to be raised from this call because we were promised greater stability and less problems, not more instability and more problems.

BRENDA BREWER:

Cheryl, this is Brenda. And I just want to confirm, yes, we are having issues this morning and this is the final week. We should be clean next week for sure. So there are bugs, but I would certainly report this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. We all understand bugs and the vagaries of all sorts of transitions. But load testing and pre-testing is part of what one does in an effective organization to avoid the inconvenience to both the staff and the volunteers when it happens. But, let's move on. And now, let's move on unless someone wishes us to really [litigate] anything we've covered now straight on to the draft questions.

And I don't know whether it's going to be easier for you to look at the Google Doc yourselves or not. I would suggest that certainly staff has had this link long enough that if they had prepared a PDF to put up that's great, but we didn't specifically ask them to. So it's not a problem if they didn't. But what I would be doing is taking you through now the

comments that we've received. And I, again, want to go back and thank everybody who has taken the time to make comments on our questions.

I also want to note at the top of the meeting that you all should have, and if you haven't, then you need to perhaps check that you are receiving messages from the mailing list. Karen distributed earlier today the staff paper. It came out after our agenda was distributed. And so we just want to recognize it in today's agenda that we've received the staff paper – and thank you very much for that – and note that we will take time in our next call to review that document in greater detail.

But, let's now just go to the questions that we have been discussing over the last ten days or so. With the types of comments we've had. We have, as is often the case, two different types of comments. Those that are of a grammatical and language-based. And I would suggest that we probably don't need to discuss those in any great detail.

Rather that I certainly am willing to accept the fact that my command of the English language is far under par having only being able to speak Australian since I was born. And so I would be more than happy than someone [inaudible] otherwise if we just go through and accept the general, grammatical changes that have been proposed. And what we do need to perhaps discuss in greater detail are the matters of substance.

So for those of you who have the document open, we have two pages of document. In the first page we have a number of comments which are

of the language and grammatical nature, and I propose we just accept all of those. But we do have a couple of substantive ones.

The first of which was raised by Rosalie. Rosalie Morales suggested, and this is one I'd like to get your feedback on. And thank you very much, staff, for putting that up as a PDF, that will help. She proposed that as our first question we ask the respondent, which it's probably going to be a Chair or lead in the AC if they're all component part thereof. To specify, there was 50 designated community that [SO/AC] first to make sure that they're talking about the same thing.

That's the first thing I'd like to suggest we discuss. Is there anybody who doesn't think that that's a worthy addition to our questioning? If so, let us know now. Is there anyone who would propose different or a variation to what Rosalie is suggesting? Alan, you've got your hand up? I must be seeing microphones offhand, sorry.

Okay. In the absence of anyone arguing any other way. It looks that we will be accepting Rosalie's suggestion and of the post-preamble pointing document. We will be asking that questions. It would be a good idea if when we put out our next draft it there are any other administrative and general questions that you people might want to propose. Farzi, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Cheryl. Also Greg commented on the document at [inaudible] mentioning designated community. He questioned what we mean by community and whether the members of the SO and ACs or is it like the larger, like the non-members? So I think this is something that

you have to address in our group now. The questions are framed in a way that I believe that it's addressed the members. If we want to include questions that actually also include non-members for the accountability then we have to, I believe, I suggest that you have to have a question on outreach and a question on entry barriers. These two questions can clarify how the SO and ACs possibly take and the entry of non-members. So this was just my comment, but if anyone can comment on the designated community or has any idea of whether we should also address non-members or if we should just restrict it to members for these questions and would be grateful if you can comment. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. The floor is open on asking for responses to your question then, Farzi.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl, it's Steve. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And indeed, Steve, and welcome.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. I would say the designated community is exactly what the Bylaws describe. As the designated community of each and every one of our ACs and SOs. The table in the document are Google Docs. But it's

copies are verbatim or the Bylaws described as a designated community for say the ALAC or the GNSO.

