

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
August 29, 2017
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recording has started. You may begin.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, MJ. Raoul and Joan, over to you now. Thank you very much.

Joan Kerr: Okay, great. I just have a couple of questions to ask you guys before we start with the charter. One is, Raoul, I didn't get a response for the SSR meeting. I need to get back to them. I sent that. I'll resend it on the MPCO Ex Com Skype message again. I'd like to finish that today. And secondly, we don't have a date for the EC meeting. I think we said the first Wednesday or the third Wednesday. So those are the two outstanding things that I think we have to do.

So anyway, let's go to the charter. If you can let me share it, give me sharing right, Maryam, I'll do that and we can start. Hopefully, I'll have the right version this time. Oh, is that how you're going to do it? We're not going to share it on the screen?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, we are. I just wanted to, for anyone who didn't have the link on hand to give it.

Joan Kerr: Great. Yes, make sure I have the right one.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, Tapani was here on Sunday and we just had a look at a few first sections of the charter. And Tapani noticed that the section is the Article 2.2, we actually need to check all these references because that one is outdated. I don't know how long it's been that and it's just been carried through. But yes, we need to change it to 2.1.2 on Section 1.1. And also, we need to put non-commercial with the dash and that's how it's consistent with the other NCSG and NCUC documents.

Joan Kerr: So Raoul, where do you want me to go? You want to go through the comments this time or?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think that's what we...

Joan Kerr: Then we have to validate everything afterward I think.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I'd like to have a run through of all of it, yes. I resolved those two issues by Tapani. Although we need -- I'm just going to make a find and replace for all the non-commercial to become non-commercial with a dash.

Joan Kerr: Okay, go ahead. Then tell me where you want me to go when you're done with that. Okay?

Raoul Plommer: Okay. I think you can, in the meanwhile, you can look for the first section that has comments on it in the meanwhile. I'll do that find and replace. Okay. I did it. So Tapani was saying this one 1.2.2 scope where Gangadhar also has

the first comment. It says operation concerns are defined as the concerns arising from the use of the GTLDs by the non-commercial organizations that serve non-commercial interests to achieve their own mission. It's quite a mouthful. That could be a bit more -- it sounds like jargon.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Can you hear me okay?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Because I keep muting and unmuting. I never know which mute or unmute I'm on. This is what I call you get the first draft and then you start to wordsmith everything and re-check everything.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it's never ending.

Joan Kerr: Editing is 90% as far as I'm concerned. 10% is getting the content in there and then saying okay, what do we do now. All right.

Raoul Plommer: I think these include really -- I don't think it needs to be sort of more obvious that it's not limited to those.

Joan Kerr: I agree. Even as well as. It should just be and transparent, comma, transparent registration and continued ownership, right?

Raoul Plommer: Well, I guess it's an effort to separate the other general issues and then transparent registration and continued ownership of domain names.

Joan Kerr: Because that's how we started with that.

Raoul Plommer: Oh, right. Yes, I see what you mean.

Juan Manuel: I don't understand some comment there.

Joan Kerr: You mean (Sam's) comment?

Juan Manuel: Yes, (Sam's) comment. I doesn't understand. It doesn't, this (unintelligible) mandate, I don't understand that comment.

Joan Kerr: I don't either. I don't know what he means.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I guess he's really just looking for if it's -- if those issues really have something to do with the domain name system and I think they do.

Joan Kerr: So we can just say resolve for that one, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it's done.

Joan Kerr: We did resolve Ganga's as well because it was just a suggestion. Okay. So Raoul, Tapani was okay with the operational concerns that it was defined okay in terms of what we're trying to do.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, like the mission and scope he thought that were fine.

Joan Kerr: Well, that's the biggest thing as far as I'm concerned.

Raoul Plommer: Well, that's right, yes. Although he was saying that this is really a mouthful, that the first bit of the 1.2.2. We should really try to think a better way to say that.

Joan Kerr: Yes, your mission not be so many words. I hate missions that have more than 12 words.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. I think we can just take off that serve non-commercial interests. We can just say from the use of the GTLDs by the non-commercial organizations to achieve their own mission. I mean obviously non-commercial organizations have non-commercial interests. That's like a fundamental thing. So I think at least that bit is redundant.

Joan Kerr: Well, take it out and let's see what it looks like. How's that?

Juan Manuel: It's clearer for me.

Joan Kerr: Do we need to say -- here's a suggestion as well. Operational concerns are defined as issues -- because we use the word twice as concerns in one sentence. I know that's the name but as issues arising from as opposed to concerns.

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: And take out the.

Juan Manuel: That I was trying to suggest when I put the word those before Raoul raised it.

Joan Kerr: Yes, so how does that sound?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think that's better already.

Joan Kerr: So here's another suggestion. Operational concerns are defined as issues arising from the use of the GTLDs by -- do we have to say non-commercial organizations again or just say by...

Raoul Plommer: That's actually now the only time we say it.

Joan Kerr: I know, I'm just saying if we say it such (unintelligible).

Juan Manuel: The first time that we said (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Yes, but it's up at the missions too. Anyway, that's better. And then we're defining it later. That's all right? The scope looks good now. It's a lot better. I love editing. Oh, boy.

Raoul Plommer: So I guess what about the one, two, three? We could maybe check the NCUC and Tapani was also saying that they have now their comment period on, on their charter. So we should really have a look at theirs as well to sort of make a conscious effort of aligning these two with the NCSG and, yes, I think we need to -- sorry?

Joan Kerr: What did he say that we have to check?

Raoul Plommer: At the moment, the NCUC as their charter review process on and they're now at the phase where they take public comments on their charter review. In fact, it would be nice to pay a little attention to theirs as well and I think we could draw some good points for us and definitely would find some aligning things to do with our own charter.

Joan Kerr: Right. So I don't get any emails from NCUC as a whole.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I could maybe try and forward that link for all of us.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes, go ahead.

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry, can someone mute their mic now please? It's really causing interference. Thanks, I was just looking at 1.2.2 again and it says operational concerns are defined as issues arising from the views of the GTLDs but its non-commercial interests to achieve their own mission. Reading this on the first go, I honestly don't understand it.

