
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Welcome to our meeting of 28th February, 5 UTC.
[Inaudible] through the agenda.

On today's agenda, we're pretty much just focusing on one thing, a second reading of document A, version 1.5, because this is document, want to be able to in Copenhagen [inaudible]...

So hopefully we can get that. I do have other stuff in the agenda, should get there, but I really don't expect, and that's to start working on document B, which we haven't done yet. And then at some point, to get to continuing discussion of responses. These things will all be [inaudible] and see if we can get there.

And also, particularly, there is [inaudible] I think it needs to be synched, but I don't know. There is any other business, and just [inaudible] it. Bernie's hand is up, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I don't know if it's just me, but your audio is very choppy on my end.

AVRI DORIA: Gee, and I'm using a phone.

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.

I don't know what else to say. Maybe I can switch to using the Adobe Connect, which never works for me.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well I mean, we can hear you, but it's amazingly choppy. So, let's give it a try.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, well, Jordan will be doing most of the talking. So, okay. So, then there is any other business on the agenda. Does anybody have any they want to mention at the moment? No? Okay. Bernie, your hand is still up but I assume it's still up. Thank you.

Okay. Next on attendance, we have the people that are listed in the Adobe Connect. Is anybody just on the telephone, and not in the Adobe Connect?

Okay. Hearing no one. Just want to remind people about statements of interest, SOI. If you've had any reason to update it, please update it, and is there anything that anyone wants to update to the meeting at the moment?

I see no hands. Oh yes, please, go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Hi, Avri, thanks. It's Pam Little speaking. I've just posted in the chat that I have an update, and I'm now representing [inaudible] group, participating in this working group. I'm sorry for the sound, I've missed

a few meetings in the last few weeks due to the change of employment situation. And I will hope to see you all in Copenhagen soon. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you very much. Congratulations on the new job. And yeah, look forward to seeing you in Copenhagen. Okay. Anyone else? Okay, in which case, we'll go on to item two, which is second reading of document A. And at this point, I will turn the floor over to Jordan.

Jordan, I'll try to watch the chat, and if there are any hands, I'll alert you just in case your eyes are in the document on Drive, and not looking at this screen. So Jordan, please.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks Avri. Hi everyone, this is Jordan Carter here. Is my audio also choppy? Or is that coming through okay?

AVRI DORIA:

Sounds good to me. [CROSSTALK]

JORDAN CARTER:

Fantastic. Okay, let's do this thing people, as someone else in this community might say. Staff, could you load the PDF copy of the document? So, we're on our fourth chat about this, I think. What I did, following the last meeting, was to go through and make structural changes that we discussed.

So, quite a lot of what was section two is now annex one. Quite a lot of what was section four is now annex two, flagged for deletion. And the section four and five has been tightened up into just recommendations that are either things to start doing, keep doing, slash change.

I think I've separated it into keep doing, change, and stop doing. So, my hope is that we can clear this out of this group for discussion in the CCWG at Copenhagen. And the reason for that, not necessarily is that I think it's quite all the way there yet. It doesn't feel to me quite like we're a finished product.

It feels to me that we need more perspective and more angles on what we've got so far, to kind of inspire us to get all the rest of the way there. So, my own personal thinking about this is that it isn't about perfection, but it is about having the wider discussion with the whole CCWG.

So, that's kind of my hope here, and I think we'll start off with whether there are any general comments before we work through the key points I added as track changes or track edits...

AVRI DORIA: George has his hand up.

JORDAN CARTER: ...would like to make some. So, George, why don't you go ahead.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Am I being heard now?

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Am I being heard? [CROSSTALK] Thank you, thank you. Yeah, these are difficult comments for me to make. You know, I'm your Board liaison to the staff accountability WS2 effort, and what the liaisons are supposed to do is to try to give you a sense of how the Board might view what's coming in, or how... And then how we might be able to help in a way that doesn't really detract from what you want to do, but to help you fashion something that has maximum effect, and is, would be acceptable and operational by the Board and the staff.