In a few instances there are formal members like the ccNSO serves the community of country code managers, but it uses the word members as those who have joined. So I would recommend if there's any confusion on what the designated [target] community is, we can include a reference to ICANNs Bylaws. All of the seven ACs and SOs, they only exist because the Bylaws created us. And when they created us they designated the community that we serve,

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So Steve, to play devil's advocate here, would that then suggest that Rosalie's proposal of asking the respondents what their definition of just a designated community is not required.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We may wish to reiterate for them what the Bylaws say their designated community is and invite them to comment on whether they would validate or expand, how they view that designation of their community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Farzi, over to you.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Cheryl. I actually agree with Steve that in our Bylaws we actually have their... it has been mentioned. And I'm just going to copy

and paste it here. Also, we have it in the Google Doc. So I don't necessarily see a point of going to the [communities] and ask them who their designated community is for them. But I don't necessarily disagree and if other members are working where we're supporting this, we can do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Well, let's leave that as a flat and open question for this next iteration then. Because we have a possible reframing of some of the questions with our next draft we may find it is more or less easy to address this issue. Unless anyone would like to make another comment on that point, I'd like perhaps move to what is possibly the most substantive proposal which was from Giovanni where he proposed a quite different formulation of the question.

I know Farzi, for example, you were quite comfortable with its reframing. But we certainly have a number of people requiring to Giovanni's proposal with general agreement. Just checking that I haven't missed anyone. Now, I think they all agree, Alejandra, Matthew, Leslie and an anonymous agrees to that reframing. So let's perhaps first now put to the community at this call, the reformulating of the questions as Giovanni proposed.

For those of you who may only be on audio or who do not have the Google Docs open at the moment, I'll take the [time] just checking to see if Giovanni's on this call. I don't believe he is. So I'll take the liberty of reading to the record his proposal for the reformulation of questions.

The first one is, “Can we reformulate the questions as follows?” Is what he proposes. “What are the published policies and procedures by which your AC or SO is accountable to the designated community that you serve? Including procedures to encourage participation by that designated community and transparency about your AC/SO deliberations, decisions, eligibility and elections. Please include a link where they can be consulted.”

Now, we can break that down further if we were to use a number of those points as subsets of a question. But let’s take that one as read and then read the rest of them to the record and then we’ll come back and discuss them, if you don’t mind.

The next reformulation was... the next point from Giovanni, “Were these policies and procedures updated over the last decade? If so, could you clarify if they were updated to respond to specific community requests or concerns? Next point is: “Do your AC/SO have mechanisms by which your members can challenge or appeal decisions and elections? Please include a link where that can be consulted.”

The next point is: “Does your AC/SO maintain [inaudible] policies that are relevant to this exercise? If so, please describe as specifically as you are able.”

Finally: “To the extent that there are multiple stakeholder groups or constituencies in your AC/SO, please forward this request from [saying] to them accordingly.”

So that’s a proposed reformulation, one that a number of you have indicated you are quite comfortable with. If you all agree, I’d like to

establish whether you are going to agree that this reformulation is a good way forward.

So it would be having a preamble, some perhaps general questions indicating who you are and who you are speaking for, and then these reformulated questions, the first one of which I would suggest could be broken down to a couple of sub-questions as well.

The floor is open for discussion for that, and I see Alan Greenberg. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. On that last point of forwarding to constituent stakeholder groups and constituencies accordingly, I would far prefer to see “as appropriate.” I understand it’s a vague term, but in the case, for instance, of At-Large, there are several hierarchies. The ones at the bottom – there are hundreds of them. To ask them to complete this I think is something which will A) not be successful, B) be a drain on their work, and C) not be relevant, because these organizations, although they are constituent parts of At-Large in fact have other lives, and their bylaws and rules largely focus about their other parts of their lives.

So I would like to have an out there to say that we should drill down as far as reasonable in the context of ICANN. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. I certainly have no problem making that update. Greg, in the Google Doc, you raised a couple of counter-questions – clarifying questions is I guess how I could refer to them – regarding almost a

degree of granularity. Would you like to speak to that? I know you're only on audio.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I'm sorry, Cheryl. Was that question for me? This is Steve.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No, Steve. It was Greg. In the Google Doc, Greg had raise a couple of clarifying questions, and rather than me speak on his behalf, I know he's on audio. If he's able to, I wondered if he wanted to speak to them.

Okay. I'm going to assume that Greg has got some audio problems inasmuch as he may be in a situation where he's unable to respond. So let's go over, as the Google Doc shows them.

The first point that Greg raised was: "Does this research the actual members of a given SO/AC stakeholder group/constituency/RALO, etc., or to the global community? Shouldn't this be differentiated? Being accountable to a membership is not the same thing as being accountable to, for example, all Internet end users or all ISPs. "

To some extent, of course, that goes to the point Rosalie was making earlier as well. I'm not sure whether we're going to resolve that one now, but we certainly need to take [the next step].