Joan Kerr: So is it the word issues or interests?

Maryam Bakoshi: No, I think the word interest. Yes, I think the word interest. It's almost like we're (unintelligible) joining and it's not really flowing.

Joan Kerr: As soon as you said it, the word interest stuck out to me as well. So just by non-commercial organizations to achieve their own missions. Is that what you're saying? Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, that's correct.

Joan Kerr: I'm going to mute again.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you, Raoul. That reads better now.

Joan Kerr: And just one quick question. I know we had this conversation before and I was looking it up. Did we define what public interest software concerns were

again? (Unintelligible) somebody else because I always want to explain what something is.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it was explained to me, like, twice already but I keep forgetting so I have to check for the third time and we'll elaborate that elsewhere on our site I think. I think all of those issues we should have a separate webpage explaining exactly what we're doing there.

Joan Kerr: Can you hear me okay or am I still on mute?

Maryam Bakoshi: We can hear you.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, can hear you.

Joan Kerr: I'm sorry. Yes, I think that we'll define all of those and put even the links to what's happening in ICANN regarding those issues. Separately, I agree with you. I put it down as a to do. Hi, Remmy. Welcome. Thank you for joining us.

Raoul Plommer: So what do you guys think of the 1.2.3? (Sam) has said that it's obvious and redundant but did we have a look at NCUC's version? Do they have something similar and if they don't, we could leave it as well because I think it's kind of obvious since we're part of ICANN that we'd be committed to the same form of doing things.

Joan Kerr: So is it referenced somewhere else? Because if it is, I agree, the less that we have, the better, as long as we can refer to something. Yes, it might be redundant. I'm going to propose that if it's somewhere else, especially in NCSG, but I don't know. Let's leave it and check it, and then if it is, then when we finish this document we have to say an opening statement like we

adhere to the GNSO and NCSG charter rules, right? So that certain things like this we don't have to write in our own charter. Does that make sense?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, that makes sense. I'll put a link to the NCUC charter review on Skype.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: So we can have a look at that. But yes, maybe if we make a comment that we come back to it and check it. Like these kind of reference things, I think we can still leave note of those and try to move on with the other comments and then sort of go through it a few times in this fashion.

Joan Kerr: All right. Can you hear me okay?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Can you hear me?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I can hear you.

Joan Kerr: Can you hear me? Hello?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, Joan. Go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Leave anything that we have to check either against NCSG or NCC as highlighted so that we know we have to come back to it. Okay?

Raoul Plommer: Sounds good.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Where to now?

Raoul Plommer: Well, then there's 1.3. Juan has left a note to check NCSG principles so I guess that's the same kind of thing, we'll leave those. Then (Sam's) comment is not -- we've changed it to members so that's resolved. 1.3.3, (Sam) says I personally find it sad that we have to spell this out in the charter. Well, we should again check that, can somebody make a comment that we check from the NCUC if they have this similar kind of thing? Because these are also like reasons I think to maybe have rules within our organization. So I guess, I don't think it's that terrible if they're there. But if the NCUC doesn't have anything similar, I don't think we should either because then it is really kind of obvious that we do things the same way as ICANN does. We are part of ICANN.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I agree that if it's something that -- we have to follow ICANN's bylaws anyway so if it's there and NCC does not agree with you, we just take it out. Because we're trying to make this a lean document, right, so people read it. So I'll put it down that we check against NCUC, 1.3.3. So I have that as well?

Raoul Plommer: Okay, cool. Juan has 2.1.1 he wants to change as to if. I agree with that. That's okay. I guess it's better than as needed and if needed. It's really the same I think. More comments as well. As is correct. Okay, right. Resolved. Then there's 2.2. Okay, yes, so basically Sam's comment is before we changed all those titles, 2.2.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So now, hold on, maybe we should actually check 2.6 to see what it actually says about the Treasurer. Subcommittees and volunteers. To support their activities, committees may organize ad hoc subcommittees and may advertise for and recruit NPOC volunteers. Right, okay, so basically I think what he

means is that we'd need to put the Treasurer to 2.6 so that -- because now, they're listed as elected officers. I guess that's the problem. And we don't have an elected treasurer.

Juan Manuel: So treasury doesn't mean be mentioned on officer eligibility? Just take out treasurer from that entry.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, treasurer would be by appointment, I think, and the other (unintelligible) are EC positions we can -- those are elected. I think treasurer is the only...

Juan Manuel: We should mention that in that place or it is not possible?

Joan Kerr: I think we have to remove treasurer from Section 2.2.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: That's the first action because they're not elected and then say later that the EC will appoint a treasurer.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I took the treasurer out. Added the comment.

Joan Kerr: I'm trying to -- hello?

Raoul Plommer: Uh-huh.

Joan Kerr: I'm trying to remember where we said we appoint -- it is I think we do address the appointment of the treasurer later but I put it down just to check that to make sure we do have it that the EC will appoint.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Anyway, we've taken it out. This is just the officer illegibility. So let's deal with that and I put it down as something to make sure we don't forget. Okay?

Raoul Plommer: Okay. I guess we'll leave the part where it says not be running for NPOC chair if serving on ICANN nominating committee, yadda, yadda, yadda, yah. So I'll just resolve that.

Joan Kerr: So in 2.2.1, number C, if a chair wants to run for a nominating committee, it's saying that they cannot run because a lot of -- for example, Farsi is the chair of -- I know it's not the nominating committee and I know other groups that are doing it -- they run for another position and then they resign from their position.

Juan Manuel: (Unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Or is it just specifically for the nominating committee and we don't even have a seat on the nominating committee.

Raoul Plommer: That's kind of funny isn't it? But yes, it's -- I think it's really for saying about the nominating committee. I really don't see the relevance of having that in our charter.

Joan Kerr: No, we do want to pursue having a seat on the nominating committee though.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. Oh, absolutely.

Joan Kerr: So maybe we should leave it in just because we want to pursue that. Right? So then the chair cannot run for that position is what it's saying.

Raoul Plommer: No, it means not be running for NPOC chair.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: If you're in the nominating committee or as part of another supporting organization.