So, I'm going to make some comments, and I will exaggerate a bit. And won't you to remember that I am mostly the messenger. So don't kill me. I read the document fairly thoroughly today, and I'm working from the Google Docs document.

And my sense is one of real concern. And the concern is that the document, I think, misses the mark, and fairly badly. And Avri, you'll recognize some of these comments, because we had a side conversation about this. What I don't get from... What I get from the document reading between the lines is, there is a problem here somewhere.

In fact, there may be many problems, but they're all sort of with the staff and the relationship with the staff. When I read the lines themselves, I never really see that. And so, as a result, if I'm looking at

the document just as a reader, I think, I scratch my head and I say, what problem are these people trying to solve? It's really not being discussed here.

And am I tip-toeing around for most of it, and then there is some kind of blatant [inaudible] charges, buried in some of the recommendations. And the concern I have is, and the limited amount of feedback I've gotten back from the Board on this, is what's going here? We don't understand this.

So, I am really concerned. And my sense that, you could cut 80% of this out, 80% of the attempt to explain all of these relationships, and you could address the problem directly. You have two recommendations which are [inaudible], they're F and J. That says, we need mechanisms to talk about this and figure out how to do it without fear of retaliation.

And J says, we want to include our feedback in a meaningful way, with respect to the staff members and their performance evaluations. And my sense is that if you just do that, and you did it in a few pages, you'd have a much more effective document. Frankly, if my job depended upon this document, I would start over.

And I hate to be so negative about it, but I really think you ought to consider what you're doing here. You're giving a lot of background which probably isn't necessary. You're giving, some of that background is incorrect, and you're not really addressing the problem that I believe you were chartered, or at least, I think you were chartered to address.

So remember, I'm the Board liaison. I'm not part of the group. You can take my comments for whatever you think they're worth. They're

either worth a lot, or they're worth nothing. But I feel compelled to give you this introduction to my reaction, and probably the Board's reaction to what is being produced now. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Great. Thanks George. A couple of sort of comments off the top of my head. If you look at the top of the document, at the start, it was pretty descriptive about what we had to do. We had to work on ICANN, to develop a document that clearly describes with all of the staff, vis a vis the Board and the community.

It should include a general description of the powers [inaudible] of the ICANN staff by the Board of Directors that do and do not need approval of the ICANN Board. So, I think that's pretty much a quote out of the work stream one report. Now, as it happens, I personally agree that focusing down on what the problem is, and what might need to be solved, would be a more useful document, but I don't know the extent to which we can just unilaterally change the conclusion to work stream one's report, and do something we felt was better.

So, I would just make that point to start a conversation. The second point I would make is that, to the extent that there are errors of fact in the document, if they've been introduced to recently through editing changes and stuff, that's fine. It says, then they're stable for a few weeks.

I regret the fact that as a Board liaison, you're introducing that kind of quite direct criticism of facts so late in the piece. It's a pattern that

we've got into trouble with during the work stream one work. So, if there is stuff that you said [AUDIO ECHOING]...

And I'll just stop with those comments at this point, and [AUDIO ECHOING]...

If you're not speaking, please mute your microphone. [CROSSTALK]

AVRI DORIA:

Greg has his hand up.

Greg?

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. This is Greg Shatan. Sorry, it took a little time to get to the mute button. I do read the text from work stream one from annex 12. I don't think that the suggestions that George has made are inconsistent with the instructions from work stream one.

We're asked to complete a general description of the powers invested in staff. And you know, to cover, you know, in ways that we feel fit, you know, the roles that ICANN Board staff and community. I'm not even sure that's part of the annex 12 text, to be honest, although it's [inaudible] but it's not in italic.

But I think that we could meet the requirements of the work stream one orders, if you will, without this kind of history of the world approach, that is here. I think there is just a huge amount of general stuff, and

stuff that's way beyond the remit of what we have been asked to do in work stream one.

So, I think that while we obviously do need to bring home and faithful to the work stream one recommendations, I don't think that this is, at all, what was required by work stream one. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Jordan? I have no other hand.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks Avri. I was just checking if I was muted or not. The italic quote at the top of the document is exactly a copy and paste from the work stream one annex 12. So, it is exactly what we have been told to do. That seconds, that italicized text. So, one of the interesting things about that text is that it says work with ICANN to develop a document.

