RECORDED VOICE:	This meeting is now being recorded.
AVRI DORIA:	Hello everybody, this is Avri speaking, one of your two co-rapporteurs. I don't know if Jordan will be joining us, I hope he can, but last I talked to him, he was feeling rather poorly. I won't get into details, but if he was feeling – this morning he is in Brussels – if he's feeling this morning the way he was last night, Brussels time, I don't expect him to join. So the attending, small as it is, will be taken from the Adobe Connect listing. Is there anybody that is just on the phone that is not in the Adobe Connect? Okay, I'll ask that again. So first I'll go through the agenda review – please mute – ah, George, I see you, please mute yourself.
GEORGE SADOWSKY:	I can't. Can you hear me?
AVRI DORIA:	Oh yeah, I can hear you, and I hear myself echoing.
GEORGE SADOWSKY:	I'll go muted.
AVRI DORIA:	Thank you. Okay, to continue with the agenda review. So, after doing another attendance check, we'll ask about SLIs, then a debrief from

ICANN58, briefly on the full plenary discussions, though many of you were there, and sort of go through that. Can the agenda be made self scrollable please? Okay, now it's scrollable. So we'll go through the full plenary, the change there, then Jordan and Thomas Schneider and I had some discussions with Patrick Dodson, who is on the call in the host spot there, and talk about those a little bit, because that has a lot to do with our plan going forward, which is the next item. Then basically we're going to talk about how we'll get going with the discussions with Staff.

And all of this is new information, so I really do want to get it talked through and give people a chance to ask clarifying questions, comment, see if what we're coming up with is acceptable to you all, et cetera. And then, basically go to – this is analysis collection, the table that Jordan has started putting together, there's a table there. And also just want to mention that we still have the four pending Staff questions. Then maybe just a brief discussion on how this relates to the three currently documents that we're working on.

All things being equal, then we get to a schedule update, we have to define a deadline for the issue submission, whether that's another week or so, basically to make sure that anyone that does have an issue that they want included can get that in on time. Then we'll need to talk about finishing up our documents for plenary, a comment period, and then we have the Johannesberg meeting at the end of June. I'll mention right now that we may need to increase the frequency of meetings in April and May, in order to complete the work, but that's something we can talk about further.

And then I guess if we have any other business, if we get there, that's fine. Does anybody have any other business they want us to add to the agenda right now? Okay, I see none. Is the agenda okay with everybody? Is there anything that needs changing, or what have you? No, okay, let's go with that agenda.

Okay, the next thing is attendance. We don't have too many of our members here, only five of us, which is too bad, but this is recorded, and hopefully people will be able to catch the recording and catch up with where we are at. Is anybody on the phone that isn't in the room? I said I would ask that again. Yeah, please, thank you for having Jordan down as apologies. Okay. Anybody need to update the small to moderate of interest? Remember that we need to keep those updated, and if anybody has any updates, especially pertinent to this particular effort? Give a pause for a second. I see no hands, so I'll move on.

Okay, so the debrief from ICANN58. We had a fairly long discussion at the plenary for WS2 and please pardon me if I get slightly incoherent at times tonight, you're probably used to it, my first meeting was 18 hours ago, so I'm a little long on the day. So basically what we had really asked was an extension to our charter, not that we changed the charter, but because we saw, as within the work that was already chartered, but to be able to basically do an analysis collection, and basically that.

So that was discussed there and approved by the plenary that as part of the work we're doing, in keeping Document A sort of content, what exactly are the problems. And this came out of some issues that were brought up during our last meeting before Copenhagen and brought up especially by both Greg Shatan and George Sadowsky. So anyhow, that

stepping back during the collection of the issues and the analysis step, before we go back to the documents, is where we are at now.

Now the other thing we had talked about there was working with ICANN and that being something different than ICANN supporting the group. And we had indicated that we were very happy with the support we had been getting from Karen, but that it wasn't quite the working with ICANN that had been sort of put on the table by WS1 and that we felt we needed to do as part of our charter.