Joan Kerr: The other way around.

Raoul Plommer: Or advisory committee then GNSO.

Joan Kerr: Right. It makes sense.

Raoul Plommer: I guess, so we'll just leave it there and the 2.2.2.

Joan Kerr: Did we just lose Raoul?

Raoul Plommer: No, I'm still here.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Not showing on the document. That's why. Sorry.

Raoul Plommer: I guess we'll leave the...

Joan Kerr: I meant Juan. Did we lose Juan? And I think Remmy is on the phone. Oh, you are there. You're not showing in my document, so I thought we...

Juan Manuel Rojas: I am on anonymous, but I'm not (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Okay. Don't be anonymous and fool me.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Oh, so.

Joan Kerr: I'm going to mute now.

Raoul Plommer: So should we just leave the 2.2.2 as well? Or should we put a comment that we need to check if there's something like that in the NCUC charter as well? How about that?

Joan Kerr: I put it down to check it under NCUC so we'll leave it for now.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, good. Each member may fill only one elected position within the NPOC simultaneously. I think this -- we're not electing NCSG EC members, are we? Did we?

Joan Kerr: Sorry, what was the question?

Raoul Plommer: You know, in 2.2.3 it says each member may fill only one elected position within the NPOC simultaneously. So was the NCSG EC position elected or not?

Joan Kerr: No, it's an appointment. We appoint two people to that committee.

Raoul Plommer: Right. That's fine then. Then we can leave that as it is. Officers will be elected for one year terms. I don't know. I think that -- oh yes. Okay, so basically we have a difference to the NCSG charter. We can maybe replace the last bit, no officer may serve in the same position for more than five years in any ten year period. So we could just add what Juan got it for us, at maximum two full one-year terms consecutively. Do you agree?

Joan Kerr: So this is 2.3.2?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: And so the suggestion is -- because I like the second part, no officer shall serve in the same position for more than five year in a ten-year period. So the question is the first part, is that what you're saying?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, that no officer may serve in the same position. Instead, we would put officers will be elected for one year terms at maximum two full one-year terms consecutively. Oh, that's only for chair though. Should we put something like that for chair or NPOC?

Juan Manuel Rojas: I think it would be nice to have maximal two full one-year terms because one-year is shorter I think and I think I agree.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it's now about -- we are going to have one-year terms but now, we're talking about should we allow somebody to be chair more than two consecutive years?

Joan Kerr: Yes, I don't think that's ever a good idea. Can you hear me okay?

Raoul Plommer: Uh-huh. Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay, I don't think someone should be in any one position for too long.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes, so I agree. Because it should be rotating and people should be developing and coming in and out.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Maximum two full one-year terms. Yes, I think that's good, Juan. So this is talking about overall elections though, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, for officers. Yes. But I think we should just -- we could just extend that to all elected positions.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I agree. Go ahead. Maryam, were you going to say something?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, I was going to say (unintelligible) I was going to say the same thing as Raoul because the NCSG chair is only elected position in the NCSG EC. Every other position is appointed so if the positions are elected in NPOC then yes, it should be (unintelligible) term limit. Does that make sense?

Joan Kerr: So I could hardly hear you. So could you repeat that?

Maryam Bakoshi: I said I was agreeing with Raoul and yourself to say that if the positions are elected then they should be term limited, like the -- so the NCSG EC, the only reason why it is says chair is because the chair position is the only elected position. All the other positions are appointed. So if they were all elected then it would be the same thing for everyone (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Right. So Raoul, I guess we're (unintelligible) Juan? He said the quote, so yes, Raoul, so change that then because I think it's a good idea.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. Somebody else can suggest some wording but something like that.

Joan Kerr: Yes, we can do a bit of wordsmithing but the intent, I think we can agree on. But it looks good.

Raoul Plommer: Maybe I'll add in that position just to make it clearer.

Juan Manuel Rojas: In the same position maybe, I think.

Joan Kerr: Same position.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Because then we are not able to be in NPOC anymore if that is
(unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: In the same position, yes. Perfect. Clear language is always good. Can you
hear me?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, there's some Ganga's notes about bolding. I'm just accepting them.

Joan Kerr: Good, perfect. I'll move down.

Gangadhar Panday: Hello?

Joan Kerr: Hi, Ganga.

Raoul Plommer: Hello, Ganga.

Gangadhar Panday: Apologies, I joined late because it's raining heavily here.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I know about this technology and storms. Okay, so you know about --
we're on 2.4.3 at the moment and remember to mute your devices when you're
not speaking if that's possible. Thanks.

Raoul Plommer: We're at 2.5 now.

Joan Kerr: Okay, perfect. My goodness. Oh, I don't want to talk about these responsibilities. No.

Raoul Plommer: I agree with Juan and (Sam) and we could just use what he was -- what Juan took from the NCSG Charter and replace NCSG with NPOC.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Apart from the last NCSG.

Joan Kerr: Yes. You can hear me right?

Raoul Plommer: We can hear you.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Yes, I agree. It's pretty -- I mean it says what it's supposed to say and as everybody always agrees, it's better for us to align with NCSG as much as possible.

Raoul Plommer: How's that?

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) more. There's one more at the end of 2.5.1. It says NCSG.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think we should leave that.

Joan Kerr: Oh, right. It's saying (unintelligible) to it.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes, because according to all of them.

Joan Kerr: Perfect.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Anyone could understand that comment with (Sam) 12.

Joan Kerr: I have no idea what he's saying.

Raoul Plommer: It's the same as it was in the 2.2.

Juan Manuel Rojas: In the -- about the treasurer on the committee.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, if it's by appointment or what. So I guess he's saying that we should maybe have the treasurer listed here.

Joan Kerr: Yes. I think we should say to support their activities, committees, and any appointments, right, so it's not just a (unintelligible) appointments in general.

Raoul Plommer: Can you read that again?

Joan Kerr: I'm saying that we can put the word appointments in here and not just necessarily say the treasurer, just appointments.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: And then that way if we want to do appointments for other things, we can.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Okay, but just my question. We have subcommittees and we are only one executive committee right now. The rest of them are coordination groups. Then I don't know if subcommittees fits here.

