
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Good morning, afternoon and evening everyone, depending on where you are. My name's Jordan Carter from [inaudible], the co-rapporteur with Avri Doria for this Staff Accountability Workstream of Workstream 2, of the Accountability CCWG. Welcome to this meeting on the 19th of January, 2017 at 19:00 hours UTC. Avri's got some family commitments, which I think means she won't be able to join the call. So, it's my job to walk you through this agenda. Hope you're all having a good week, wherever you are.

And the first item is just an agenda review, attendance, SOI check. And just mentioning attendance, is there anyone on the phone line who isn't in the Adobe room that we need to know about? [AUDIO BREAK] Not hearing anything there. And if your statements of interest are not up to date, please make sure you update them. If your interests have changed and if you need help with how to do that, please contact the staff.

And in terms of the agenda, we've got a second look at our document A, the document that looks at the relationships between staff, and boards, and community in the ICANN system. We've got an initial section of the first draft of document B, which Avri has started to pull together. And we've got a sort of request to see if anyone would like to volunteer to help draft responses for the staff questions that came to us as far as

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.

their response to our questions. And we'll do a brief schedule check at the end.

Are there any other items to the agenda that people need to add or should take off? [AUDIO BREAK] Not seeing any hands raised. So if not, we'll carry on. If you do think of something we need to raise, we can deal with it in the other business section of the meeting, Item 6.

And if we move to item 2, which is the document A, we've talked through this and got feedback on the call on the 5th of January and Klaus, Avri and I had a go at sort of tidying the document up and shortening it a bit. And that's that clean version you can find the link in the agenda. There's a very slow and Google doc with lots of changes and track changes and so on that shows the differences between the two. And that's linked in each of these documents and has a link to the other in the Google doc forum.

And so the question before us I think is to work through that and get feedback those on this call. There are more people on this call than there were on the call on the 5th, which is good. And I have to say that as Avri and Klaus and I were looking at it, we still feel like this is more of a first draft document than a second draft. We think it could very usefully and bear quite a bit of tidying and tightening up. And we think we're up for doing that over the next week or so. Along with anyone else who would like to help with that process.

At the moment, for something that was conceived as being about six pages, and it's quite long and probably it would be easier for people to read and digest if the time is taken to make it a short and more readable

document. But that doesn't mean it doesn't already at this stage encapsulate a lot of different ideas and suggestions and thinkings from the small group of people. So what I'm hoping we can do is especially today get comments and thoughts on that instructional piece but also on any of the specifics that are in the document. And if we could also agree a point by which people could add some comments and thoughts by means of the comments section of the Google doc version of this, and that would be helpful as well.

And so I'll just paste the link to the clean version. It's going to be easier for everyone if we have comments on the clean version of the Google doc. And I've put that in the chat. But I'd like to open up by just asking Klaus, Klaus Stoll, who actually did the first draft. The second we've done quite a bit of input on it. So, Klaus, was there anything else you wanted to say and then I'll open the forum for any and all contributions. You don't have to.

KLAUS STOLL:

Thank you, Jordan. No, the only contribution that I would like to make is, yes, it looks like what we have has a lot of substance, but what we need to do is to get more structure and order into the whole thing, so that it's actually become readable. And I think what we need to do that is we need a little more time to do that. I think at least a week. But before we should start the editing process, I really would ask everybody to read the document, the clean document, and comment on the clean document and suggest as needed.

We need ideas; there is already a lot of good stuff in there but before we really go into the last, not the last but the editing process, I really would like to hear from more people and have more ideas. We already have some good and important contributions. I think there is much more talent and knowledge in this group that could benefit that document. Thank you very much.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Klaus. I know it's early in the year, so people may not have done as much reading of this. And Avri suggested working through the document part by part, and just asking for comments on each part. And that might make it more of a digestible thing. But just before we do that, does anyone have any general comments? So feedback you'd like to offer? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, I'll just briefly mention the structure of the document. So there's -- I think staff have actually had the old version in the window. And the version that's in the window is the version that isn't updated on it, it doesn't have the introduction and the time. And so, if it was possible to do the one that's labeled and clean a copy, that would be amazing. There we go. Thank you.

So there's a bit of an introduction to the documents. Then there's the specific relationship between the roles of the ICANN board staff and community. And there's some comments about the relationships between them, the looks of the kind of bilateral relationships between each of those three components. And there's a section of proposed changes and clarifications which is a bit more of a commentary and

section, and [inaudible], so those headings aren't right, they need to be shifted. And then there's some recommendations toward the end.