And we tried that, because we, Avri and I met with Theresa, and after that, and so far, the experience of working with ICANN to create a document, has involved the staff answers to the question, sorry. The staff background paper, the staff answers the additional questions that we asked, and now this intervention from George.

So, I don't think we've got a model of operating that is actually capable of delivering those italics. The second point I would make, I guess, is this. The parts... We can describe those things and do nothing more, and put all of the recommended material in the other document, in document B from our charter. I don't mind if we do that or not. I could really care less.

It might make more sense to have all of the recommended changes in one place. But then I really don't understand why we did this document at all, because there is quite a good formal establishment of the standard relationships, it's call the bylaws.

So, you know, I think this is an endeavor which has had not very much input, and a few people's writings and stuff. And that's why my desire is to ventilate it, with the CCWG. And that might be to table this basic set of comments and analysis, and say, some people have worked on this piece, and some feel that it goes beyond the scope, and that a more helpful thing would be to focus on articulating whether there is a problem here.

Because I guess the last point I would make is that everyone who has been involved with, or is involved with ICANN, has a different take on whether there is some problem or not. And if there is an elephant in the room, I haven't heard anyone actually prepared to discuss what it is, A. And B, I haven't really found the forum where it is the right place to discuss this.

And so I think that's one of the two recommendations that George suggested, were the critical ones, and maybe they are. So just a welcome for the feedback on this. I think, you know, my basic view is that we need to get some more guidance in the plenary about what it is they would exactly like us to do. But let's go... Avri, your hand is up, and then Greg, your hand is up.

AVRI DORIA:

Yes, this is Avri. Hopefully I won't break up much. I basically was going to say something similar to what you said. I think it's good that this came out. I think that it should be repeated to the plenary, when we discussed this document. I think the plenary is the place to find out whether we're meeting the requirement for the sub-team or not, especially if we have a question that I don't think will resolve it today, because I also tend to think that this document is, in general, meeting the requirement without going far overboard, without getting into the content, one way or the other.

In terms of the elephant, I think that you're right. I think what we've mainly see is a large blanket covering something big, walking through the room, and we don't quite know what it is. And nobody is willing to let us peak under the blanket yet. We've gotten a couple indications of groups that are working on statements, but we don't have any yet.

So, I would actually like to recommend that we do go through the document, fixing what needs to be fixed, before sending it forward. But that's just my recommendation for how to proceed. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

So, I think, just riffing on that for a moment. Doing so in a way that isn't at this meeting, whatever it is, it isn't halfway through approving a draft. It seems to be where this is at. Greg, please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Greg Shatan again for the record. Just to respond. First, I don't view the bylaws as the staff mandate or the description of the staff

powers. That's not really what the bylaws do, or what the bylaws generally do. So, I don't think that saying that because we are asked to do a general description of the powers invested in ICANN staff by the Board, that we should do something different because that's what the bylaws do.

I don't think that's what the bylaws do, and I think you know, look for here, is probably more of a functional description. And I mean, it is interesting that actually narrowing sort of characterization to talk about the powers vested in staff by ICANN Board of Directors. So, not all of the functions of staff, but literally, you know, what is kind of... What does the staff does, because it has been given certain powers by the Board. But in any case, that's really...

The bylaws don't do that, they create certain frameworks, and structures, and some private laws in which those powers are contained, or framed up, or restrained, probably the better word. So, I think that a plain English description of the powers vested in the ICANN staff, is what's needed.

Bylaws are certainly not plain English, you know, are not reflective of real life. They may govern real life, but they're not a description of it. Secondly, I'd look at the elephant in the room a little bit differently. I think that the elephant of staff accountability has been hidden in this document, by being in a heard of elephants. And I think if we honed in on the issue of staff accountability, then we would really be able to spend frankly more time on the issues of staff accountability.