Specific to –

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl, it's Steve. On that one, I do think that we resolved it. Farzi and I were talking about making it as clear as possible that it's the designated community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: By the Bylaws, yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Created to serve for the Bylaws. It's not a bad thing to just paste in to this questionnaire the phrases from the Bylaws on all seven ACs and SOs in our Google Doc. By putting it in there, they'll all be reminded that their designated community is not necessarily just the members. Members of the designated community who decided to join and engage is a subset of their designated community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That is why we encourage participation and discourage barriers to entering and eligibility so that more members from the community will participate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. So let's move to the next point Greg raised, which I think is specific to the reframing of the questions. He says, "It's not clear from this question" – I'm assuming it is the last of the reframed ones: "To the

extent that, if there are multiple stakeholder groups or constituencies in your AC/SO, please forward” – and as Alan’s modified it – “where applicable.”

Greg’s point was, “It’s not clear from this question whether the individual stakeholder groups and constituencies are expected to answer this question with regard to A) the SO or AC as a whole, B) the particular stakeholder group or constituency, or C) other stakeholder groups and constituencies within that SO, or more than one of the above. This needs to be clear before this goes out.”

I think we just need to be aware of that. Obviously, we’re going to have to take a sanity check again on the next draft of our document. So I think we just leave that open and have that carefully attended to as we look at how the exact wording happened. That would probably take care of that.

His next point is –

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes? Go ahead, Steve.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. On that point, I believe the answer is B. If GNSO forwards the questions to the Business Constituency, we expect the Business

Constituency to answer with respect to its own accountability questions, eligibility, outreach, etc.

So that was, of the three choices offered, B. I believe we should try to make that clearer. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. So we need to be quite articulate on what we're asking for. I think that was Greg's point.

His next point is: "The term "stakeholder group" and "constituency" are terms specific to the GNSO. Other SOs and ACs have subparts with different terminologies; for example, RALOs. This should be rephrased to take this into account, either by being more general or more complete."

I'm certainly not going to argue against that. I think we need to be as precise and articulate as possible with our questioning. Does anyone want to comment or react, or do we just do our best to make sure our next run of this much clearer?

Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Because I was drafting this original set of questions, it occurred to me that it wouldn't be that difficult for us to have seven different forms of this question, one for each AC and SO, as opposed to one general question, which attempts to normalize all these idiosyncrasies of ALAC versus GNSO versus GAC or anything else.

It's probably not essential to have one question. We probably could customize the question to resolve some of the ambiguities that people are pointing out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Steve. Of course, that's in keeping with the suggestion from our last call, Call #7, where there was also the proposal that some specific questions for the ACs and the SOs might be integrated into our questions as well. So that's fine.

His final point is one of a more fundamental nature. Here he says: "More fundamentally, it's most clear to me that, for individual stakeholder groups/constituencies/RALOs, etc., accountability falls into the remit of this subgroup."

That's a very good question. I guess there's no harm in asking these questions as they form part of the fabric of the accountability of the ACs and SOs, but if someone wants to argue strongly that we shouldn't ask for the component parts of an AC or an SO to respond, then I guess now is the time to make that argument.

Is anyone going to be making that argument? Let's assume that –

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Cheryl, in the case of GNSO, there really isn't any GNSO super-structure accountability, other than the Council. GNSO is all about the stakeholder groups and constituencies in side of it. So at least for some of the ACs and SOs, it's entirely appropriate to dive into that layer because that is the layer at which the target communities come together. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So noted. So we've given it an [earring] and we'll give it another [earring] obviously before we go to final press and send it to the CCWG for consideration.

With that, it looks to me – and correct me, fellow rapporteurs, if I'm wrong – that we've dotted a few I's, crossed a few T's, and added a few S's to our document in that we seem to have general agreement that we've some reframing of the questions and some clearer articulation of some of the questions. We can take another cut on these questions for the community between our meeting today and our meeting next week. We will have an action item on us all to continue to make comments on the next draft of this documentation.

Is that the will of the meeting? Not hearing anyone argue with me, which is always a good thing, I'm going to assume that that's the case. We as rapporteurs will take a next cut on these questions and update the Google Doc links so we have no confusion about the Google Doc links we're using.

I'll ping a reminder to the list for those of you who are not getting updates from the Google Docs – and not everyone does I realized – to go back into the Google Doc and have a look at the next cut so that we can perhaps – because of finalizing our questions.

The other thing, of course, is we also need to look at these questions with some possible modifications thereof in the light of our recently received staff background paper so that it's a sort of a hand-in-hand piece of homework for us all, and that is of course to, in advance of our

discussion and deliberation on our background paper next week, also do our personal review of it, for those of you who haven't already had the time to do so today since it has come out.