So, are there any comments that people would like to make about any of the stuff in the first section? Section 1 – The Roles of ICANN's Board Staff and Community. And Klaus, your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

KLAUS STOLL:

Yes, thank you. One of my ideas was -- maybe it's a really bad idea. But as you see, the first three sections, basically the role of board staff and communities specified relationships. It's basically repetitive or editing of existing documents and things which are out there. We didn't make all that stuff up. And to be absolutely honest, I'm thinking about the psychology of the reader to wade through basically 4, 5, 6 pages before we're actually coming to proposed changes, clarifications, activities.

Maybe it would be a better idea to really, after the introduction, start the document with the proposed changes, activities and put actually the basis of which all this has been developed and commented on in the agenda at the bottom or at a later part. It's just for me, I find it difficult for somebody to read all this stuff first and then basically come into the meat. There's a lot of packaging around the meat and the meat is coming very late in the document. So maybe therefore psychology wise, to put the packaging more to the end might help. But I'm not sure if that's actually feasible and possible, but it's something I was thinking about. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Klaus. And it's definitely feasible and possible. I don't think we have anyone outside the group telling us how to structure the document. We've got the guidance in the Workstream 1 report. And if we were to do what you say in terms of making this sort of the reference material about how stuff works, we would probably be worthwhile being very clear about were there any differences between things that do come, as you say, from external documents and are just plain copies of information, and things that are opinions or forward looking sort of assertions or normed creating about how we would like things to work. That would be the only thing I would say in terms of the editing job.

Are there any other comments at this point? I don't want to pick on, I saw George here before, but he's finished. And going to the other -- are there other board members on the call? If there are and I've missed your name, I apologize.

Okay, well did anyone spot anything in the roles and descriptions, if you read them, on pages 3, 4 and 5 -- is there anyone who read them and thought, "Ah, that's not right." Are there any like alarm bells set off by any of this content? Looking especially at those of you who've got kind of leadership roles and have been around longer in the ICANN system.

[AUDIO BREAK]

I know that for some of you, because I've done these calls as well, for some of you it might be the first time that you've looked at this document. So we will keep rolling through it, but if you see something and you want to go back, that's fine. And that's the idea of how these groups are working. But I will move on to the second one, second

section, which is a bit about the relationships between the board and staff and community. I guess I've got the same question. Are there any general comments and are there any bits that you read and you think, "Ah, no!" Are there any things that you think are missing? And anything along those lines? Pam, your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Hey, thank you, Jordan. I'm sorry, can we go back to 1.3.1. I've just missed a comment, or the opportunity to comment.

JORDAN CARTER: We can, yeah. 1.3.1 is on page 4. Page 5, sorry.

PAM LITTLE: 1.3.1, page 5, yes. Can you -- yep. The wording says, "ICANN community members, actually ICANN's SOs and Acs to develop policies applicable to the root of the domain and system." I'm just wondering why the root to the domain and system isn't just applicable to the domain name system?

JORDAN CARTER: We can fix that. That's a good question. I think it probably comes from a CP-TLE sensibility, whereas ICANN'S only role is about the root. But what we should try to do is make the language as standard as possible and consistent with other documents. And I'm sure that that language isn't that.

PAM LITTLE: Okay.

JORDAN CARTER: It's a very interesting point to pick up. Thank you.

PAM LITTLE: No worries.

JORDAN CARTER: Like we can probably get language out of the bylaws that makes it really clear. And Jeff, your hand is up.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. For 1.3.2, where it says what the ICANN community doesn't do. And a second one is implement policy. Should we be citing to the -- there was a GNSO policy development process for implementation versus policy and some concrete recommendations that came out of that. It seems to me a little bit incomplete to say the community doesn't implement policy without making reference to that PDP, at least for the GNSO, and I'm not sure if the correct statement is the community doesn't have a role in implementing policy.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks for that, Jeff. It would be helpful if you were able to maybe share that reference if you have access to it. And you can click the email

on the left maybe with that and potentially isn't a straight up and down, in-house question. And this is one of the bullet points where the language has changed a bit from the first draft. This was a blanket. There's the role.

And I think that was about thinking again about the core and root zone, where of course there's all sorts of participants in the ICANN system who do implement policy. You only have to think of being a Registrar to understand that. So the language still isn't quite right. And if you can't find it, perhaps our friendly and helpful staff could also have a look today. Where that reference is, the GNSO PDP. Thanks for that.