But because this is a survey document in a sense, it's kind of a mile wide and an inch deep, and it's not as deep as it needs to be when we get to the staff accountability issues specifically. I think if all that was here was a description of staff roles and of accountability issues connected with, we would have a more powerful dynamic, a document, a more readable, and more, one that can be responded to.

So, I note lastly that the one, two, three, four below the italic text, is not part of the annex 12, just to be clear. So, that's a decision made by the group as to what it might do. But even here, I think the role can be dismissed, or that can be dealt with briefly, and you know, a lot of the other stuff, just goes way, way over the line, in my view.

I hope that people don't have a certain pride of authorship or concern about letting go, and that will always be an issue talking about significant changes in the document, but I like the membership model, and I like the PTI as a separate corporation outside of ICANN. There are all kinds of things I like, I'd let go of. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. I've got George next. I guess we're not actually [AUDIO ECHO]...

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

I'll be quick. The elephant in the room is pretty clear to me. There are people who think that staff are crossing over the policy implementation line, improperly, there are people who think staff have power over them, and if they complain and try to negotiate, then staff will

presumably unfairly deal with them if they're registrars or registries. I picked that up.

And so, the issue is, staff behavior. The problem is, there is no place to adjudicate this, that doesn't leave them open to retribution or retaliation of some kind. If that's the elephant in the room, it can be pretty directly addressed. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Avri. I've got a question for George actually, which is [inaudible] and I apologize in advance that it is, but [inaudible] we've got that little description, right, in the text, of what work stream one perhaps has to do with part of this, that's just half of it. The other half I what we're calling document B.

And what I thought the staff would provide us as the working paper, was essentially that. So, I've thought that we get a staff paper in August, or whatever it was meant to be in June, that's provided the basis for actually what is specified there.

And we didn't get that. And then we asked some questions to try and uncover more information, there is that and the other one, and we've got quite a lot more information, but we didn't get that. So, I think we've got a copy of the undelegated powers, and I don't think we're kind of apprised of the fact of where there is any sort of formal allegation.

And probably more importantly, as a group of volunteers writing some questions, and then two months later, getting some written answers, and then two months later having a conversation like this on a phone call, it seems to me we've got to be able to do better than that.

So, I guess George, my question for you as the Board liaison is, how can we do better than that? How can we do what the first sentence says? Work with ICANN to develop a document that's [inaudible], and how can we get some access to some of the really challenging people inside the organization who will already know what that is? That we can then couple with your very [inaudible] summary of what the elephant is? And have a discussion that's grounded in A, facts about what's there, and B, focused on the real problem?

Because I certainly endorse what Greg said. But, if anyone has got [inaudible] about this text, I hope that they are prepared to deflate it, and I've savaged other people's text and have had mine savaged. I'm totally fine with that. Is that something that you feel comfortable [AUDIO ECHO] on another call? Because I really think we've got to be able to [AUDIO ECHO], how to get ICANN to work with us differently.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

I'll take a stab at it. My relationship with staff are different than yours, clearly. So, my experience is going to be very different from yours. I don't know, expect that I don't think that staff is particularly hostile in this area, and so it surprises me that you haven't had better luck.

And I don't know, I admit, I haven't been part of this process until recently, and that's my fault, and that's overload if, of things that I had to deal with. But, I wish I had been there, I could have helped.

Now, it depends on how much time you think you have. I don't know what your time schedule is, but if you want me to raise this with staff, I can do it. Maybe we can get you the statement that you want. I don't know, but I'm really to help you in any way that you think that you need help.

AVRI DORIA:

At this point, in terms of our timeline, we're slipping a week every week. So, we've pushed the boundaries of our timeline, and as I say, at the moment, we're trying to get to have something that we can take to the next meeting for discussion. I think adding the content of this discussion in the document is, or as a cover to this document, is probably worth doing, but I do hope that we can get something through, and deal with it in the larger group.

I mean, for example, I look at the list of attendees we have at the moment, and two or three of those have contributed to this text aren't here, and I don't mean to defend their text so much as to argue for, you know, some of the material in the thing.