Joan Kerr: Right. But we can have ad hoc subcommittees. We can, say for example, Juan, you have a really great idea for communications, let's say, but you want

to know what your region, let's say we're going to do regional strategies. You may want to put together a subcommittee ad hoc for South America and then say, okay, this is what we found in South America. Let's put one in for Asia-Pacific. Do you know what I mean?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So we need to (unintelligible) have these committees.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Okay, it's an open possibility, right?

Joan Kerr: Sorry?

Juan Manuel Rojas: It's an open possibility.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Now, I don't like the word their activities. I think we should be more specific. To support NPOC's activities, I think we should say, not their. And then something to the effect, I'm not trying to put the wording in my head, but help might be needed. From time to time, to support NPOC activities, the EC from time to time may organize ad hoc committees and appoint volunteers. Something to that, oh, it does say that, and recruit volunteers. But we need to put the appointment in here as well. Maybe we're trying to put too many things in this one. This is just addressing some subcommittees and volunteers. Maybe what we have is 2.6.1, the EC may from time -- may appoint volunteers to fulfill a particular position, something like that. So it's a separate thing just so we have appointments in there.

Juan Manuel Rojas: I have another question here. I'm going to...

Joan Kerr: Go ahead, Juan.

Juan Manuel Rojas: In the last part, I know that we are behind, but then it says if consensus cannot be reached to form each subcommittee, EC will initiate a formal election for these positions. I think it's too much.

Joan Kerr: Yes, we don't want to go through that. I think, yes, we're too small to be able to -- yes, you're right, to do that kind of stuff. Yes, I agree. I think we should take that out because these people are volunteers for heaven's sakes. Any other thoughts, Raoul? Uh-oh. Hello?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Raoul goes for a water, I think.

Joan Kerr: Can you hear me?

Juan Manuel Rojas: He's there. He's editing. Yes, I can hear you.

Joan Kerr: Okay, great. Yes, I agree. I think that part should be taken out.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Gangadhar is writing.

Joan Kerr: Okay, so the first question is, before we get to Ganga's question, is Juan had the suggestion that we take out if consensus cannot be reached that we -- the EC will initiate a formal election. I agree that we should take that out. What does everybody else think? Hello? Am I on mute?

Raoul Plommer: Oh, sorry. I was on mute. I've been talking for I don't know how long here and I just realized I'm on mute.

Joan Kerr: Can you hear me okay?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Maybe he was talking without sound.

Raoul Plommer: I hear you guys talk but I was thinking I was going through as well, but I wasn't. Never mind.

Joan Kerr: Okay, go ahead then. I'm going to mute now so you can speak. Go ahead.

Raoul Plommer: Okay. So basically, if there is a situation -- I mean it is kind of farfetched that there will be these kind of trouble in consensus making, in making a sub-committee. But if there is, then we can have an election over it. But if we don't have this clause there, I think then maybe we can't have an election to go through with it. Or yes, I don't know if that means that we can't have an election because I guess we still could, even if it doesn't say it there.

Juan Manuel Rojas: Yes, but why we want to run an election just for a subcommittee. That's my question.

Joan Kerr: I see both points but I agree. This is to organize an ad hoc committee. Why would we want to put ourselves through that? It's a lot of work. It's more work to get the damn election going than anything else. I mean, where -- in CUC's and that -- this is the committee being formed, there any volunteers, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, okay, I took about.

Joan Kerr: Extend the dates, that's all. Maybe that's what we do (unintelligible) for seven days and maybe something to the (unintelligible). If we don't have any volunteers, we can extend then the date, the time.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, it does say at least seven days.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: I don't actually think that the – I wonder if the treasurer is discussed elsewhere anymore because I guess we could adhere in the end that

Joan Kerr: Yes, (unintelligible) 6.1. I think we should add something to the effect of appointments as well.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: Before you do that, I have one question. Do we have the – what is it that were going to reach – excuse me, I have allergies so – what are we can reach consensus about for a subcommittee?

Raoul Plommer: So I guess it's just about the – who gets to be in it. I guess it's not really a consensus thing usually, but...

Joan Kerr: Right. (Unintelligible) seven days and then hopefully (unintelligible) our volunteers (unintelligible). I don't know. Do we have to reach consensus for who is going to be on the committee?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, everybody can be...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: ...I guess really.

Joan Kerr: That's all for volunteers, period. Right?

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Joan, (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Hi, Joan, and everyone. Remember this was recent. Ganga, I'm just going to mute you for a second there. Thank you. Now remember there was this region with the view that (unintelligible) or whatever – I think for, I think. So this was structured in that way.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Maryam Bakoshi: So now (unintelligible) has been lessened to one. Then 2.6 has a very different language. Does that that make sense?

Joan Kerr: Correct. Yes. This is actually, yes. So are you saying that we should take that out as well?

Maryam Bakoshi: On – I'm not for against it, I'm just saying that was (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: And I remember the old charter lots of the committee had to have a set number of people and stuff like that. So yes. It depends on what the (unintelligible) wants with this one.

Joan Kerr: Yes. I just don't think that we have to say that. I think this is fine. And by the way Ganga just wrote that the treasure is mentioned in 3.3 – 3.4. Will just take a look at that, but I think it should be (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Kept okay, I added in the end. I took this consensus bit off and I just put the EC can also make appointments for all the volunteer positions as it deems necessary.

Joan Kerr: Perfect. I'm just going to go up to 3.2 just to see where the treasure – to see what it says about the treasurer so I can check that off on my list. Is that okay?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Just because we were talking about it. Because I knew it was mentioned before - 3.2 - 3.2.2, yes, there we go. I thought we did that gosh. Yes.

Raoul Plommer: That treasure should be there, shouldn't it?

Joan Kerr: Kept welcome to anyways, but I knew as mentioned before that was – all right. I'm going back up to where we were. Okay.

Raoul Plommer: Okay so, the next issue...

Joan Kerr: Just one second. Gangadhar no, we're going to appoint – it's an appointment position for the treasurer. Okay, where do you want us to go – where do you want me to go, (Raul), in the document?