And any other hands up on either section 1 or section 2? I would say that in terms of section 2 there's a bit more normative stuff. There's kind of an attempt to characterize what would make these relationships good or what they would look like if they were working well. And so that's not joining out of existing documents. That was kind of using this protest as a way to test the norms and see what the community thinks about them. If they really do match how people would like to act.

And an example of that, just so you can see what I'm talking about, is on page 7 and in 2.1.1, the CEO/Board relationship. It's just suggesting that collegial setting and [inaudible] and directions, good performance management, position planning and testing of policy frameworks are essential to making a relationship healthy on the Board side. Openness, honesty and excellence (inaudible) provision for the appropriate info and analysis or intention of the Chief Executive helping to maintain the relationship in a healthy state.

So there's a bit of just trying to say what good looks like. And because it's helpful, I think for everyone in the ICANN system to have some kind of shared community statement of what good looks like. And are there any comments about section 2? [AUDIO BREAK]

I will say at this point, that there's no intention on our part to try and push this to some kind of conclusion or decision today. Especially given more editing is needed. So if this is your first chance running through the document, that's alright. You'll have lots of opportunity to add some feedback and thoughts.

And if there aren't any comments on that one, we'll turn to section 3 – Proposed Changes and Clarifications. And that starts probably down on page 10. And it looks at sort of how ICANN is typical and how ICANN isn't typical as an organization, and the tensions that creates for staff. So that section actually just tries to I think capture the uniqueness of this organization. And it would be interesting to get feedback on how well it does that. So whether you're mystified by that section or any comments on that one? Pam, your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Jordan. I was just thinking the second paragraph, the ending of that paragraph says, "In the case of ICANN, the situation is similar but with some important differences." I think the wording "some important differences", or "but with some important differences" might be maybe obsolete or better deluded because we're talking about the similarities in this bullet point, rather than talking about the differences. The

differences are the following paragraphs, or set out in the following paragraphs. Does that make sense or --

JORDAN CARTER:

It makes sense to me, yeah. Thanks, Pam. [AUDIO BREAK] If there are no other comments on this one, we'll just have a look at Section 4. This is the bit that I think needs quite a lot of tightening up and it thinks about the kind of interests that play in the ICANN system, and some of the tensions that that gives rise to. And the need, really, is for the whole system, all of the components and staff that, the board, the community, to be able to come to consensus, frankly acknowledge the different interests at play and manage them in an open and transparent way, I guess, would be my summary. Does anyone have any, sort of, thoughts or responses in reading that part of the document?

One of the things I would like to read it for, or just adding my own two cents for, is that I think some of that gets close to the edge of the scope of this group and might need to be looked at in that light. But that's just a comment from me. We'll keep on going then. Section 5 is the recommendation and sections and there's a few of those there. And some might be controversial, some might be uncontroversial. I don't know. What do you think? Does anyone have any thoughts about those?

I've got one of these acclamations that I thoroughly disagree with so I might just talk about that one briefly, see if it stirs anyone. There's a bullet point, second to last bullet point on page 15, about removal of existing financial dependencies between contracted parties and the

board and staff. To make sense that means that ICANN shouldn't be funded by domain named registries and registrars. I disagree with it. I think that they provide the proper sources of income for the functions that ICANN does and then I think that that conflict just has to be managed.

It's a personal view and a recommendation I would support. Are there any other thoughts or ideas on this recommendations section? Jeff said in the chat that he agrees with the removal of that particular bullet point. Alan, your hand is up, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, on that same point, can you explain it? What is the intent of how would ICANN be financed, if we're no longer dependent on the contracted parties?

JORDAN CARTER:

I can't, but Klaus might be able to explain his thinking there. I think it was originally a little bit longer. Klaus, would you be interested in speaking about that one?

