
GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay folks, it looks like it's 5:31, we've given the gracious minute. So welcome everyone for joining us. Seth has joined us, thank you Seth. And the only person that has sent their regrets is Judith, and I cannot get hold of Louie, who's part of the original committee that we start.

Let me just go over some of the history behind why we decided to strike this working group. The MOU originally signed in 2007 was updated in 2010, and what was very interesting is going back to the original 2007 document, and the MOU, you could see some very serious trimming in the last version of this document. So, what was missing, and what's very clear in the MOU is in terms of the shelling out some of the responsibilities and effective ALS upgrades and improvement, the periodic reporting, this is exactly what they say, periodic reporting to ICANN on outreach and engagement and providing advice on the certification on ALS [inaudible].

The question—and Alan, you're the purveyor of all things, bylaws and rules and procedures—one, I wanted to start the discussion as the question is: given the revised rules and procedures adopted on October 3, 2010, was the MOU that we have signed ICANN modified to integrate these changes, and how do we know, what is the procedure that we need to go through with ICANN besides our ratifications? Do you have any insights on that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

You said that the MOU was modified in 2010. I don't recall that at all.

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.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, the revised rules and procedures were.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, Okay.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: The MOU has not changed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry if I'm not clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. No, the rules and procedures for ALAC changed. There was no other change made at the same time. To be very blunt, the bylaws and all of the memorandums of understanding are somewhat out of date.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Gotcha.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm assuming that as a result of the last at-large review, there were some changes made to the bylaws. There were no corresponding changes made to the MOUs, which had just been signed at that point. I'm assuming that as a result of this review, and the work we're doing on ALS expectations, and criteria, we're going to see a pretty wholesale revision of the bylaws, and I suspect re-issuing of the MOUs to bring them up to date. So I would not focus—and I'm not giving a legal opinion—but I would not focus on trying to adjust our rules to match what's in the MOU. But we should be trying to get our rules to state where they reflect what we are actually doing, or what we want to be doing, and then we'll make sure that the bylaws and the MOUs reflect that as we go forward. So that's the order that I would look at it; not trying to fix the MOUs now, but let's get the rules—and I'll give an example of a rule that we have in our current operating procedures which is I think what our rules and procedures are called. There's a rule saying that the unaffiliated representative must poll the unaffiliated members and then cast a vote that is verifiably what the unaffiliated member said. Now that's a really nice rule, but it's completely impossible, because we use secret ballots, and there's no way you can verify how the unaffiliated representative cast their vote, other than to trust them and appoint someone who is honorable. So there is lots of things in the rules that just don't make any sense, and it's time—and I think your initiative to say let's reorder them, get them in a good shape, have them make sense, make sure they actually can be implemented, makes complete sense. So I'm supporting strongly what you're saying.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great, thanks Alan. I just wanted to recap that I do understand what you're saying, in terms of what's done first, and what's done second. It's just more of a—after I was looking at the rules and procedures today, and making these notes today, and I fell back to the original MOU, looked at that—which by the way, Seth was one of the signators on—or looks like John has joined us as well. Welcome, John. Can you hear us, are you on... Okay, you're on Adobe?

JOHN MORE: I called in, but I'm now joined by Adobe, I think.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, welcome John. For the benefit of everyone, John is a lawyer based in Washington. He's with the Washington DC chapter of ISOC, as well. And he's been gracious enough as well to, in addition to their chapter ALS to [inaudible] be with us. So, we have John More, who's a lawyer, and Seth, so welcome to both of you. And I think Alan is almost by default a lawyer in his understanding of procedures. So thanks you all for joining us.

So, back to what I was saying, John, just before you joined, I was asked, almost a rhetorical question, you know, chicken and egg situation: rules and procedures, and our MOU—and Alan has made it very clear that we make our changes on our rules and procedures, remove redundant and erroneous information, organize the information in a logical order. So that's where we stand now. So thank you Alan for verifying that.

If we could go to the next page on the document. So in terms of my observations, as I stated before, someone—and I'm not sure who actually activated this—I'm assuming Alan, please chime in anyone, Seth and Alan, they know the history on this. But in 2010 the document was modified from the original 2007 rules and procedures. And I guess I have to click on changing the center panel. Okay, sorry, the center panel is showing what I'm talking about.