Raoul Plommer: Three-point-1. That's for the next comment

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: So for 60 EC and voting officers. So as chair and vice chair, PDC membership coordinator and communications coordinator. That's five, yes?

Joan Kerr: I have a question. I'm wondering if we instead of having a vice chair we should have a co-chairs.

Raoul Plommer: I don't know. They'll have problems inviting both of us to the chair meetings.

Joan Kerr: No, but it doesn't have to be both. As co-chairs – you see, vice chairs is like – to me, this is my interpretation. A Vice chair is if the chair is not available the Vice Chair takes over. Right? It's sort of...

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: I've always disliked that personally, but if everybody's okay with it, just a suggestion. Just co-chairs – (Maryam) just wrote something. Let's see what (Maryam) says here. Natures mostly covered – okay all right, we'll go with ICANN. All right I just want them all working together. Okay. It was just a – I just thought I would mention it. Okay. All right. But we could be the rebels and suggest the co-chairs, but anyway.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: We're in...

Raoul Plommer: I think it's fine as it is.

Joan Kerr: All right. Let's go.

Raoul Plommer: Nice try.

Joan Kerr: It's not (unintelligible) to argue the merits of it. Okay. It says Vice Chairs (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: All right, I think we can actually take the 312 out altogether because we don't need that anymore, because we don't have committees. I mean this is not really something that needs to be clarified anymore.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: We won't really have Vice Chairs for...

Joan Kerr: Anything.

Raoul Plommer: ...committees.

Maryam Bakoshi: Will the policy committee have a vice chair?

Joan Kerr: No.

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay, if it's possible for us to go back to the composition with the policy (unintelligible) there.

Raoul Plommer: Which section is that?

Joan Kerr: Yes, just going to ask. I think it's down further. Hold on, lets me see if I can find it. Policy. Yes, here we go.

Maryam Bakoshi: It's 3.3.6.

Joan Kerr: Sorry?

Maryam Bakoshi: It's 3.3.6.

Joan Kerr: Three-three-six, is it?

Raoul Plommer: Try to look.

Joan Kerr: Kept oh, sorry.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, yes. It's about – that's about policy committee chair. Yes, it doesn't say anything about vice chair.

Joan Kerr: Overcome I don't think that there is it...

Maryam Bakoshi: no, sorry, it's 4.1.2.

Raoul Plommer: Oh, no, 4.1.2 actually, 4.1.2.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, that's what is going down to.

Joan Kerr: This is just saying what it is, so I was down there before. There we go. The chair – vice chair, 4.1.2. And the general assembly.

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, there's a vice chair.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. But I still think that addition is a little silly because obviously it says here that the (unintelligible) will have an executive committee, EC, comprised as follows. And there's a vice chair. I think there is no – nobody will think that because their Vice Chair of a policy committee for example, they would get to vote in the EC for that. I mean, that's just silly assumption. I think we could just take that out, but it's sort of obvious.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes because the members of the EC that votes, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, the issues they might not think that, but it's quite easy to assume that because I'm Vice chair or somebody else is because this person is a Vice chair that you know, (unintelligible) your vote. Sometimes this thing might be quite straightforward to you and I looking at the charter, but someone else who isn't...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: ...(unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Now the other thing is that we can change in 4.1.2 – we can change a B to a reporter instead of a vice chair.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: It doesn't have to stay. Right?

Raoul Plommer: Right, I'm on board with that.

Joan Kerr: And that solves that problem.

Raoul Plommer: And then we can take three point out.

Joan Kerr: Yes. And that's what a nice little committee, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes and then like the – maybe like the NCS can help somewhere that says committees can choose Vice chairs if they decide to. You know, so just leave that up in somewhere.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: ...because it's quite important that the CT has a Vice chair when the chair is not available. Somebody has to take the responsibility for the policy committee. That's really important.

Joan Kerr: Yes. All right, so back up to...

Raoul Plommer: Three-point-one-point-three?

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: In fact, I took 3.1.2 out and now there's – change the number 3.1.3 to 3.1.2. So that's a bit clearer now.

Joan Kerr: Three-point-one-point-three, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, 3.1.2 – 3.1.3 is gone and now it's 3.1.2. We're actually 3.1.2 is gone and 3.1.3 changed to 3.1.2.

Joan Kerr: That's okay, we'll get – we'll just get it adjusted. Okay, 3.1.2. Is that where we are - 3.1.2?

Raoul Plommer: Okay. So 3.2.2 is the next on and (Sam) said something about the secretary position. And that – yes, that – we've already worked on that it was agreed that the secretary is – or is it secretary, which one is it?

Joan Kerr: Were at 3.2?

Raoul Plommer: Three-point-two-point-two.

Joan Kerr: Three-point-two-point-two. Right, okay. Have I missed something? Is this the first reference to the secretary position? I thought we had taken that – so, we highlighted it so we could take and referred to it. Okay. (Unintelligible). You know, I thought we did just the Secretariat, right?

Raoul Plommer: Right.

Joan Kerr: We could take it out – we could delegate to the Secretariat or contracted service – (unintelligible) example. I think that would be good.

Raoul Plommer: How to sell it?

Joan Kerr: Yes. That was good. I heard nothing or seen no comments I'm...

Maryam Bakoshi: Can I say something quickly?

Joan Kerr: Go ahead.

Maryam Bakoshi: I still find it a bit difficult with the word Secretariat because we're coming you know, where is the Secretariat? Is it icon Secretariat or visit the (unintelligible)? So that might be a bit confusing as to...

Joan Kerr: Right. You said that before.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay. So...

Maryam Bakoshi: Might (unintelligible) a question mark there discussing it further...

Joan Kerr: That's what we did before. So, well first of all we should read the question, what is it that were delegating? Is says administration of budgeted expenditures.

Maryam Bakoshi: And then – that's not my role as well. I don't do that.

Joan Kerr: No, that's what I'm saying. I'm questioning why we're doing that. So, 3.2.2 is talking about actually – come on, don't freeze up on me, whatever you do. Duties and responsibilities. Okay.