KLAUS STOLL:

Yes, and my explanation won't be very satisfactory, but the point is quite simply, we often think that that relationship, the financial relationship, basically leads occasionally to conflict. And the original paragraph, which was a little bit longer and explained a little bit more, was quite simply to say other ways to alleviate the problem and Jordan even in his remark pointed on it, that we point out that there is a

problem and that might lead to finding better solutions or better mechanisms to resolve these problems. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks Klaus. So, I think it's just drawing attention, like, having it there does at least draw attention. It definitely draws attention to the fact that there might be a conflict. And you can't, you know, in a complicated government system you can't remove conflicts of interests or perspectives, you're not meant to. If you can deal with them transparently it's probably helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, it's Alan. I guess I understand that there is an issue and I certainly can come up with examples of my own. But they don't lead to that recommendation, unless there's a companion part of saying, you know, are we now going to charge a usage fee for the DNS, or something like that? Or FBR asks us to contribute money to ICANN for every domain number that they allocate. There has to be a companion part. You can't just say, cut that loose.

JORDAN CARTER:

Yeah, I agree with you, Alan, stepping out my Chair role for a moment. Going back into it, Klaus, go ahead.

KLAUS STOLL:

Yeah, and if we do that second part we're definitely out of the scope of this working group.

JORDAN CARTER: And it may be that, you know, drawing attention to the fact that, I can see a hypothetical with the fact that ICANN and some of the (inaudible) certain staff and so on, stakeholders and businessmen, makes dealing with those stakeholders and businessmen a little trickier than it would be otherwise. And that might place pressures on staff that should be recognized and managed.

So, I think there's something there and that angle of things within the scope. That's all I can think of so far. That is clearly within the scope of our work and that relates to the primary source of funding for ICANN. Of course, if we (inaudible) new gTLD's, then we oughtn't to have any funds coming from registries or registrars. I'm being facetious, by the way.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan, if I may come back in. I have no problem identifying the conflict, but putting it in a recommendation which we then do not believe is implementable, as we understand the world to be right now, I don't believe is within our responsibility.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, I think there's been a few comments on that so I think we'll need to take another go at that. So, that's this document. It's longer than I thought it would be. We've talked about the need to edit it. We've got some specific drafting suggestions and some comments about one of the recommendations.

Are there any other kind of comments before we -- I mean, we've got (inaudible) now, clearly we've got more to do. So, shall we essentially wrap up on Document A? Jeff, please take the floor.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, this is Jeff Neuman. I know we talked about certain areas, kind of, opinion, and certain areas being, kind of, a definition of what actually occurs. But it's hard to delineate in the first couple sections which parts are opinion and which parts are based on our analysis of the current condition. And that's why I said earlier, we need to, kind of, source the information sections 1 and 2, where did we get this information from?

Either we got it from personal observation or we got it from the bylaws in certain circumstances or wherever else we got it from. I think we just need to source it, otherwise it all looks like our opinion on what the role of the board should be, what the role of the staff should be, what the relationship should be. It's just, to me, I kept saying, well, where did we get this information from? Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Jeff. Yeah, I think there was a comment earlier on, on that. Some of the sourcing is detailed in the long appendix to the other draft to these papers where Klaus went through and showed, sort of, where comments were coming from. So, some of that information is available and just needs to be added back in terms of referencing.

But I certainly think we need to be clear is what is versus what we would like to see. So, I think that's a very important point for the next version of this, to reflect, and thanks for making it. Phil, your hand was up. Phil Corwin.

PHILIP CORWIN:

Yeah, thank you, Phil for the record. Just a couple of points I want to make. One, I agree. I don't see any practical way end ICANN's dependency on funds coming in from the contracted parties providing most, if not all, of its financial support. So, we shouldn't be suggesting that can end but suggesting exactly its problems, how to manage them. Second, it might be worth mentioning at least that all those funds originate from registrants and are upstream through the registrars and registries.

Third, we should consider that, you know, there is a problem that, you know, some groups are viewed because of the amount of financial support they get from ICANN, to attend meetings, to be, you know, in some way, some degree of control there.

But also there's another working group on Diversity and that type of support for participation in ICANN is probably integral to getting greater diversity participation, particularly from poorer parts of the world.

And finally, it's probably not within this document but I assume that at some point there'll be another document that actually addresses what remedies exist or additional remedies should exist when staff acts in what members of the community believe is an unaccountable way, particularly in usurping decisions that have policy implications. Am I

correct that that will be addressed in another document? Because I don't see anything in here about that.

JORDAN CARTER: I believe that it is. My understanding is that that's the purpose of the B Document which includes establishing appropriate processes (inaudible) issued that enable community and staff to raise issues.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay, I'll reserve comments then for when we review that. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay, thanks Phil, good points. Klaus, your hand is up as well.