So, Jordan and Thomas Schneider and I had an extended, actually, I don't know how extended it was, but a good conversation with Patrick Dodson on how we could go about this. And basically came up with the main part solution to that, and since Patrick is on the line, after I speak on it, you know, stop and give him a chance to amplify, correct me where I sort of have not gotten it correctly, or what have you. And I'm digging up the documents now so I know what I'm talking about.

So basically, the first part is, obviously as the rapporteurs for the group, we needed to revamp our work plan and that is what you see in the agenda, what we're working through today. And that we actually started on the work of identifying the systematic functional issues that we have, so that we're really all talking from the same table of issues, and we can look at it, as opposed to just sort of speaking in general about the issues.

So that now as part of the work that it was going to do on the staff side, the MSI group – and I don't remember the translation for it at the moment, so when Patrick comes in – oh yes, there it is,

EN

Multistakeholders Strategy and Strategic Initiatives, that's the one that manages most of the work for the staff side, accountability, WS2, the HERT reviews, and all that. That basically they would take on the topic and work with us. The first thing is that Jordan and I will be having sort of one-on-one conversations with the senior staff members just on some of the issues in our documents.

So I'll be taking to Diane in HR, just to make sure that we have access to all the documents that may be useful in terms working this, and I will report back on that conversation to the group. Jordan will be talking with someone either from Human Resources or from Corporate Legal on the relationship issues and going through the work we've done, and making sure that we've got alignment on what the various responsibilities of staff, et cetera, are, vis-a-viz working with the community. He will bring that back to the group, will bring that back into the documents.

Now, the other part was trying to get a group of senior folks from the organization, from Staff, to actually participate in the group with us. People who can speak fairly authoritatively, people who can take ideas back to the rest of the senior staff, to get their take on it and possibly their buy in. As I understand the procedure on that, Theresa, who is the head of this group, will be taking this issue to the senior staff, executive team, what have you, I'm not quite sure exactly whom, and we'll talk about finding a couple volunteers there that can work with us. So that's sort of my understanding of where we are, coming out of ICANN58.

Jordan and I have talked a little bit about the restructuring and we've got some of it here. I'll stop now, give Patrick a chance to come in and

correct, add, clarify, what have you, and then also put the rest of you to ask any questions you might have.

PATRICK DODSON: Sure, thanks, Avri. This is Patrick Dodson, for the record. And I'm on the same, I think, 18-hour day that you are. So it sounded all clear to me, so congratulations. I don't have anything to correct there. That was a really good, I think, capture of our discussion and the framework for moving forward. And so I think this is a better and clearer path for us.

Part of what Theresa will be taking back to the exec team is the clarification of the nature of the engagement by staff participating in this group, more so than the traditional support role, and allowing those staff that volunteer to speak openly and freely, and also as important, if not more so, ask a lot of clarifying questions so that we understand the root of the issues or ideas that are being brought forth, so that we can provide perspective, also play that intermediary role as appropriate with exec staff and other members of the organization, to make sure that we're not running into issues that we may run into later on, public comment, implementation, that sort of thing.

So, I'll say myself, looking forward to having this dialogue and hoping that it becomes something that is productive and collegial and help the recommendations for both sides as we go forward in this group.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, thank you for that. I have a question for you, but I'm going to first ask, we had a phone call that has joined us, it's seen to be 5888, that isn't muted, and I'm wondering, though, before you mute yourself, if you could identify yourself for the attendance list? Will the phone number person please identify themselves?

PAM LITTLE: Hello, is that me? It's Pam Little, I'm sorry, I was running late, so dialing in late.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you very much, I just wanted to identify who the phone number was, thank you very much on that.

PAM LITTLE: No problem, sorry about that Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, great, oh now I see your name, great. Okay, so Patrick, I wanted to ask one question. I know that you've taken over the support role from Karen for this group, as well as some of the others. Will you also be a participant in terms of this group, or will you be mostly in that support and coordination role?