Maryam Bakoshi: That should be to the treasurer.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: That's right, yes.

Joan Kerr: Where we doing that?

Raoul Plommer: To delegate to the treasurer the routine of ministration budget expenditures.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, that makes more sense.

Joan Kerr: Thanks, okay, good. All right, yes. All right, good. (Unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: All right, so 3.2.7.

Joan Kerr: Can't make appointments, yes. So once I get. 3.3 (unintelligible) NCSG? Or other ICANN's including ICANN committee and requested by NCSG. Oh, yes. Perfect sorry, where are we going now? I just wanted to check that.

Raoul Plommer: Three-point-two-point-seven.

Joan Kerr: Perfect, all right, outreach.

Raoul Plommer: I don't know, now that I look at it it's actually better the way it was.

Joan Kerr: Was her, there?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, Juan had commented that it should be on a separate line. But I actually prefer help was. It's just all-in-one. It's kind of like the heading.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: That's really a small thing anyway. Okay, the next thing – right, okay, yes, 3.3.3. That's about the secretary. So (Sam) has commented, "It's not clear to me that the existence or non-existence of the secretary has been determined yet.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: So...

Joan Kerr: Three-point-three-point-three?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Right, 3.2. I thought we weren't going to include that.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, because we don't have a secretary anymore.

Joan Kerr: No.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, so I guess...

Joan Kerr: Let me say number – we just put a reference so that the ICANN Secretariat or ICANN staff will undertake these tasks or...

Raoul Plommer: Well, we can't really have that in the charter.

Joan Kerr: No, because it has nothing to do with us, as soon as I can.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Raoul Plommer: I think we should really just change the numbers so that the next thing is about the treasurer...

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: ...instead or actually going to be able to make this a little shorter now.

Joan Kerr: Yes. So down to – yes. I need to put that up 3.3, right?

Raoul Plommer: Uh-huh. I remind you we might need to check the numbering again we start changing them, because if there's a reference elsewhere to these...

Joan Kerr: So, just leave it as they – for now then, because we do it, we'll crosscheck everything again, you know what I mean?

Raoul Plommer: Actually, there's only a couple after that. So...

Joan Kerr: kept his are these?

Raoul Plommer: We should leave a note about crosschecking. Reference.

Joan Kerr: Crosscheck numbers. Crosscheck reference numbers, right? Okay. Do we want to go through with the treasure will do? Cause it seems to think that we did before.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, hang on. Oh, hang on. Well, I guess the treasure is an easy officer. Although not a voting member. Somehow it is?

Joan Kerr: Yes. An officer usually is the chair, vice chair, the secretary and treasurer, but we don't have a secretary. Okay, so a lot of these duties the treasure will not be doing, like B. Right?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, I was editing elsewhere. Sorry, where we at?

Joan Kerr: Three-point-three-point-three-Number B or (unintelligible).

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: They won't be doing any...

Raoul Plommer: Committee financial meetings.

Joan Kerr: Right.

Raoul Plommer: Yes. I guess we take it out?

Joan Kerr: Yes. My gosh, I'm so lucky, I have to tell you guys this. I have guests from Vietnam and the mother makes amazing food for us and she just brought me some amazing lunch.

Raoul Plommer: Nice.

Joan Kerr: I'm gonna be spoiled – I'm going to be (unintelligible) miss her when she leaves. This amazing food for me.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, I changed the lettering as well. Okay.

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible). So Number (unintelligible), provide ad hoc financial status report. Ad hoc? What does that mean? How do you provide ad hoc financial status report? Just here it is?

Raoul Plommer: Kind of, yes, where do you see that? Oh, there, yes. Ad hoc financial status reports. Yes, okay. So basically that's the treasurer is sort of responsible to produce a report when he's asked for it.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Rough draft on the financials status. They basically are we in debt, are we going bankrupt?

Joan Kerr: Yes, okay. All right. Okay, so number G, keep ECN members informed as to the FCC action and decision. They're not making any decisions, they're just coordinating what we...

Raoul Plommer: Yes. I think we should change EFCs and change it to treasures actions and decisions.

Joan Kerr: Yes. But they don't really make decisions they only make recommendations.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, but they do have some actions like you know there was...

Joan Kerr: Kept that was fine, but they don't make any decisions. They can make recommendations.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, let's check that section 4.4.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I'll go down to it. So I must be lucky today. Sorry guys, I have a beautiful blackberry tree in my front yard and I told my neighbor they can take – one of my neighbors picked some and made a blackberry pie for me. Okay, 4. I'm sorry I have to change – my neighbors are so good to me. All right. I guess I shouldn't be talking about personal stuff here. So, purpose (unintelligible) oversight (unintelligible) i.e. Secretariat. So that holds. Including routine ministration (unintelligible).

Man 2: Excuse me, this is the same that we put in three something?

Joan Kerr: What we were just doing is what the EC is responsible for. So now we're defining what the treasurer does.

Man 2: Yes, but the three – the treasurer, you know, up ahead it was talking about treasurer. That here are the duties of the treasurer. It is not the same? I'm a little confused because I'm reading the same.

Joan Kerr: Yes. No, the first one is saying how we're overseeing it. And then this one is – but you're right. It seems to be a lot of overlap is what you're saying.

Raoul Plommer: Is because the 4.4.2 used to be about the finance committee, but now that's being absorbed by the treasurer. So basically the treasurer now does what used

to be the duty of the treasurer and the finance committee. That's why it has all of that overlap there.

Joan Kerr: Correct.

Raoul Plommer: But I guess we could just take the 4.4.2 out and just, like, put that in the 3.3.2.

Joan Kerr: Okay, maybe. Sorry, I was on mute. But also the – for 4.4, the treasurer does not provide oversight. They just provide information, because you're not responsible for making the decisions. This is the point I was trying to make.

Man 2: Yes, okay so yes, so she's oversight, not really decisions.

Joan Kerr: Right, this is why people don't change things.

Man 2: But I mean, there is still stuff like not authorizing exceptional expenditures not foreseen in the budget that (unintelligible) the EC. But okay, that's important information of the EC so I guess that still in check.

