

---

PRAGUE – Cross-Community Working Groups

Monday, June 25, 2012 – 14:00 to 15:00

ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Julie Hedlund:

Hello everyone. This is the session on cross-community working groups and their principles, and we're just getting the Adobe Room set up and waiting to get the teleconference set up. So if you'll bear with us for another moment or two, then we'll get started. Thank you. Please bear with us everyone. We're trying to get the teleconference facilities up for this. If that doesn't work shortly I think we're going to go ahead and proceed without it.

So welcome everyone, this is the cross-community working group session. Hold on for a second, just needed to hit record in the Adobe Connect Room, and we unfortunately don't have the teleconference facilities up right now, but I will be taking notes in the chat room for those who might also be in the chat room. My name is Julie Hedlund and I would just like to quickly introduce our panelist and our presenter.

We have Jonathan Robinson who will be presenting the slides today and we have Alan Greenberg and we have Chuck Gomes, and we also have John Berard here too, maybe we can engage John. He's like "no." And we also have Cheryl Langdon-Orr and maybe she'd like to be engaged as well. Thank you everyone and I'm going to go ahead and turn things over to Jonathan.

---

*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.*

Jonathan Robinson:

Thanks Julie. I'm going to be presenting the slides. These slides and this work comes out of some work undertaken by the GNSO late really last year and then a little into this year. So let's go into this, and the way we'll work through this is give you some of the background, let you know where we've got to, review the principles that came out of the work and in many ways, most importantly consider the kinds of issues and question that are live and where this work goes.

The context in some ways as was is that there has been increased use of cross-community working groups within the ICANN, broader ICANN community and these we're defined as being those that are chartered by more than one supporting organization of advisory committee. And this increased use has created a perceived increased importance of the community working groups, and certainly from the GNSOs perspective, and quite possibly from a broader community perspective, raised questions about whether some form of special rules of guidelines are needed as to how we conduct these activities in future.

GNSO Council based on some actual practical examples as well as just the general context that I've just outlined decided to establish a drafting to look into this and form a preliminary perspective and an agreed perspective on the GNSOs view of cross-community working groups. And one of the things that struck me, I guess in some ways since we did this work, and when we initiated this work we were in some ways looking back and saying "well these have begun to be used, they're being used perhaps more often, we're certainly aware of some challenges that have come about."

---

And what strikes me going forward and there are a number of reasons, but with the new gTLD program and entities that are going to be potentially involved and/or interested in potentially more than one supporting organization or advisory committee, in many ways this is perhaps a bigger and bigger issue for the future. So in thinking about this I think we should be thinking about the impact and the issues looking forward as much as what drove us looking back to initiate this.

So, we included representatives from all the GNSO stakeholder groups, most of the constituencies and had representation from the ALAC, which was a helpful basis on which to get the whole thing going. And together we worked on developing a framework under which we thought jointly chartered CWGs might function effectively and I guess produce, as we say, produce meaningful and timely reports and recommendations.

Through that we developed a GNSO agreed perspective, and we very much saw this as – and it did create a few waves, people asked why was the GNSO doing this on its own, what’s the GNSO doing this when this is a cross community issue by definition. But the GNSO felt strongly that it needed to have some kind of departure point for engaging with, working with the broader community to try and develop a community wide agreement on the role and function and working of CWGs in the future.

So where did we get to? Well having developed the work at the tail end of 2011, there were a couple of practical issues that stopped us approving the principles earlier in the year but we did approve them in March. And then we sent those out to other supporting organizations

---

and advisory committees for consideration, comment and essentially with the objective of seeding what might be the next phase of the work. And I think that's in many ways where we are now is trying to take this forward.

The GNSO has right now, just prior to this meeting, met with the ccNSO and got some very interesting and comprehensive feedback. And I think it will, it's interesting because it immediately highlights that the work that the GNSO did is unlikely to be adopted by the broader community as a whole; it's certainly going to be influenced by input from other SOs and ACs, which for me is great. Because that means we haven't put people off from commenting, we haven't put others off from providing sensible and effective input.