PATRICK DODSON: Great question, my intention is to play both, acting as a participant, as well as leading the team here on the support side. So being able to

jump in and out of those camps, and bring, I think, my perspective of being somewhat new to this group and this effort, but also having the experience of having supported ICANN in my previous role, working with the partner, explain the design, consulting agencies that had worked with ICANN through nearly all of, I think, the tenure, and was very actively involved in the works team effort.

So I have, I think, also some perspective on some of the dynamics and interplay that has occurred, and I'm able to bring a perspective that's not just from the staff perspective, but also hopefully from that middle ground, working with both groups fairly effectively and successfully for the last several years.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Before I move to the plan going forward, would anybody else like to add something about the brief from ICANN58, clarifying questions, what have you? Okay. Ah, yes, George, please.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks, Avri. I think Patrick said it very well. The one thought I had, which you may want to put on the agenda, or you may want to dismiss out of hand, is are you going to get the kind of frank discussion that you need, I think, maybe you don't, but I think you do, in order to address some of these issues with the specificity and with the frankness that you're going to need to proceed. In other words, are you going to really want to have open sessions? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, George. You know I would never dismiss it out of hand. I would have to think about it first. But beyond that, that is certainly the hope, and I'll talk a little bit about that in the plan going forward. But certainly the intent is to have those frank, open discussions and I think that is one of the reasons why it's a consultation with the executive team within ICANN, get the right staff members to comment, have that conversation with us. But you know, obviously time will tell.

I think it's something that certainly Jordan and Thomas and I are committed to, and I believe Patrick is, as well, and we'll see that going forward. If there are no other questions at this point, I'll start with the plan going forward. Please, though, raise hand and ask to speak at any point, I don't really want to do a full hour monologue, but I know I'll be getting close to it.

So, we talked a little bit about the discussions with staff. So Jordan and I are already working on our schedules for our first early engagement with the senior staff members responsible for HR and within Corporate, just to soft of make sure that we're in the right place, that we have the right information, et cetera, and as I say, that's information they will bring back, then there will be a coordination meeting amongst Jordan, Thomas, Patrick, and myself after that step, just to make sure that we've got a clear start. We'll report back to here. Start including a number of the staff members in the work group and actually I think the hope is that they will actually be able to devote some of their time to it, that this will be an assigned task, as opposed to something they have to go off and do as a skunk works project, which I think is quite good.

One of the specific things we talked about is a policy of non-retaliation for all participants, and ICANN is committed to that. We as co-rapporteurs and the chairs of WS2 are committed to that. We've got all our ombudsmen and proper and collegial behavior to go on, so we're basically all, those of us in the leadership and the coordination part of this, are very committed to working on that non-retaliation, to holding ICANN and to holding ourselves as community to account for that, anything in this part goes to what George was asking about. Can we have open and frank discussions.

And we think we only can in that kind of environment with a strong commitment from both the organization and the community that we indeed will see it that way, and as much as one can be committed to that, I think we are. I'll stop there for a second and see if anybody else – somebody's got an open line and it's noisy – okay, thanks. So, does anybody want to comment or add anything in that category? Okay, I see nothing in the notes that I need to read. George, yes.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yes, I think, Avri, it's going to be really important to define what the goals of those discussions are in a way that you're going to get the information or the insight or the knowledge, or some combination that you need to go forward. Because I could see if the goals are not specified right, you might do a lot of talking, but you might come out without what you feel is solid information that you can make recommendations on the basis of.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, George. Yeah, and that pretty much leads to our next issue. So talking about the issue of analysis. Did you have a further comment you wished to make, George? I see your hand was still up, so I didn't want to be ignoring you. I guess, it's a remnant, okay, yes, it was a remnant. Okay. So if there are no other questions on that, then let's go to the issue of analysis collection.