KLAUS STOLL: Yeah. Thank you, Phil, for making that suggestion. What I would say is it would be very good to make these comments now in the B Document because there's a certain inter-relationship between the two documents and it would make those look better if we take this relationship into account right from the start. So, I think the draft of the draft of the B Document is available and I think the sooner people would comment in this interview would be extremely helpful also for the A Document.

Just to repeat, I'm saying what Jordan just said, the way we worked out in the original draft in the Sections 2 and 3 is, every single sentence, everything was both taken either from the Charter or the documents

which are quoted there full, and each section had a note where it actually came from. So, if we later want to edit those in, or not, everything which was there has a basis in existing document's charters and so on and so on. Nothing has been, in brackets, made up. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

And only to add, that if anything in that section has been made up, it wasn't made up by Klaus, it was made up by me. So, it should all be, first of all, and if there's editorial errors in there it needs to be identified really clearly. Look, thank you, that's been helpful. There have been some useful feedbacks and comments there on that document. We'll come back to the schedule for our work in a little bit, but I think the next steps for us though to plead, ask, request, egg, of you to have a read of preferably the clean doc and the post to a link's in the agenda, the one that's on your screen.

And so that you (inaudible) functionality to add your thoughts and opinions, views. If you can take half an hour to do that, that would be a very significant and amazing contribution to the work of this group. And then after that, the (inaudible) writing team will get together and re-cut it. I suspect it will come back looking quite different, because I think those first sections will go down the bottom as an appendix that, kind of, is just the facts. But I don't think we're going to start making stuff up. I think the, kind of, general tenor and direction is already there. So, thank you for that input and I'm going to move us on to the next agenda item.

We've got 25 minutes left in the whole call. The next agenda item is the B Document and Avri's apologized that she's not here. She had a family commitment that she couldn't make this meeting. As you all know the rapporteurs can't guarantee to make all of these meetings. This document was about the capability of working with ICANN to consider code of conduct, transparency criteria, training, KPI's, etcetera, etcetera, as listed in that first paragraph in italics.

Now, quite a lot of the response to what's already done there came back to us in the stack of higher staff questions which were basically asking all of those things. And if memory serves, Avri has gone back to the staff and said, "It's great that those things exist and can we have a look at them please. Can we have a see, and see what's already there?" So, I am sure she's made that request. I don't know where it is in terms of coming back. I think what Avri's done in the draft one of this document that's here, is cited some existing documents, quoted some parts of --

BERNIE: Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Hello, Bernie.

BERNIE: Yes, on Avri's request I've been told that there should be a response from staff by the end of next week for you.

JORDAN CARTER: Oh great, thank you, that's helpful to know. And just on that Bernie, did I characterize her request right? It was basically can we see the documents that are referred to?

BERNIE: I'm sort of stepping in in your groups and I haven't been following it that close but that is what I have been told, yes.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay, thanks. So, it's a rough draft, this document. I don't propose that we work through this in any great detail now. My proposal is rather that we wait to see what information the staff come back with. Because if you go to the end of this document, that's required to complete the assessment of the current and planned measures and propose any changes. Knowing that the docs there is a great start and they can be described once we've seen them and assessed.

So, I think that the work of that group, that document, will really be able to take off once that initial information is available. And certainly, for myself, my hope is that that can be the start of quite a good dialogue between the group and the staff. By the group, it might mean our smaller group or it might mean the bigger CCWG as we get some material in front of the Plenary. If anyone does have any comments on the draft that is here, I'll give you the chance to make them now.

And I know that Avri will read the notes to this call and it can be added as feedback. But to be entirely honest with you, it would probably be

more helpful if you took the opportunity to look at the Google doc and add any comments there that you've got. And I don't see any hands up. I see a lovely green tick by Klaus's name there. And I see Bernie's hand up.

So, this Document B is a start, and so I thank Avri for making that start. With both this document and the previous one, if anyone desires to be more involved in the drafting of the next draft, please can you let us know. All help gratefully received. Alan has asked, do you have a URL for Document B? URL for Document B. Let me paste it over into the chat. And there's the agenda. There you go.

Okay, the next item is a very quick item. We do have some questions from the staff. Avri's prepared a pro-forma document to record what those questions are. The question is whether anyone would like to start drafting semantics? Or whether, a better way to do that would be to actually just have a, sort of, 20-minute segment in the next call where we just discuss each question one by one and record the discussion. My instinct is that starting with a bit of a brainstorm about what the answers are might be quite a good and quick and efficient way to do it. Klaus, your hand is up, please go ahead.