Joan Kerr: Yes. And then it does say that EC, coordinating with the treasure contract (unintelligible). So yes, everything is – so go back up to 3.3.

Raoul Plommer: Okay, 3.2.3. Yes.

Joan Kerr: 3.3.3. Yes, so his talk about treasure, right? There we go.

Man 2: So that's about 3.3.2 G. No, 3.3.3 G. Right?

Joan Kerr: Yes. That's right.

(Raul) informed: So I'll just put it informed as to the treasures actions.

Joan Kerr: Actions, right.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: (Unintelligible) just a quick question about the word confusion. So since you might have to make banking decisions...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: So I think that's a valid word to leave and there, the word decision. Yes, you might have to make decisions about banking or (unintelligible) and stuff like that. The money tree value now, talking about the way to disburse funds for instance.

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Sorry, go on.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think it could be okay to leave that word there. I mean, it's basically only going to give us more leverage against the treasurer, if you will.

Joan Kerr: Everyone else is okay with that?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I mean saying it there that he has to keep us informed about his decisions doesn't mean that he gets to do them. If he does, he will keep us informed.

Joan Kerr: Just for the record, I really dislike having someone arbitrarily – I mean I guess we just have to trust people who are doing it. So I know it's not like we have a lot of money, but you could.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: All right, so we're good for the treasure, everyone? So down the chair, vice chair and now the treasurer and we've taken out the secretary. Any questions regarding objections to the – (unintelligible) asking that, but it's all about the treasurer, yes. Are we good with the treasurer? For now for the edits, because obviously we're going to go through it again, right, later? Specially with the numbers and checking back and forth. So now we're at the policy development committee.

Raoul Plommer: Right, hang on. I'm just – okay, I mean, yes, we – I really think we should move the duties from the – what used to be the finance committee area – we should just move those duties to 3.3.2 now.

Joan Kerr: Okay.

Woman 2: (Yon Gunder) has his hand up. Go ahead (Gunder), please.

(Yon Gunder): Three-point-three-point-three-G. (Unintelligible) about the treasurer again for maintaining this treasure in the same (unintelligible) right?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry, I didn't catch that.

Joan Kerr: Yes, me either. We're talking about 3.3.3 G? Yes? No, he typed it in. Can you repeat your question (Gunder)?

(Yon Gunder): Yes, all the 3.3.3 is treasure (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: That's correct.

(Yon Gunder): And we are mentioning treasure additional (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: I didn't catch that last part. I'm sorry.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, (Yon Gunder), I heard it about replacing with he or she, but I think those – we actually try to avoid he or she now or his or her because that implies that there are only two sexes. And we want to be modern about it, so it's either going to be theirs – their actions, or the treasurers. I think...

Joan Kerr: I think treasure is...

Raoul Plommer: Yes, I think it's fine. Keeps it clear.

Joan Kerr: Yes, because we're not defining, like you said, the gender, so...

Raoul Plommer: So, I added the bit now like on 3.3.3. I added the duties in the latter part. So basically we need to see now which of these overlap with the stuff that was already in the section. I mean, that is quite a lot for a person, especially if they don't even hold an executive position for that. Yes, it is quite a lot.

Joan Kerr: We have to reword it. And if I could suggest something – it's something that I could take just that section, 3.3, and put them side-by-side and word smith it for everyone?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Is that okay?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: The next meeting?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, then we will make a note of that.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I'm going to because it can say that the East – something to this – this is what I'm suggesting, guys. That the EC will work with the treasurer to coordinate, boom, boom, boom. For the thing.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: You know what I mean?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Sounds good? Is everybody okay with that?

Man 2: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Okay. So let's – you and I can talk off-line about how to do that then. Okay?
(Raul)?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, good.

Joan Kerr: Where to next?

Raoul Plommer: That would be 4, which is the operating committees. Now we only have one of them left.

Joan Kerr: Yes, because remember we did is that policy? One already?

Raoul Plommer: Sorry?

Joan Kerr: We were going over the policy development committee next.

Raoul Plommer: Yes, this is a 4.0. We were at 3.3 something.

Joan Kerr: Right. But we're dealing with the treasurer now. Now the next one from 3.3, the treasurer, the next one is 3.4, 3.4, which is the development committee, policy development committee.

Raoul Plommer: Oh, did I miss that?

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: That's right. But there's nothing wrong with that.

Joan Kerr: No, because we actually did do that one before. And again this next 4.0.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes, because remember we did the issue manager and all of that?

Raoul Plommer: Oh yes, we're basically anything that doesn't have a comment should be fine.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Okay, so previously it was called the policy committee. Okay, need to sort that out.

Raoul Plommer: I guess we can leave that for later. Unless you got something on your mind right now.

Joan Kerr: No, I don't. I like the policy development committee better than policy committee, personally, but...

Raoul Plommer: Yes, me too. But yes, so basically I see instead of having – we have 4.0, which says operating committees. Now we should just take the bit where on 4.1 and change it there instead. So then, four is only about policy development committee. Yes?

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: We've already talked with easy, right?

Raoul Plommer: Uh huh.

Joan Kerr: Perfect.

Raoul Plommer: I guess he can still mention something but the policy development committee has formal permanence, you know, has permanent devotees and responsibilities. That's stupid to say, isn't it? I think we can just take the whole thing out.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Man 2: Maybe just take out the part that says our (unintelligible) formal operating committees...

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Man 2: ...to interview the policy development committee, right? In addition to that created committee which oversees (unintelligible). The following there are – no. The following will be created with permanent duties and responsible or something built like that.

Joan Kerr: Or just name it. In addition to the executive committee, which oversees and manages N Park -- I don't like the N Park -- additionally -- so we already have addition -- were just talking about that. The policy committee will be formed too. And then we'll talk about what it does. Right? Can you guys hear me?

Man 2: Yes, I – we are (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: So the first part – the first one is in addition to the executive committee, we all agree on that which oversees and manages the...

Raoul Plommer: I think we can just take it out.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: Like all of it. I think it is the policy development committee and then go to purpose, 4.1.

Joan Kerr: Yes, because 4.0 says the policy development committee, right?