Jordan has taken the issues that we've received so far, and has started populating a table. This table is in the drive document and is open for comment and suggested text by the group. So as it says at the top, the table is to help understand the issues experienced by participants, by identifying issues, understanding things that contribute to those issues, and the impact those issues are having, we can build the evidence and information base for our work. Subsequently, one should probably declare we can work on the proposed solutions.

So, George, this is basically the approach that we've discussed taking. The columns, we have the issues, so what is the problem, the matter is going to be addressed by some change in process or culture, not individual performance. So that's the first. Then there are contributions to the issue. What factors, processes, situations, cultural matters, or other things might be causing the issue or making it hard to resolve? And then finally impact, what is the impact of the issue. Try and describe who the impact is on and what the impact is, where possible.

So then the final line is the staff accountability process is about improving the processes and culture associated with staff accountability. It is not appropriate to identify individuals or to identify

specific incidents in this tablet. The co-rapporteurs will delete any material of this sort which they observe. So basically this is the approach.

Now we have not necessarily collected all the issues, but several have come in already, so we've got those in the table. So one of the first things will be for those who presented the issues to make sure that we are describing it, the brief description here is correct.

We will then spend time talking through each one of these lines, going through all three columns, and looking at it, hoping that this is a mechanism which will absolutely force us to focus on what are the issues, what are the factors et cetera that contribute to the issue, and what impact they're having, to make sure that we've really got a clear view. At the moment, I believe we have four issues in the table, oh no, five issues in the table, but we're not going to start the detailed discussion in this meeting, but just wanted to give people a chance to sort of look at these. Yes, Patrick, please.

PATRICK DODSON: Yeah, sorry, didn't mean to interrupt, Avri, just wanted to add in response also to George's comment, which is very well taken, the framework here is also designed, and part of this was a conversation in Copenhagen, to focus on problem diagnosis before we jump into potential remedies and solutions and mechanisms. We often times are trying to solve while the problem is still being clarified, tends to muddle the discussion, and I think it leads to some of the conversations that I think you're alluding to.

So, hopefully this framework will iterate over time, as well, so that we can start to frame a good stable setting, to then look at what 'good' looks like, and then I think figure out what those mechanisms are, either existing, but need to be clarified or enhanced, or if there are new things that need to be recommended, it will be a much more productive dialogue. But this would hopefully help constrain the conversation without restricting it.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. So, just to basically look at the table a little bit more. As I said, we've got the five issues and we invite further submission of issues. I'd like to say, and we'll come back to this, but I would like to say another week for doing that, unless somebody comes back and says, "We're working on one and we'll have it in 10 days, or we'll have it in 14 days," but I would really like to have the initial set of issues and perhaps contributions and impacts, within the next week, so that we can get started on it.

But at the moment, in terms of issues, we've got the first one, no forum in which people can safely raise and work through concerns about staff accountability or performance. And remember, as I said, this document is open to editing, to adding suggested text, suggesting changes to the text. So an example of contributions to the issues, and these are still very unitary, in terms of we putting it together from the documents, mostly Jordan put it together from the documents that we've received and what we've heard.

You know, the suggestion had not been made before for such a forum. There's a fear that given staff role in relation to contracted parties, this may lead to repercussions, that is where our safety raise comes from, and then impacts, unexpressed concerns of performance, may be potentially used for feedback that has not reached the performance system.

ICANN organization may feel unresponsive to community concerns not expressed due to fears. Now this is just, as I said, not at all definitive. Just first draft at getting things down from what we've read. So I will ask people after this meeting to spend some time in this document if they're not writing their own, putting in comments, and making suggestion edits.

So, look at the other issues. Staff are seeing us crossing the line from policy implementation, policy development/decision, and there is no way to address this. One of the columns we may also add to this, what mechanisms are already existing. We don't have that column in there, but perhaps we need it. So, contribution to the issues, staff concern with ensuring the policy frameworks are implementable/consistent, could lead to problem solving that is interpreted as crossing the line. Often development process does not adequately document policy to its implementable state.