So the original document, one of the major changes in the original 2007 to 2010, the change in the number of reps that the ALS chooses in the unaffiliated. The one change they did was one rep per ALS, and one rep representing the unaffiliated, so that was one of the only major changes that I noticed in the switch in 2007 to 2010. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, the changes that have been made over the years, there have been a number of them. We ran into an election problem a few years ago, where we didn't have a way of addressing ties, or things like that, so we ended up making a rule and addressing it. The changing from two reps to one: nobody knows how it got set to two. We never had two, we never intended to have two, but somehow that's what the rule said. So...

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

All right.

ALAN GREENBERG: You'll also note, we have two documents, we have operating procedures, and I don't remember what the other one is called. If you look at the other one, it says explicitly—well, let me background—when we take a vote, we take a count of one ALS one vote. When LAC RALO takes a vote, each country has and equal voting strength and if there are multiple ALSs per country, then they divide the voting strength and make against them. And that was to make sure that very large countries do not predominate within the RALO. If you look at our rules, it says we use that method also. We've never used that method. We never intended to use that method. But that's what the rules were that we approved way back in 2007.

So, there are things like that, that have never been true, but somehow the words got in and no one paid attention. There are other things we changed, when we had an actual problem to fix, and we tried to fix it. So, we actually fixed that one, by the way, because one of the modifications we did a few years ago, said if there's a conflict between the two, the operating procedures wins.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, yeah. That makes sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a {CROSSTALK}.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Any other questions from anyone on this issue? Or asking any questions to Alan on this? Okay, so moving forward, I—

JOHN MORE: Excuse me, this is John More.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Go ahead, John.

JOHN MORE: Yeah. The only question seemed to be that would be useful for the future discussions—or for this part of this, is to lay out what is the structure that's wanted, and I gather there's a certain number of inefficiencies in here also that want to be address. So if we can have a second document of what is the operating principle that you want to have imposed, it would be helpful in the discussion, I think.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thanks, John, that's quite logical. And I want to turn to Sylvia on this, because she's working with each of the RALOs and there isn't a template, and there's no consistency. So Sylvia, do you want to address that issue in terms of what the skeleton will look like in the revised version?

SYLVIA VIVANCO: Okay. Hello everyone, this is Sylvia Vivanco. Glenn, what I was planning to do is to give you an overview of the rules of procedures for the five RALOs. Is that Okay?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, thank you. That's a good segue. Go ahead.

SYLVIA VIVANCO: And I can address then, how some of them are already reviewing their procedures, so how they [CROSSTALK].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay.

SYLVIA VIVANCO: And organize their work. For APRALO, APRALO adopted their original group back in 2009, and you see on the screen there, there is a previous. In 2014 the new APRALO rules were approved. And they are quite detailed and they are comprising of 33 articles. So they have a system whereby they have defined, there is a table of contents, it has definitions, and it's very detailed, according to the practice in the regions. And we have their titles on the APRALO leaders, responsibilities, decision making process, working methodologies, emotions, flows, points of order, so it's quite detailed. And you can review there on the chat, and you can see there it's quite extensive. So that's one model, to go into every single detail.

The second is the AFRALO ROP, the rules of procedures. They date until 2009. And they are really very very brief. They are just a few articles as you can see there, from October 2009. A few definitions, and remember back then, in early 2006, 7, 8, 9, the RALOs were at the very early stages, so AFRALO realized they also need to improve the rules, and they organized already a working group to start reviewing their

operation principles. And this review—the review started its work in 2014, and how they organized their work it's in titles.

They have different titles in the VL membership: weighted vote—vote was an important issue for them—member performance, performance metrics, certifications, quorum, and certification criteria. And there are drafts under each of those links. There are drafts for all of them, until the certifications. So there are two topics where they need to discuss, the quorum and the certification criteria. And AFRALO will reactivate the working group this year, in 2017. They had to stop because of all the activity in the IANA transition. So I do not expect to see a very—but planning will be as extensive as the APRALO rules, those 33 rules, but still it will be very detailed. But AFRALO, this is a work in progress, they haven't started in the actual drafting of each article, but they have defined some ideas and principles and concepts about the issues I just mentioned.