But, you know, our schedule has slipped. We have gotten the document deliveries from the staff. I know that I have been for staff to participate, I've even made an issue of it on a panel with the CEO at the Hyderabad meeting, and still, you know, nothing developed. So, I'm not

sure that waiting for some future cooperation is going to do anything more than help us look further. Yeah, Jordan, I see your hand is up.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks Avri. I want to be really clear, George. I haven't sensed a tiny, a [inaudible] of any staff hostility or anything about this project. Overall, I've noticed that, in the middle of last year, and progress slow down a lot. And just the timeliness of some of the key outputs, I think... Oh God, I'm having a complete name blank.

When Grace left, and one of the other staff members was left to finish all of those papers, there was a multi-month delay as she was getting up to speed with all of the issues. So, I'm not making, I'm not trying to apply any kind of lack of supportiveness, it's just that the outputs that we got didn't match the specification that we've been given.

And so, I kind of agree with Avri. Like, if we're not going to be able to... We were never going to get anything signed off for the public consultation at this plenary meeting, and so it seems to me the best thing to do, almost, having carried on a discussion, is to try and do a one pager of this discussion.

A kind of, this is what we're trying to do. This is the work for the output that you can go and look at, that has been done. These are the criticisms that have been raised of this, we want to have a conversation with the full CCWG, with a broader set of directives about how to proceed.

And I think that's probably the, you know, because then people want to read what's been going on, maybe [inaudible], I guess that is [inaudible], or people will say, oh, there is a document like that. I don't know what the answer is, but I know we need to broaden the conversation, whatever.

And I think that people have been nice and acute in this discussion, and the notes have been great, thank you staff, writing down. So, is that a kind of workable approach to this? We get something onto the agenda, it doesn't have to be very long item, and it will then give us, maybe wiggle room about sort of just moving a bit away from what's written for work stream one.

Maybe getting better entirety about what might come in writing. And hopefully, at least I would like to express as the co-rapporteur, there is no defensiveness over worry on my part about staff writing some of this stuff. I would rather get access to that skill and support. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

I put myself in the queue again. Am I muted? No, I'm not muted. I've put myself in the queue again, because I'm not comfortable, fully, with that approach. I like the idea of us writing a cover letter, but I actually do think, and this has happened already before in the group, and perhaps I can, you know, I can call on Bernie to correct me if I'm wrong, where documents that aren't there for first reading, even though we hoped to have one for first reading, but are there as things that can be discussed and that we want further opinion on, are included.

So, I'm more inclined to recommend that we send this document, cleaned up as much as we can, making sure that it doesn't have the typos have all been accepted, and anything that's you know, been discussed has been accepted.

But that we include the cover note, as you suggested, Jordan, but we also include this document. And that we not bury the document based upon, you know, the comments received tonight, but that we let it sit out there and let it be part of the discussion. Let it be part of what people might have read before the discussion, so that we can have a fuller discussion with a larger group of people.

So, I guess that would be sort of a counter suggestion to just the single pager. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

To be clear, from my point of view, I wasn't trying to suggest that we shouldn't send the document. I don't think it should be buried myself. I see Bernie's hand is up as well.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, please Bernie. I did ask you a question, so thank you. Please, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Just a comment. First I'll say, I certainly feel your pain. The comment is, I think it's fine to send things to the plenary for discussion in the way that you're thinking about it. But, what I will ask is that you get the best

results if you can frame what you're asking of the plenary to the best of your ability.

The best it gets framed, and described as to what you are looking for from the plenary, I think the better results you'll get. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks, that's good advice. I appreciate it. Yeah. So, I guess that cover note needs to include that framing. I see Jordan agreeing to that. Okay, so we've done the, how are we going to handle this? We have 24 minutes left to the meeting. Do we want to go through the document at all, and clean up where we can in those 24 minutes?

Or, do we want to just sort of, I don't know, get the 20 minutes back? You know, so I'd like to... Greg, I see your hand up.

GREG SHATAN:

Greg Shatan again for the record. I'll try to be as brief as possible for me. I agree with what Bernie says. We need to make it clear, if we are asking people to read 19 single spaced pages or not? Because that's part of the question, a part of the work load issue, and I think, you know, part of how we frame this, and you know, one of the questions is, whether... How much of this is really responsive, or necessary to the remit of the subgroup?