KLAUS STOLL:

Thank you. I was thinking that actually most of the questions can be answered with some of the content which is already existing in the activities and recommendations which we have in part 4 and 5 of the A Document.

So, I think it's a very, very good idea to suggest to have a brainstorm, but maybe the brainstorm can be opened by just cutting and pasting in what we might have already on relevant answers in Document A. And if people agree to that I might find the half hour to actually do that.

JORDAN CARTER:

I think that that would be a great help and so if you were prepared to do that, Klaus, I think no-one is going to complain. So we get some material in there that there's already been a little bit of work gone into and it tends to be easier to respond to something that's there than to look at a blank space and go, "How shall I fill it?" At least for most of us, that's the case. So, thank you.

KLAUS STOLL:

Okay, I will try. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks. Cheryl's made a good point in the chat which is we should re-circulate these URL's with a re-request for people to contribute and we can do that after this meeting. They're all on the agenda so I'll just re-send the agenda with a different heading and a little bit of different body content around it. Thanks, Cheryl.

Now, the last item is check in on our schedule and I went back and had a look at the paper we put up in December about our proposed next steps. I don't assume that staff will have that on hand but I'll just paste the link into the chat. This is our next steps. And what we had said in that document was that in the call on the 5th of January we'd work the

draft of Document A and we did do a bit of that. Then on the 19th January call we would test agreed changes to draft Document A. And we'd work through draft Document B. And then the call in a fortnight on the 2nd of February, we would finalize Document A and test agreed changes to draft Document B.

To me it feels like we're running a little bit later than that. But what we've been asked to do by the entirety of the Plenary at the last call, was to have either one or two of our documents ready for Plenary discussion in Copenhagen at the face-to-face meeting. And to me, while it feels like we may not get those documents in to the CCWG before the Copenhagen meeting, I certainly think that at the rate we're going we will have Doc A ready to do that at Copenhagen and maybe Document B as well. Depends on how much energy we put in.

So, I think basically what you can expect is that we'll maintain these fortnightly calls as scheduled and that we're roughly following that. And next steps that we agreed in December that it's just taking more than two calls to get the documents ready for Plenary and that we should still aim for the next call to be able to come close to signing off Document A. 5th of February and 16th February to hopefully do the same thing for B. In fact it might take another call for each of them.

Jeff has asked in the chat: is there a link for the questions doc as well? Jeff, if by that you mean the questions docs, like, the pro forma documents for where we would write responses to questions? Then I'll just post that. Answers to the staff questions is in that Google doc. So, all these docs were linked to the agenda that I emailed out for this meeting, about 15, 16 hours ago. So, that's where we're at, a little bit

behind but making progress. Sorry, Bernie, I missed your hand. Go ahead.

BERNIE:

Thank you. Just a little note. You may have noted Matthew's posting today. And in there, there is some formalizing about how documents will be taken to the Plenary for first and second readings. And one of the things in there, just to make sure everyone is on the same page, is that a document can't be considered by the Plenary unless it's been distributed to the Plenary at least seven days before the Plenary meeting. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, Bernie, that's a really important point, and a good one to make. So, yes, and that means that to have that, the very last opportunity for us to sign anything off and send it to the Plenary would be the call that we've got scheduled on the 2nd of March. Because the Plenary meeting is on the 10th. But we can say we will finalize something on the 16th and then discuss it on the week after.

So, it's an important point to note that there's just... it's a pleasant sensation that we will all have at least a week, which means generally at least a weekend to be able to look at things and think about them when we ask for input on them. And I certainly appreciate that and I hope you all do too.

So, are there any other business items for this call? If there's no other business, let's wrap it up. Thank you all, that was a good chat and

please look at the Google docs, please add your thoughts to Document A, the (inaudible), the Document B. If you've got thoughts about the staff questions, we've got another call in a fortnight, two weeks from today. If you do have inputs it would be wonderful if you could—on Document A, I'm talking about now—if you have input on Document A it would be great if you could get that to me by close of Monday UTC so that we have enough time to, kind of, edit it into another version and give that to you to read with a bit of head space before the next call.

And to the other documents, I think it's a case of commenting and rolling out (inaudible). So, if you're planning to look at all that my plea would be to start with Document A. That's not just because it's the one I have to worry about, but it's the one that we need to get finished first. And with that, I hope you enjoy the rest of your 19th of January or the start of your 20th. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]