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Raoul Plommer: That's right, yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Take it out, I agree. I do that all the time when something gives me a pain. I just take it out.

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Perfect. Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Joan?

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: So, I'm just thinking we shouldn't take it out completely because it's almost like an intro to what other committees that (unintelligible) has peers of course (unintelligible) with the policy committee. But again remember that somewhere else in the charter it was stated that (unintelligible) committees where they are required, correct? So...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Only got so have like an introduction to say it will be formed.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, (unintelligible).

Joan Kerr: Excuse me, I couldn't hear (Maryam) clearly because (unintelligible) interfering,

Raoul Plommer: I think (Remy) has his mic off.

Maryam Bakoshi: (Unintelligible). Actually (Remy) is not on.(Remy) is on mute, so somebody else, maybe (Yon Gunder)

Joan Kerr: I was on mute, so...

Maryam Bakoshi: So I'll just ask (unintelligible). Actually (unintelligible) is not on so is (unintelligible), is someone else. Maybe it's gone now.

Maryam Bakoshi: Got you need to unmute your microphone if you're on.

Joan Kerr: Okay. Oh, some is getting at that. So I think what you're saying is in addition to – I'm reading on the left-hand side – in addition to the executive committee, because I don't think we have to put which overseas and blah, blah, blah. But in addition to the executive committee, the (unintelligible) will form the policy development committee. Is that what you're saying? Something like that?

Maryam Bakoshi: I don't think we have to put oversees and manages, we know that already.

Maryam Bakoshi: No, I'm talking about in addition to the executive committee which oversees and manages (unintelligible). The following is an (unintelligible) formal operation committee permanent – something like that. So I think you not introduce the policy development committee.

Joan Kerr: Yes, I agree. I actually group that because it needs an introduction.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Okay. So, (Raul), I think – and then we go into – if you could put back the original and then we'll just take out some of the – take out which – (Raul), can you hear me? Am I on mute? He's here.

Raoul Plommer: I can hear you.

Maryam Bakoshi: I can hear you.

Joan Kerr: Oh, great, because I keep going back and forth on mute so I don't know. So I would take out oversees and manages the (unintelligible) that one sentence. Yeah, and I'll just say the following. Perfect, yes. I think that's good. I'm gonna mute now. So, we're up for .1. Is everyone okay with 4.0? I'm on.

Maryam Bakoshi: My phone dropped.

Joan Kerr: Sorry?

Maryam Bakoshi: My phone dropped, sorry. Yes, I just come back into the call. And so what I was suggesting. I see what (Raul) is doing, however was suggesting – 4.0 a (unintelligible) committee would just ask or whatever ES, in brackets. And have introduction, yes. So that kind of gives room for expansion later on. We have 4.0 which is a (unintelligible) committee. And then ES in brackets as a heading. That's my suggestion though. And then in addition to the executive committee, you know, the following is the (unintelligible) committee with permanent (unintelligible) and responsibilities. And then 4.1 will say policies (unintelligible) committee.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Like you said, Joan it's an introduction to the committee or committees.

Joan Kerr: So you're saying 4.0. For some strange reason I'm having a hard time hearing.

Maryam Bakoshi: So, 4.0 is now – right now at this policy development committee.

Joan Kerr: Yes.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, but my suggestion is to have the (unintelligible) committee and then ES as 4.0. Have introduction and then 4.1 will be policy committee.

Joan Kerr: I see what you're saying. Make it broader so it leaves it open for a later time to change.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Or to add rather?

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes. That's what we're trying to do so that we don't have to get all these changes later.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Is everyone okay with that? I think that's a good digestion. And then defining what the committee is for now.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Joan Kerr: Yes. Did you ever get that, (Raul)?

Raoul Plommer: Basically we put back the operating committees.

Joan Kerr: Yes, on 4.0.

Raoul Plommer: Is a heading. And then 4.1 is the policy development committee.

Joan Kerr: Correct.

Raoul Plommer: All right, I'll do that.

Joan Kerr: And then before you do that you should in addition to – and then you put the policy committee after that. I think we need to and 4.1 we need to say they first sentence first, Raul. In addition to the executive committee – but you shouldn't start with the development committee. It should start with an addition. And then – report to fix that. While they're doing that I have a question. It is 12:58, which is almost 1:00. What does everybody want to do?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, think we're closing in.

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: So, did we want to schedule for next Tuesday as well?

Raoul Plommer: Yes, think we definitely need to do that.

Joan Kerr: Yes. So, we'll start at 4.0. We're doing pretty good though. So two things...

Raoul Plommer: Yes.

Joan Kerr: So, 4.0 will start again. If everybody could lead – we're now into the call minutes and start to wordsmith. (Raul) and I are going to look at 3.3.3 for the treasurer and for the wordsmith that. And will send that out before the meeting next week. Now Monday is a holiday in Canada and it is a last of the summer holidays were a quotation.

Raoul Plommer: Oh.

Joan Kerr: (Unintelligible) or whatever. Whatever we do, I'm saying we have to do it before Thursday because Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday are party time. And I have not...

Raoul Plommer: Okay.

Joan Kerr: Just telling you, (Raul), (unintelligible) on Thursday.

Man 2: So Tuesday you are with a headache.

Joan Kerr: I don't drink and that a good thing. I may need a bed. But anyway so we'll work on 3.3 and resume on Tuesday. Does that sound good?

Maryam Bakoshi: Sounds good to me.

Joan Kerr: Okay, but if everyone else please go through it again and just cross out any numbers and things like that that's okay. Okay?

Man 2: Okay, next week all right.

Joan Kerr: Yes, next Tuesday.

Man 2: Okay, great.

Joan Kerr: Okay, thanks a lot, guys.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you, everyone.

Joan Kerr: Guys, I think we're doing a good job down. Paragraph...

((Crosstalk))

Joan Kerr: Thank you (Maryam). Thank you very much, (Raul).

Raoul Plommer: Thanks, bye.

Joan Kerr: Okay, bye-bye.

Maryam Bakoshi: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much for your time today. Goodbye, everyone.

Joan Kerr: Bye-bye.

END