So we waited for the ccNSO feedback, written feedback – I'm not sure who else has formally fed back to us if anyone. I'm getting a sense from Julie that no one else has. But it certainly sets the seed for the future in how we might go. And interestingly, one of the key points that the ccNSO suggested, apart from all of their detailed feedback on what we've done is, as a way forward, is that a cross community working group to deal with these issues might be the way forward. Now there's clearly a circular breakdown in logic there in some ways because how on earth can you run a cross community working group when you don't know how a cross community working groups is supposed to work in the sense that that's what – so there is a circular illogicality about it.

But I think that shouldn't stop us forming a perhaps some form of discussion group or group that goes forward that is inclusive and seeks to produce the desired output for how cross community working groups

might function in future. So in terms of the scope and possible purposes on of the key issues that came up is how does the work of a CWG relate to the GNSOs policy development process. And then we went through, some of the key elements we tried to establish were the formation, operation and possible outcomes from CWGs.

We have covered these in the full detail in the slides but I just wonder how constructive it is to go through these, or whether we should open the discussion up. Because of the fact that these purposes, the conclusions that we came to are really for the guidance of the GNSO. I'm concerned about really opening up the discussion to these when that's really the future work. So in some ways I wonder if we shouldn't discuss the future of CWGs and how they might evolve within ICANN rather than going through the detail of the work the GNSO did.

Certainly the PDP point is important because the GNSO does have specific ways in which PDP work is carried out and somehow CWGs need to be used in such a way that doesn't undermine the existing core processes of how the GNSO functions, but actually contributes and enriches that. Maybe I should pause for a moment here and give comment on where we got to and where we might go and think really about that rather than the detail of what the GNSO actually concluded because I think we'll be able to chew that over in future work.

Let me pause and see if any of the other panelist people around the table, anyone has any comment on that. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. I think there's too much effort and focus on trying to come up with detailed rules and rigid rules for these kinds of things. The issue of do we need rules for how this cross constituency working group to settle the rules works under I think is a silly argument. We have had cross constituency working groups working in ICANN for a number of years now, they all manage to function moderately well without detailed sets of rules, most of them have been effective, they all typically operated under different set of rules that were developed in a rather ad hoc manner and that didn't stop their effectiveness. I think the inward looking and desire for rigid rules at the outset is misdirected energy.

We inevitably, depending on which groups are participating in the CWG, we're likely to use somewhat different rules and methodology. The subject matter I think is going to govern to some extent how it works. And I think we're focusing too much on the rules then we really need to to be effective. I know in the GNSO side this was done to, at least partly because of reaction to some issues that came up during the JAS Working Group. I don't think we should set a whole...

Well, I read something many years ago, this was a book on what was supposed to be humor but wasn't, and they said in a corporation a policy is something that is set based on a one time occurrence which is not mentioned in the policy. And I somehow think this procedure we're in is that kind of thing. We are reacting to the perceived sins within the JAS process and it's not clear we really need to have a lot of rigidity to make this work. At least certainly not until we have a lot more experience. So that's my personal view. I certainly don't worry about

---

the rules that the working groups is going to use that looks at rules, because we've done it before, we'll manage to do it again.

I just think we're spending too much time on introspection. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson:

Let's just check, we've got Cheryl and then Chuck.

Chuck Gomes:

You just want to follow me so you can correct me. This is Chuck Gomes. I'm going to agree and disagree with Alan. I certainly agree that we don't need rigidity, but I really believe that some common processes for doing these things will facilitate things and we don't have to go back and discuss them every time we start a community working group. And I think he's right that we will have more of these in the future.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record and chuck, I'm glad I let you go first because you do know I like to follow you. I've been following you through many meetings in many fora for many years. But in this case I like to follow you particularly because I want to build on what you've said. For my sins, and they are many, I have been involved in, I believe other than the JIG, every single cross community work group that this organization has ever done. So I guess I kind of know how they do and don't work, and they do all work slightly differently.