And I think that's an issue separate and apart, but to some extent, a reaction to the lack of timely input from staff in order to meet the initial ways this group [inaudible]. But, if you give somebody 19 pages, you have to tell them, do you want comments, line item comments on 19

pages? Or do you want people to get a sense of the document? A sense of where we are? And let us know if we somehow wandered into some sort of drafting Bermuda Triangle or not.

So, I think we do need to be clear about that, and about the fact that, you know, I just looked at the number on the last page, I'm not going to count words. But in any case, I can reframe the fact that there is discomfort, it's not just George's discomfort, it's my discomfort, maybe others too, that there are huge swaths of this document that probably do not need to exist in the context of this group.

So, there may be interesting in some other context impertinent in that other context is this isn't that. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, yeah. I think actually, the pertinent part of the document is 11 pages, because most of, a lot of the stuff was moved off to the annexes in Jordan's restructuring. So, it's actually 11 pages, and you know, the first page or so is the fluff there. So, it's still 10 pages. It's still a lot for people to read, I suppose.

So, yeah. The annex may be both non-pertinent and impertinent. Okay. Okay, Jordan, I see your hand up.

JORDAN CARTER:

Yeah, okay. Look, I completely agree with the framing. George, I want to thank you for being direct. As I've said in the chat, the conversation is... I put into words things I didn't feel comfortable saying in a role of rapporteur, but it's out there now. So that's good.

I think one of the things where this does go beyond scope maybe is in just, you know, if it just looked at the bilateral relationships between staff and community and Board, it would be shorter through the appendices as well.

So, I think we've... Avri, I'm just struggling. I'm thinking off the top of my head with what we might do next. I think having the one page of that frames what we're looking for, which is like, I think, from the chat, one of the real problems in respect to staff accountability you want worked on, and in what form would they best be worked on?

So, kind of going to those two recommendations that George pointed out. And to just be clear, we're not looking for [inaudible] assistance. We don't expect for people to have read the piece of, the paper that's been written, but they're welcome to.

And I completely agree with Greg's point, just in the...

AVRI DORIA:

I tried to tell George that in our conversation. That he could have participated, and I told George that many, many times over the months that, of course, George could participate as George, and just let us know when he was putting his Board hat on.

So, I feel that we've been fair in doing that, and I hope that George will agree, that we have tried to tell the Board member that he could participate as just a regular old participant, if so he wished.

JORDAN CARTER: That would be awesome if people did that, as well as or instead of liaison role, if they were available too. Because I'm sure all of you have got lots of free time on the Board.

And what I don't know, really, what to do is how much time to put into the 19 or 18 pages, or whatever it is. I think my instinct is to kind of leave it there, because it's the document that has generated conversation, which is indicating some guidance. So, if people are happy with that approach, which I'll just restate, I'll do a bit of work in thinking, and circulate to the list tomorrow morning, our time, in New Zealand, an ICANN version of that one pager for you to look at, and it's for [inaudible] to quick review of that.

I think we could... If we've got our next call in our calendars... Is there another call this week, Avri?

AVRI DORIA: I don't think so. And Bernie, what is our deadline for a document to be out for...? It's Friday, okay. I don't believe we have another one scheduled.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We've got Thursday the 2nd of March at 19 UTC, meeting is in my diary anyway.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, I have the same meeting. Thursday, March 2nd, 19:00, staff accountability.

JORDAN CARTER: Because we were squeezing this one in as an extra meeting.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, I've got that one too.

JORDAN CARTER: So, what if I draft that note? And what if we...? And if we ask people, and they have like [inaudible] staff problems in the document as it stands, the big document, maybe they can pick those out and do something, change it to really highlight them. And like highlight it yellow, or write a colored spaces around it. And then on Friday, well Thursday, UTC, we'll just agree, we'll focus on the one pager, and then we'll get this out the door.

Is that a good place to finish here?