Next is the ERUALO. If Terry can put the EURALO on the list, you can see the link there. And EURALO has the articles of associations, they refer to them as the bylaws. They get dates from 2007, and they were amended in 2011. And EURALO, as well, is in the process of reviewing the articles, the bylaws, and they formed a task force on review and revision of EURALO bylaws. The task force made some progress, and drafted up to 12 articles.

What EURALO's doing at the beginning, they realized they need to look at their governance and structure. They have a board, they have a chair, and a secretariat. And one of the issues they discussed—and they are still debating this issue-- is whether or not to have a vice chair or a

secretariat. So they took a lot of time to debate those issues. So, just as a word of caution, there is a lot of—whenever these issues are discussed, there are many, many opinions, and it can take some time to make decisions. So that's where EURALO is. They did twelve articles and I think they still need more time to debate other issues such a performance metrics and also voting, and the certification was also a big issue for them. So they are at eleven, and they are still discussing the big concepts.

And then, LACRALO is the other RALO, which in 2007, approved the rules of procedures. And in 2014, you can see there, in 2014, because there was some discrepancies—LACRALO is bilingual, so there were discrepancies between the Spanish and the English versions. They approved this version which you can see on the screen, which tries to make both versions consistent. However, LACRALO has many controversies about some various issues such as voting, the weighting of the votes, as Alan mentioned, decision making process. So there are a number of issues they're going to analyze and discuss. And I expect that next year there will be a reactivation of the working group to reorganize the LACRALO rules. And according to the drafting procedures in Latin America, I expect that the rules may be extensive or very detailed, and they will need to go into a number of articles, perhaps the same number of APRALO—between 30, or even 40 articles. So it really depends on the legal tradition of the region, how you want to organize the rules of procedures.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you so much, Sylvia. I had switched to [inaudible], because my Adobe dropped on me, but you can hear me Okay?

SYLVIA VIVANCO: Yes I can hear you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. So question: I guess what we see is not one size fits all for each of the RALOs, so we have latitude to adopt certain rules and procedures to our liking, and some that are not. Is that correct, Sylvia? Because I just want to be absolutely clear on what we can and can't do.

SYLVIA VIVANCO: Exactly. Each RALO has complete freedom to draft the rules in accordance to what is their legal tradition of the region. As I said, regions like Latin America or even Asia would like to be very detailed, in the North American region, perhaps the same level of detail is not required or even cross-referenced with the ALAC rules of procedures if some articles are useful for that. But yes, regulations. So each RALO has complete freedom as long as all the procedures are in accordance with whatever is written on the MOUs to which ICANN. So using the framework of ICANN MOU, everything is possible.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great, thank you. Alan did you have something to say on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I'm going to disagree a little bit with what Sylvia is saying. Based on the premise that I believe the MOUs have to be rewritten. So, the region has freedom to set how they do their business, according to their procedures. They don't have the freedom to override decisions that the ALAC is making, or things that are in the bylaws, or things that we are going to try to get in the bylaws. So, the freedom is how you do your business, not necessarily what the ultimate aims are. The MOUs are all written slightly differently, but they all have basically the same content, and I would expect when we have revised MOUs that also they will be basically the same.

So, for instance, you're looking right now at general rules at ALS expectations and criteria. The region does not have the ability to change those. They may augment them, but not change them. And since that's a work in progress, we're going to have to see over the next few months how that unfolds. The at-large review will almost certainly make recommendations, which, if adopted, accepted by the board, will change our basic ground rules.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: And Alan...

ALAN GREENBERG: The region can't go outside of those grounds, but how you do your business, whether you take votes, whether you do consensus, what your quorum is, what methodologies are used, how you count votes, all of that is internal to the region.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I want to draw on—Seth has just written in the chat-- I'm not sure if he has voice or not. I'll just read it, and if he can clarify, if he has voice, he can add to it. In response, I believe, to what you're saying Alan, "I have a problem with drafting rules and procedures with a view toward the MOU being modified, but I do not think we have a rule of procedure that is inconsistent with an MOU provision so in place going forward." Seth, would you mind elaborating on that?