No process to reconcile policy implementation process with development process, leading to it simply it's not being resolved. Now one issue that's not found here is that this (inaudible) has put in a whole notion of implementation review teams to work with staff, but that's still relatively new, and really there's no feedback yet on how that's

working and even does everybody know that it is there. I don't want to necessarily read through the whole table, but just to make sure that the issues have been mentioned.

There are concerns that the overall culture of the ICANN staff is less focused on supporting the communities in policy development. Contribution to the issue was uncertain.   The impact validated a perception by the community of ICANN being focused on other matters. Okay, another one, there is no institutional route for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability systems.

So in this instance it has not been requested or proposed in the past and a traditional line of approach, has not sought feedback outside the organization.   Possibility of community input might be unconstructive or negative. And impacts, no formal way, and risk of lack of voice on the part of those outside the organization. And then the final one we've got is staff may not be consistently reading ICANN accountability commitments in the way they summarize and subsequently respond to recommendations or concerns expressed in public comments submitted by community members.

And indeed, that is an issue that also showed up in the ATRT2 report, and some recommendations were made, so we need to sort of check where those are, and is the problem just as described there, or larger than as described there.

Okay, Julf is saying apologies, sorry Julf, hopefully you can still here. So, this one, uncertain expectations, resource constraints, a view about

requirements, inadequate consideration of public comments, and the consultation process. So this is a first stab at it, by no means complete, I don't even necessarily say we have all of the issues on the table. So, let me stop here and see if there are comments. Are people okay with these three columns that we have here, and perhaps that other column that I was thinking of, what are the methods available of solving them, perhaps that actually belongs in contribution to the issue.

There's what is the problem, and then perhaps the methods that aren't being used, aren't adequate, aren't understood, et cetera. Does anybody want to add anything here? Does the framework look like it's a reasonable place to start? Does anybody thinks this is a really bad framework to start with and has an objection to following this is a process?

Okay, so at least amongst the few of use at the moment that are on this call, I see Cheryl has written, "Fine with the framework." Patrick wrote, "We may want to consider adding a column for participating staff comments or thoughts." Okay. A question I've asked, Patrick, is if we're working in this together, is that already starting to once again follow us up and can the staff sort of put their contributions into the issue as if they were members of the group? Would that be in keeping, or do you think it really better to sort of segregate them into their own column?

PATRICK DODSON: I think it's an open question, my initial thinking was just for more the sake of clarity, not necessarily the segregation, but often times with these issues, they tend to have two sides of a coin, and it's sometimes

hard to parse those out if you put them in the same grouping. And so I was thinking a separate column, but it could certainly work, them being incorporated in the contributions to the issue column, or the issue column, as well, and to keep it more unified, it just might be harder for people to tease out the different stakeholder points of view.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, does anyone else have a comment on that? And George says he has no comment on that.

PATRICK DODSON: I think you raise a good point, Avri, this is Patrick again. I'm completely open to looking and seeing how we might be able to use the framework and not separate out and turn it into a two party negotiation as much as a larger group collaboration so that issues and contributions and knowing that as we got more participating staff involved, they can weigh in and start to frame some of these up, and see if there are equally systemic or cultural behavioral challenges that are hindering, or perceived to be hindering the organization. Keeping it in the framework and keeping it consistent probably would keep us out of the bilateral dynamic.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. That was sort of my fear. One of the findings is with people adding comments and such, and discussion, the names can or should be identified, now not everyone always – at times they end up editing the document in an anonymous mode, and we've never had an objection to

that, but it's always better to have people identified and certainly so, comments can come anonymously, and sometimes that may be the safest thing for someone to do, but comments can also come tagged and so of course, if it has a staff person's name on it, or a community member's name, or a board member's, at the moment we have all three of the bubbles from the larger ICANN participating and so, you know, we should be able to identify, and as we talk about them more, we will also know where a particular comment came from, but it can always be tagged. And if we find that we need to put in an extra column or an extra three columns, or an extra board column and organization column, we certainly can. But thanks for sort of sticking with the simpler form, and let's see how it works.