AVRI DORIA: Sure, why not? Okay. We've got two hands up, oh no. Jordan, your hand is... We've got George's hand. Please George, go ahead.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks Avri. I did want to make these comments on the Google Doc. I could have inserted a whole bunch of comments, and I'm willing to do that, but the problem with the Google Doc is that there are so many comments in there, that when I put my comment in, it doesn't go in the

right places. There isn't a line that connects the comment to the exact place in the text that the comment refers to.

Am I doing something wrong or stupid? How can I do this easily so that you can all see it? Or if you want to see it?

AVRI DORIA:

I think all the comments do show, and so you may just not see your line, but if you've highlight a section, and then you go and you click the comment box on the side there, it's showing a comment that's linked to the place that you have highlighted.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

So, you're telling me, there is a real visible link there that I can use. Okay, I'll be glad to do that.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah. [CROSSTALK]

GREG SHATAN:

...briefly point out that if you click on any given comment, it will move the document so that the comments will go to the next to the part that it's commented on, even if it's moving pages away because of the stacks of comments in the document. Similarly, if you click on any place in the document that has a comment attached to it, so bringing the comment up to where you are in the document.

So, it's only when you are looking at the document statically that the comments appear to be very far away from the target.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you Greg for saying that. Yeah, it really is quite dynamic. And in my experience, has worked quite well.

Okay. So, with 14 minutes left, we've got a plan. We've got where Jordan is going to take... Somebody has got to mute. It sounds like we're on a police radio.

So, Jordan is going to basically start a note and it will be out in a bunch of hours, which will probably be my morning, his night, what have you. Then we all basically need to take a look at it, and we'll decide on that letter at our next meeting, and that will still be in time for the Friday deadline to get something submitted.

Basically, people will go through the document, they'll clean up what can be cleaned up, they'll make the extra comments, they'll suggest the edits they want to suggest in that document, and we'll release that as a commented document, with it pointed to the URL so everybody can go to it, you know.

I may do what I did this time, which is put out two copies of the PDF. One, just a clean PDF of the text as it currently stands, and one, the PDF with all of the comments in the margins, so that if people just want to read without being confused by the comments, they can.

And I think I heard you correctly, Jordan, is that you want to leave in those annexes, though we may want to comment in the note that they

are not necessarily part of the document. I had been thinking that perhaps we did want to separate those out into another document, and then just include it by reference. But I'm fine with including it, if you think it is best.

I don't know that it makes all that much difference, but I guess the scariness of 11 pages versus the scariness of 19 pages may make a difference as to whether somebody even starts reading it. I don't know. So, have I covered all the things that are going to happen in terms of getting us to Friday.

JORDAN CARTER:

I think so, yeah.

AVRI DORIA:

Bernie, not really, is that it makes no difference... Not really. I haven't covered everything that needs to be covered, or 11 versus 19? Okay, thank you. So, basically, from that, I think we might have just to leave it there, and just discuss in the letter that that is additional commentary that has not been included in the document, but that was written as part of the work in the group or something like that.

We do need avoid too long, don't read. I find that things that go longer than a page or two don't read for many. But anyway, and thank you George for putting all of your comments in the Google Doc within 24 hours.

Anything else we need to cover today? So, we ended up not doing it all. I just wanted to point out one other thing. That while this document is

supposed to point to the general solution space, it's in the next document that's kind of waiting on this one, that we actually expand the recommendations into, we need a document for this, we need that.

So the specificity of the solutions is actually in the document, but we can't really write the B document until we know what the recommendations are. The first part of the B document is written in terms of trying to capture the content from the materials that we received.

And so that's in there. I may have missed some relevant stuff. So, if somebody else, someday, who has read all of those staff documents, wants to go through what's in there, just to make sure that I have included what needed to be included.

So, that's part of B is, what documents exist now, and what's in them. And then, there is a part of B that is what new stuff do we need to meet the recommendations we're going at. And that, I really don't believe we can do until such time as we know what we're going to recommend. And I didn't want to take a shot at writing that recommendation while we were still figuring it out in this document.

So, anything else? In which case, and any other business? And I see none. In which case, I thank you all for being here. Please look at the documents, and let's end nine minutes early. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]