With that, I'm going to go back to the agenda now and call a close to our agenda item on the discussion of our questions and open up for the next 10 or 15 minutes and give my voice a rest and hand over to perhaps Farzi, with Steve's assistance, although I think Steve is still mobile – it sounds like you were working or in transit still, Steve – with a discussion on our desire to do an update of our progress reporting for Hyderabad.

The 5th of October, which of course was yesterday for some of you – two days ago for me – was the time where we needed to have formal reporting done by our original timeline. That's something that I don't believe actually any of the – perhaps one – tracks have been able to do. But we did undertake that, whilst we would be doing more complete reporting in a post-Hyderabad world, we would like to do a reasonable progress report at Hyderabad. So we do need to now spend a few minutes of today's call discussing what it is we would like to share at our Hyderabad meeting.

Now, in the agenda you have the earlier – I think it was in mid-August when this document was put together, which is a relatively lengthy and detailed progressing document. This particular Google Doc would need significant modification because it is not only a tracking document but a general archive of who said what and where we are in discussion, rather than any form of consensus outcome in most cases. It's a lot of he-said-she-said material in there. That's a ready reference for where we were

in our deliberations outside of this, speaking of questions to the AC and the SO, at least back in August.

The standard form, however, of reporting – and I don't know whether staff has that slide, the slide that Karen sent out to all of the rapporteurs. If that can come up, it would be ideal – and we did include it as a PowerPoint slide with your agenda – if we can at least report to the degree along the standard form of reporting that should be adhered to for all of the topics, I think that would be a good way forward for our Hyderabad exercise, and I'm not seeing that come up yet, but I can talk most of you through it.

The Work Stream 2 Subgroup deliverables, the common framework – and this is, of course, the full report. What we'd be doing is a progress report, sort of a lighter version of this. It should include an executive summary – I'm sure we can do that to some extent of where we're up to – a reiteration or description of our issues with the current state of [play] and any supplemental reports, any recommendations, and the rationale for any recommendation. I don't believe that we'd be in a position to be making any recommendations, but we certainly should, within the general constraints of this framework, try to give – thank you for that, [inaudible] up in the room – try to give a current state of play, and we are in terms of deliberation and discussion on our topics.

It's probably because whilst we are firmly in [inaudible] in understanding of our mandate and what it is we're supposed to be looking at, rather worthwhile briefly covering in our report for Hyderabad what, in fact, our mandate is. And it's to that and that we

probably assigned a number of the [comments] that are already in that Google Doc attached to your agenda would be useful.

I'm going to hand over to Farzaneh now, and to Steve to assist her with taking us through what your beliefs should be we should be saying in terms of reporting, as an update report in Hyderabad. Over to you, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Cheryl. Two points I wanted to make: one is that perhaps we should – I also said in chat that we should start working on another track while we await the questions to be answered by SO and AC, and that could be IRP track, we discussed that. But I am not sure how advanced we are going to get to report on that in Hyderabad.

So for Hyderabad, what we could do, we could look at the report that we initially have that we drafted together with the members about what we are charged with and what we have discussed so far. I don't have or know whether we should have deadlines on agreeing on certain matters before Hyderabad and then reporting, or shall we just continue just doing our work and discussing, and not agreeing? I personally think that it would be good to agree on certain things and get consensus so that we can report on some matters that we have actually reached consensus in Hyderabad. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Farzaneh. Can you help me understand what matters you think we might even be close to consensus on? Because I must have missed them.

FARZANEH BADII: No, we are not close to consensus, I'm just saying that, for example, a lot of questions that we've raised are clarified on the way, and they have to be finalized so that every time it's raised again, we [say] this is – the answer to this question has been finalized. And if we can do them – I'm not saying that a consensus based on like all the tasks that we're charged with. I'm talking about like the questions that we have provided answers for and we discussed with the group, and perhaps we finalized those answers. For example, who SOs and ACs are accountable to, and that has an answer, I think.

Or if we have not reached an answer, then we might want to discuss it on the mailing list and just have an answer for that. That's one thing, and there are a couple of other things, for example, the matter of scope of accountability of SO and ACs that's been brought up. That, I think we need to answer as well, which we have discussed a lot. I'm not talking about overarching tasks that we have, I'm just talking about these specific questions that keep being raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Is there anyone else who wants to speak on this topic? What I'm going to suggest then is that we start our fresh documents now that documents can be in the form of a PowerPoint slide or two, or it can be text. My tendency is probably to go for the PowerPoint and have the

notes associated with the PowerPoint, so that we end up with something that is pretty much ready to deliver in Hyderabad despite perhaps having a little bit more work to do between now and Hyderabad on some of the details. But I would like us to make sure that in putting our update together, we also don't lose sight of the August and September work that was done on the [inaudible] report version one.