[AUDIO BREAK]

TERRY AGNEW: Seth this is Terry, in order to activate your mic—because it's not activated yet-- on your tap toolbars, select the telephone icon, and follow the prompts. Or you can send me a chat, again this is Terry, and I can have the operator dial out to you on the telephone.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: While Seth is looking for that, I just want to point out to you one of the things that we had on the screen earlier was the fact that we have to take whatever we modify, this version that we do as a group in the next few months, we have to take it back to our community. And according to our rules, we have to take our active membership, which is 27, and 70% of that, or 19 members need to pass this. And I'm just going to ask, Alan: Besides our own community passing this with a 70% endorsement, do we need to also take it to ALAC or anywhere else? Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: No you don't. But of course, that presumes you're not doing anything that is counter to some more global rule. But, presumably, as we go forward, there will be checks and balances. Certainly I'm going to look at it from an ALAC point of view as well as in a RALO point of view. I have no choice but to wear both hats.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Right. Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: The lawyers will probably look at it and tell us whether we're doing anything that violates some global rule. And staff certainly will do that. So there's plenty of checks and balances along the way to give us warning flags.

With regard to what Seth said, by the way, you left out a "no" when you read it, he says he has "no problem with modifying it going forward" but he does have a problem putting something in the rules, which is counter to the MOU, and he's right. But you can get around that by having transition clauses and saying, "This comes into effect once the MOU is rewritten," or something. Otherwise you have a cart before the horse problem, of how you ever make a change if the two can't get along with each other. But we can finesse that without a large problem. As long as what you're doing is something that is reasonably going to be in the MOU as we change it.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Correct. Thanks for picking that up. My mouth moves faster than my brain sometimes. I apologize. Can you—

SETH REISS: [inaudible] if you can hear me. Am I audible now?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: You are, go ahead.

SETH REISS: Yes, I feel like an Amazon booklet. Yes, I think Alan and I are on the same page, that you can have a caveat that the rules will go into effect at such time as the MOU is amended to be consistent. It's just that you're not allowed to have internal documents that violate a constitutional document. In my mind, the MOU is the constitutional document, it's like articles and bylaws. So, I think we're all in agreement.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Perfect. Okay, thank you. Now does anyone have any questions...

ALAN GRENBORG: The MOU, by the way, is a pretty much a feel-good document, so I don't think we're going to have a lot of problems with that anyway.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, it's been pared down from the original down to a bare-bones, the 2010, and now, give me a second to go through my observations of it, but I wanted to open up the floor to anyone who had any questions to Sylvia on any of those rules of procedures that she may be able to answer. Anybody have any questions for Sylvia? Back to you Sylvia, any other comments that you forgot to mention?

SYLVIA VIVANCO: No, this is Sylvia, I don't have any other comments, just that I invite you all to read, for example, the APRALO rules, which are really quite well-written, and they go into a high level of detail, and that can be a good starting point.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

SYLVIA VIVANCO: Compare, if some of those provisions could be adopted or copied by your RALO. As some other RALOs are also looking at the APRALO rules. One of the drafters was Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is very experienced with all of the documents governing ICANN, so it's a pretty good document.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, this is Glenn for the record. One of the things going through the MOU versus the rules of procedures was reporting back on our performance. And one of the things we implemented as NARALO, and I

don't know about other RALOs, what they do, but we started a semi-annual and an annual review of what we actually did, what we hoped to do, what is incomplete, so that the community can get some reporting. We're doing it moreso for our ALS's to know what we are doing, but it looks like within this MOU there's actually a responsibility for us to report back as well. Which is moreso than just a secretarial reports. Which is one of the things that we're not an SROP.

So, let me turn to the section three on observations and issues. What I saw – as we said earlier on-- is that our current document—and that may not be the case with the other RALOs, they may need a bit of work too, but it's not our concern, they have to fix their own—is that the document jumps around a little bit. So they may talk about election stuff here, a little bit further, a little bit further, rather than any subtitles, just real clear categories or complete sections for flow.

There was no real clear job descriptions in terms of roles and responsibilities. There's no real reporting of our ALAC members or NomCom to our membership. We found that in our last annual report, that it was extremely difficult to get anything from our ALAC representative, what did they do in the past year. That was a real challenge. And I think moving forward, we want to make sure our ALAC people are actually realizing their responsibilities.