So I get the feeling that people are okay with the framework, that they're okay with the process so far, so let me go back to the agenda. Now we can add as many rows here as we need. I'd like to ask people to suggest issues and in fact, if staff has an issue in terms of dealing with the community or with the board, but especially with the community, I invite them to submit an issues.

Perhaps one of the other things that we had put there, because it's something we have to deal with, is looking at the staff questions that were submitted before, and I have segregated them into a new document. We already had a document with staff questions and a first take at answers. What I've done is extracted the questions to a new document that is just the raw questions without the content yet. The content is not lost, it's sitting here in another file, but for now, I wanted to bring the questions up.

So the staff questions are listed, and perhaps some of those staff questions are still bound to a row for this chart. I haven't looked at them in that light, to be honest, I didn't think of them in that light until I was talking. So we'll go through those. I didn't necessarily want to go through the staff questions in this meeting, but wanted to remind people that they are there, and that they're part of this whole issue analysis part of the process, I believe. Not writing the answers, but look at those questions and see how they affect the overall issue of staff accountability and the relationship, especially with the organization and community.

Then the final part in the plan, once we've completed or at least reached a very solid point, where we're pretty much complete on the issue statement and issue analysis, then we'll go back to our documents. The requirements of our output did not change, we still have the first document that describes the relationships, the issues, and possible solutions, Document A, in other words, and this analysis will fit into that and drive some of that document.

Then we have Document B, that goes through the various processes and discusses the place within those processes where the recommended changes from A might be reasonably implemented or discuss the implementation, but that's our last step, we're not there yet, and we can talk later about how we approach those three documents. I just wanted to have them in the plan so that people didn't think that they were gone. They're still on our to-do list, but as per the suggested things and as per the plenary, they are pushed to after this part. So, I'll stop again, any other comments?

Thanks Yvette, Yvette asked if we want the four questions posed by the staff to be posted. Would anybody like to see those at this point, just to have them in mind? Okay, Cheryl says, "All good." I think everybody has access to them, and such. I don't think we need to show them at the moment. Nobody is raising their hand asking to see them. And we have talked about them before.

But one of the things I do want to do, and I ask other people in the group to do, is go back to those questions, the doc is there, and see whether you can understand them in the context of the framework for issue analysis. As I said, I didn't think to do that until this evening, and so I haven't done it yet, but I'll certainly do it myself before we meet again. Okay, I see no hands. I'll move on.

So, obviously our schedule needs a revamp. George and I have not finished it, but really wanted to talk through some of this stuff. So in terms of looking at our schedule, first, as I talked about, we need a deadline for the issues submission. I'd like to say a week from today, today is Wednesday, or no, it's Thursday, in the UTC world, even in Eastern Daylight Time, it's Thursday.

So at the end of the day next Thursday as a first call for people to get issues in. That's not to say that a new issue can't be found as we go on in the discussion. We may find that one issue, once we discuss it, becomes really multiple issues. This is one of the things that Greg is often good at helping us with. Seeing that multiple issues inside an issue, not to name you Greg, but it's something you do particularly well. And so that's not to say we won't add issues later, but that we'll get the initial set of them in by next Thursday.

Is everybody okay with a week for doing that? We have been talking and asking for those for a while. Julf says yes, Cheryl gives a green check, okay, great. So we'll put that down, so the schedule for this submission will be next Thursday, end of the day.

The next thing is if we're going to have documents for plenary readings, we should aim for May, which gives us basically the month of April and perhaps the first week of May to do the work, which would be several weeks on analysis and then a couple weeks on the documents, and it's still a tight schedule, but we've gotten extended because of our needs for the greater information, but we still want to try and see if we can have something by the Johannesberg meeting, that is our commitment to the group, a commitment that was sort of made when asking for the permission to do this step back.