There's a very important discussion that's captured in that document. Again – I'm just looking through it now, – we've got a number of issues that I think we could well and truly recognize in our report as having been raised and discussed, if not fully debated and finalized. Avri has made a number of points on that. Farzaneh obviously has, Giovanni, Matthew and others, so it probably behooves us to obviously not try and do the larger report, but to look at the larger report and take aspects of that as the comments and discussions from it and make sure that we do capture that, because it is work that is important to report upon. It's likely if we get that started, it's not going to perhaps be as fully completed as we'd like it for discussion next week, so it may end up being on our discussion for the week after next meeting, and that is getting rather close to Hyderabad, obviously.

So if, again, we can encourage people to use online collaboration and make their comments and adjustment, suggestions as we go, that would be greatly appreciated. I think it's important that we also recognize that we will have a relatively free flow opportunity, the way that the Hyderabad meeting is scheduled, to take you back to our last CCWG meeting when the outline for our Hyderabad meeting was discussed. We will have opportunity in the morning to raise issues, to discuss

issues, and then in the afternoon to go into particular depth, but one of the things that the co-Chairs have asked us to do is also come up with any particular or specific questions that we are aware of, that we would like to be discussing in the afternoon as a plenary.

So that's another action item. Obviously, that would be part of our reporting or update and progress report, but that's almost a [inaudible] action item on us all to identify one – if not more than one – particular question. If we don't identify the question, that of course doesn't mean that we can't and won't discuss it in Hyderabad, but the proposal was if we had a few questions at least identified, that it would give people an idea and a plan as to what will be going on in the afternoon. So the questions that would be not what we would be limited to, but that would be able to be at least a sampler for the topics in the afternoon session, so we also need to look at that.

And so the last few minutes of the call, if anyone has any ideas on that and they've got [inaudible] into the chat, you're more than welcome to do so now, but in the absence of that, please put it to the list, and indeed make a comment on the update report space that we'll be creating shortly.

I just wanted to note in the chat what Mathew was saying: "If we make a start on one of our other tracks, it will at least give additional reporting elements for Hyderabad." That's very true, and I think that was the point that Farzaneh was making, so that would be nice to happen.

Greg [inaudible] delighted that with the difficulties of participation you feel that we've done a reasonable job of bringing your concerns to the floor, despite you walking through the streets of New York whilst on a meeting. I guess it's safe to walk and do remote participation. Maybe don't drive and do remote participation.

The proposal Farzaneh is making too is that track four of [inaudible] IRT would be applicable to [inaudible] activities. It's her suggestion, supported by Matthew as at least one of the additional topics we might be able to get a little of our work done on and to report in to the Hyderabad meeting for.

With that – and we have just a few minutes on the top of the hour – if we can take a quick look at anything outstanding that anyone wants to raise, Any Other Business or any issues that you feel haven't been appropriately covered for today's short call? Not seeing hands or hearing anyone, I want to thank you all again or all of the input that those of you who have worked on the online collaborative documents have made as of the last seven to ten days, and thank you in advance for the work that you will be doing on the next load of documentation that is coming out.

I'd like to remind you all that our next meeting is scheduled for the 13th of October, 19:00 UTC, and that amongst the next cut of our questions for community on that agenda was also the discussion on the staff background paper.

And just on the staff background paper, I think there are a few paragraphs, certainly in the introductory part of that, that would be

quite easy for us to shamelessly plagiarize in our update for the Hyderabad meeting. So with that, we will perhaps give you back two or three minutes of your lives, and thank our staff and thank all of you for joining us in today's call.

Is there anything, Steve, you would like to say in closing? And then I'll ask Farzaneh the same.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl, Farzaneh and everyone. That's all. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, and hopefully we won't have you walking through an airport next week, Steve. Farzaneh, anything from you?

FARZANEH BADII: No, thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alright, ladies and gentlemen, thank you one and all. At 1:00 AM here in Australia, I'm ready to go and put my feet up, and I suspect the rest of you are ready to get on with your days, evenings, or mornings. Thank you one and all. This meeting is now at a close. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]