I think what we need to do in the moving forward part, and I agree with you Jonathan, that's where we've got to get to now, so let's not dwell on the sins of the past, let's look to the sanctity of the future. We can

cherry pick about what's been really good and we can make sure we avoid building the big massive traps that we have learned from in the past. If I go back over my albeit relatively short because we haven't been doing formalized cross community work groups that impinge on policy until recent times, and there is that specific definition. We need to keep in our mind the fact that there will be cross community work groups which are not impinging on policy but doing something else, all very worthy and all very important and essential for a multi-stakeholder model.

What I would like to see bludgeoned out of this process is a system whereby it doesn't matter which of these types of activities we're involved in; there is a predictability, there is understanding and there is a mechanism by which if something goes off the rails we can get it back on the rails. That's kind of the role of rules. Now confession time because I like to disclose, what can I say, I'm very transparent, occasionally accountable, but certainly very transparent.

I'm known as the Queen of Process in the ALAC world. It is a bestowed upon me title. Because if there is a rule ever written I probably know it, can quote it and will make sure you will adhere to it. So I'm not an anti-rule person, don't get me wrong. But there also, whilst they're not meant to be broken they are meant to be relevant and they therefore need to be reviewed. So whatever we come up with needs to be best fit for now, recognizing that if we have hundreds more voices needing to be heard we might need to look at a different model, because we don't know what's going to be like three years after go live on new gTLDs.



---

We don't know what's going to shake out in our near future. And that's always a very nerve-wracking time. I do agree with Alan in as much as the rigidity is not something I'm overly concerned about along this first pass line. I'd like to remind everyone who's ever worked with me on a cross community working group that even in the, not even the ultimate, the very much second or third draft of the GNSO work group guidelines, because I contributed to that drafting team – Chuck you remember, back in pre-DSSA what was Cheryl saying – take the GNSO established, not yet blessed but well dealt with and developed community guidelines and let's take from those everything that works for us.

And I think this is what you need. You need a bookshelf, a toolkit. And occasionally we're going to use the whole darned bookshelf and have a whole library event and that's fine. But often we only need the fiction section or the romance novels or whatever, but they've got to be the same set; they've got to be component parts. Because what fails, and what I'm constantly challenged with as I sit between the GNSO world and the ccNSO world is the very different approach, still with rules based to policy development, more particularly in the binding and non-binding nature of things, and as a cross community in ICANN we're going to have to bite that bullet in the not too distant future.

So I think this work of where we go to next is worthy, it's important. I think we can probably use most of the basic rules in GNSO work group world to run the cross community work group, but we're not going to have it co-chartered. It won't be a chartered work group. We would be well-advised to suggest the Board asks for it, takes the problem away. Just like they asked for and outlined who was going to be involved in the

---

ccTLD IDN Fast Track, which was the very first policy influencing cross community work group.

And there was parts of that that was really ugly at the beginning. There was too much stumbling around trying to get to work out how we operate as GAC and ALAC and GNSO and ccNSO, so getting the rules right's important. But we've had resolutions come down from the Board that says "thou shalt," and that then passes the buck slightly to perhaps where it deserves to be. Worthwhile thinking about, I'm a fan, I'm keen and I will do anything I can to encourage the process to be a successful outcome.

Jonathan Robinson:

Just Alan, I know you want to speak, but that's certainly a thought and perhaps a provocative thought Cheryl in terms of the prospect of, if I heard you correctly, these groups in a sense only being chartered or if and when directed and requested from the Board. So I'll leave that with you, but Alan I'm not sure if that was what you were picking up on or something else of what Cheryl said.

Alan Greenberg:

Just a very chart comment that I don't disagree with much of anything that both Chuck and Cheryl said. I wasn't advocating no rules, I was just saying let's not worry about coming up with a definitive set of rules now. Things are going to vary and some of the things we're going to have to figure out as we go along. And for any given working group some rules may be, some specific rules that have been talked about may be the worst thing we could do, other ones they may be

---

appropriate. I think we're going to need some flexibility and I don't think we need to agonize over building a rule book in detail right now.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. Chuck Gomes again. Cheryl, I just want to follow up in the statement you made about chartering or co-chartering, make sure I understand it correctly first of all because my own inclination is that for any group it's helpful to have a charter even if it's very simple so they know what's expected, what would be the desirable results and so forth.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Chuck it's really simple. I'm only referring to a lack of necessity for a chartering organization, one or more COs in the work group that looks at the rules for the work group. That one probably we can define out of this work what the role and job is. When we went through and agonized over exactly how we were going to write the guidelines for the GNSO working groups we very, very carefully made sure we talked about chartering organizations, plural.