So we're basically looking for a first reading in mid May and possibly a second reading in the end of May, beginning of June, and then going out for comment sometime in June, understanding that the Johannesberg meeting is the end action. Now I don't know if that sounds too aggressive to people, I don't know if it sounds too laid back to people, but I believe that we'll have to start meeting on a weekly basically in April, if we plan to hit it.

Now, the expectations for all of the Work Stream 2 groups was a meeting every week. We have been on an every two week schedule because of the need to find information, because we were working on a mode of people mostly working on documents, and just discussing things later, but especially for this discussion and analysis, I really think

we'll need to move to a weekly meeting, and I ask forbearance on doing that.

And unless I get some really big complaints on it, what I will do after this, is try and get meetings scheduled for the intervening weeks. We already have meetings scheduled every other week and so it would require us getting the slots. If I grab a slot for next week, it would be at the end of the week, it would perhaps be Friday, though I understand that is a problem for Asia, because that's a Saturday meeting, so I'm not sure if we will get one in next week.

I know that I'm away, out of town, the first days of the week, and also we'll still be asking people to be doing the submitting of analysis and work on that table. But certainly the last few weeks in April, we will have a meeting every week. And Cheryl says, "Depending on the time on the Saturday, as to how grumpy you will get." Well, that's one of the Asia Pacifics speaking. I'll put out a suggestion for Friday. As far as I could tell, the Friday – well, let's look at it now. As I look at next Friday, I see Friday the 7th, I see all three slots are current empty, so which one, I know this is the one that is the best, this 5:00 UTC, that's sort of the middle of the day for them, that's the middle of the day on Friday, still, isn't it? Or am I being totally confused?

And it's okay for Europe, the 5:00, so it's only uncomfortable for the East Coast, and I am actually not all that worried about it, because 1:00 a.m., that's just party time, that's not the middle of the night sleep, it's kind of like staying out late for a beer. So does anybody object to us grabbing that 5:00 UTC slot on Friday? I don't see anyone objecting. It's

fine with Julf, who got the 7:00 a.m. slot, I'm saying it's fine with me, Greg, you're also East, do you hate this slot?

GREG SHATAN: I don't like it, it's late, especially if there is an early tomorrow, particularly, I know that we all share the pain, sometimes we have to be the pained ones.

AVRI DORIA: And this would have us being the pained one two weeks in a room. Cheryl, you've got a frowning face. "It's Saturday afternoon, so grumpy."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, 5 a.m. in the morning, fine, 5 p.m. in the afternoon on my Saturday, fine, but you know, shit happens, I'll comply.

AVRI DORIA: So you would have preferred Thursday late, but those slots are taken already. Thursday 13 and 19 are already taken. So thank you for...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're welcome.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, so, Patrick or Yvette, can you sign us up for the Saturday 5 UTC that is empty in the schedule? And so the following week we're already

scheduled for 19 UTC on Thursday, and that falls in the middle of Good Friday, I don't know who that will affect. And then I'll need to find a slot for the following week, and then we're already scheduled for the 27th, so the only one that's missing is the week of the 18th through the 21st. We probably won't do that now, because we only have 6 minutes left, but I'll certainly talk to all of you about it.

Okay. So, is there anything else? So we've talked about a general schedule, I'll talk to Jordan about trying to tighten up the schedule. Oh, I see the meeting is already in for the 7th, thank you very much. I haven't got anything else. Does anybody have anything else? No? In which case, I thank you all and I'm really hoping that this will get us going and allow us to complete our work, because I'd really like to be done with this particular task, and I hate the fact that we keep slipping later, I understand why, I've explained why, but I'd really like us to be able to complete it. So, thank you all very much for being here, for asking the questions, for agreeing to extra meetings. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]