There lacked metrics. There seemed to be an absence of any performance tracking, review or metrics throughout the entire document. No reference to any strategic plan. No real clear process. And we ran into this in the past year when we went after a number of organizations which were AWOL. It turned out a number of them

actually went out of business. They were no longer functional, but we didn't really have a clear process, warning letters, like a step by step process, leading to the ultimate, if it be, a decertification process. That I think wasn't here. There was no guiding document for that process.

They also referred to, in the document, or code of procedures, the code of conduct. Now that's a separate document that's been shared with all of you that is—I don't think anyone knows what our code of conduct is. It's got to be spelled out more. There's a really unclear connection of ICANN rules, and there's new stuff coming down the pipe, such as the new ALS metrics, and rules, and criteria. There's perhaps the new anti-harassment policies and code of ethics. So a lot of this stuff, more than likely needs to be incorporated through our process.

So if I can move to part 3 on the suggestions, clearly this committee needs to come up, as John said earlier, a real good skeleton of what should be in the sections and then flesh it out accordingly in terms of each of the sections.

And again, we have this ongoing discussion back and forth with our history and our legal obligations, so I guess this is a good point- I'm sorry John, you brought up the issue. Would you be prepared, John, to be the penholder to help us write the skeleton and the sections, so I'm sorry John, but please go ahead.

JOHN MORE:

Yes, I've done a lot of work setting up non-profits, but I think more specifically my experience working with ISOC on redrafting their bylaws, in particular for creating a chapter organization that has some

similarities, not all of them, but anyway, a way of having requirements, but also the respect back, so it's a two-way street. And that, I think makes everyone feel better if they are an ALS. Okay, so it's a dual responsibility back and forth. But also, I think—when I read the procedures, they are pretty dense, and I'm also a big fan of plain English, Spanish, and French.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you.

JOHN MORE: So clear...

GLENN MCKNIGHT: So I take it that's a yes?

JOHN MORE: So I would be willing to assist on that, and yes, as I said, I had done it before.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Excellent.

JOHN MORE: So.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, John. Alan, did you want to jump in as well as assisting on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, just a couple of thoughts: with regard to the relationship between the ALSs and certification, that's an ALAC issue. So you want to be careful—some of the processes to enact it are RALO issues, such as the decertification one, where the detailed steps have to be laid out. But, the overall responsibility is ALAC. So we want to make sure—it's a little bit different from ISOC in that at large is a complex hierarchy. We won't go into why it is, but it is. So we want to make sure we're not duplicating things that happen at another level within the region. The other thing, my gut tells me to try to keep things simple. We could end up writing lots and lots of rules, and we would still end up finding that we forgot one somewhere, at just the wrong time. So I would try to keep things as simple as possible, and implementable as possible. I hope that will prove to be possible. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Mark Twain said it best: If I had more time, I'd write a shorter letter. Before I go to you John, Alan, do you agree to assist as penholder on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sure.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: That's a way we can guarantee it's short.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, thank you Alan. So John, back to you.

JOHN MORE: So I agree fully, Alan, and I think the trick is to reflect what people are going to do, because if you have rules that people don't follow, then it's a mess. It's not good. And the second is to have built in a certain trust in the people operating correctly. But, really having clear sets of rules as to govern these various things. And I fully understand your point that it's going to have to be consistent with the overall structure. So, I think I am fully with what you've just said.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Now, thank you both for volunteering. And since Seth is on the line, and he was there at the signing at the first 2007 rules and procedure, Seth could I ask you to join as reviewer as well of this document?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We all do, Seth.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, thank you, Seth. So Sylvia, for the minutes, so John and Alan are the co-penholders, and Seth has agreed to review and comment on the draft, and so will I. Eduardo and Judith is not on the line, but will be happy to add her comments. So thank you so much, that's a serious action item.

So, just to get the juices going, part 3 was some of the things, and Alan did refer to the ALS criteria and stuff a minute ago, but some of the things that we could put in to the skeleton or take it out, such as the player roles and responsibilities, the meeting procedures, the electoral process, the rules for nonperformance, and the whole document of process of a happy person going through a warning process, an spelling out the general assemblies. As you know, we're going to have a general assembly coming up in April. And it would be great if we could have this done for April. I know it's probably not a good time, but that's giving us December, January, February and March. It gives us a four month window. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, two comments. Number one: I don't think we're going to get done by April. Number two, just to show the kind of job we have ahead of us: Use the term general assembly. That term is used in a completely different way from what you were using it in our rules and procedures.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just at the level of definition, we have a bit of work to do.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Well, I tossed that in, general assemblies, because every three years, roughly, we have a general assembly with our community. So, that's what I mean by general assembly.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I know you do, but our rules talk about a general assembly which is essentially a meeting. You have to remember all of our rules are patterned after the United Nations General Assembly.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Something I hope they'll take out. But they do right now. So they just a lot of terminology which doesn't apply to us at all.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Perfect. So back to what I was saying that this skeleton—and this is where I'm going to prevail upon Sylvia as well—if we can maybe just create a spreadsheet with each of the core ideas, what they have as skeletons for each of the other ones, and again, ours will be there as well. So we'll work on that, and so that we'll share it with the committee on what theirs looked like without having to read the

document. But some kind of structure so you can actually see and map what that skeleton looks for each.

Okay, excellent. So that's basically the key things I wanted to discuss tonight. Is to go over where we stand, where do we want to go? Now Alan did also say that four months—I think you don't think it's possible to have it by April. If not, then June will be the 10th anniversary, which will be 10 years since the signing of the original MOU. So I have no problem doing it at our general assembly, which all of us will be there, or have it to correspond to the 10th anniversary. So, back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, June is probably reasonable; April is a bit optimistic. It doesn't mean you shouldn't aim for it, but I think it's a little bit unrealistic.

In terms of the skeleton documents, remember that most of the RALOs, I think with the exception of EURALO and maybe the new APRALO have two different documents that somewhat overlap and describe the overall set of rules they have. Our target should be to end up with one. But right now, there are two documents in most of the RALOs.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. Let me just read what John is suggesting as a draft for April and June. So perhaps John, the committee can do a short report to our general group, so that we have some sense of where we are in terms—so that the community has an opportunity to hear what we're doing. And it might be a good idea for them to give feedback on the process as well. So John, we're going to be doing what we call our general

assembly in April. It's going to be in New Orleans. So one person per RALO, so the Washington group needs to assign someone, and I would strongly think you would be the perfect person to represent your community because I will prevail upon you to do a short presentation to the group. Is that okay with you John?

JOHN MORE:

That's fine. I think that, as I said, having had some experience on doing—we had about 40 or 50 commenting on changing the bylaws for ISOT, and what it was was it allowed—and we had a structure for keeping track of it, which may—some folks may already have here—but I think that's one of the important things. What I plan to do is take an opportunity, if these documents that were provided to us remain available, I will review them to look at the overall structure, and come up with at least the different topics that we would need to be addressing as an initial thing to share with everybody. And then folks can add to those topics, and we can build from there.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Excellent, great. Thank you, John. I don't think we're going to have another meeting before the Christmas. But I'd like to do a short report in our December meeting, that this committee had our first formal meeting, and we'll do a little report to the community. But is there any days in January—would that be Okay with everyone to skip the rest of December and have a meeting and update in January? Is everyone Okay with that?

[AUDIO BREAK]

Silence. Okay, so we'll send out some suggested dates. Okay, thank you. So just put a check mark if you're Okay. So Alan, Alfredo did, "Yes, I'm fine with January". Okay, so we'll send out a doodle—thank you, Seth—we'll send out a doodle on the dates, and let me know. But prior to the call, we will have that skeleton with comparing all the articles long in advance. And John, I'll be in constant communication with you on what documents that you need to have, and the lengths—and it was in the agenda today—of each of those other organizations. So, great. Okay. Open it to the floor for any other comments.

[AUDIO BREAK]

Sylvia, do you have anything to say?

SYLVIA VIVANCO: No, Glenn, that's perfect. Everything's fine. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, so thank you all for joining in the call today, this was really productive. I appreciate the volunteers, and we will be in touch, and the next call will be sometime in January.

VARIOUS SPEAKERS: Thank you, Glenn.

RECORDED VOICE:

Thank you once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]