They were designed to be applicable in the main of cross ICANN communities wide. So the instrument the GNSO has already got is more than a skeleton; I mean it's most of the body. We've got model to follow, such as the DSSA where you had a small drafting team with

---

representation from GNSO, ccNSO, SSAC, GAC, ASO if memory serves; admittedly it was you, me and Chris, the three C's were the driving force there. Oh dear, is this being recorded? Heavens, now it's out in public.

But C to the power of three basically made sure that we agreed on a reasonable charter that was as open as it needed to be and as defined as it had to be to get the work done. And then each of the organizations passed it after doing their dotting of I's, crossing of T's and suggesting we spelt dog wrong, and it's now genuinely valid and very stabled co-chartered system running, I will hasten to add, on the GNSO work group rules. That's what I mean.

Chuck Gomes:

So this is Chuck again, and it's unfortunate the ccNSO couldn't join us in this but I certainly understand why. But Cheryl you probably know this, do they, or Julie may as well, or anyone else in the room for that matter, do they have; they have their own PDP process, right? And I think you said that they're quite a bit dissimilar than what we are. So I'm real curious, obviously I don't think we should impose GNSO methods on ccNSO people, but if we could come to some sort of, and this wouldn't be our task today, but if we could come to some sort of reconciliation so that we do accommodate the different ways of working, I think that's healthy. Now if we can't we'll deal with that, we don't have to be stuck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Chuck, Cheryl here for the transcript record. You can take a deep breath and relax, it's okay. Yes they are vastly different, but the way the good rules are written, for example the guidelines for work groups,

which just happens to have a GNSO label on the front but could have any label on the front, are absolutely okay to be picked up and utilized should the ccNSO – because remember what they’ve really got is a single constituency in your thinking, right? You’ve got the members list, the ccTLD operators who choose to join and are accepted, checked by IANA, have no objections and then become members of the ccNSO. Gather into work groups, which are involved in policy development, but it’s also not necessarily binding at the end.

But it doesn’t mean that you can’t use those rules, they’re not mutually exclusive. I’m not that worried about that. What would be nice is as that organization grows and changes and is challenged by a whole lot of new things like IDN ccTLD operators, how does that fit in; we’ve discussed it over lunch. They might find having this backup set of rules even better. I don’t see it as a problem and I think there’s enough nexus points there where we can relax, it’s okay.

Jonathan Robinson:

It’s Jonathan speaking. I happen to have been just almost coincidentally as I said earlier with the GNSO/ccNSO joint meeting over lunch prior to this one at which this topic came up and for which we will get some written notes and their formal feedback. But certainly my understanding is, and I’m sure you’ll correct me if I’m wrong, but the GNSO working groups are typically focused on policy and therefore binding policy, is that not necessarily the case? Okay, so just there’s that issue, but second the ccNSO working groups, what they indicated to us was the focus of the working groups are quite broad. They’re not

---

necessarily about policy; it might be administrative, it might be – there's all sort of issues.

And therefore the outcome of a ccNSO working group and the impact of that outcome is potentially quite different to a GNSO working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I'll give it to Alan in a minute. Cheryl for the transcript record. I will undertake, Action Item on me, to get from Bart the chart, the chart of all our working groups. Because I sit on the ccNSO Council, but whilst I'm not a voting member I need to be careful what I say on behalf of them, okay. So there is a very good chart which will help you see that we have what looks like work groups to the outside world, but there are many drafting teams, there are many standing committees, there are several study groups.

Now all of those bubble up different stuff, but there is still a policy development process for PDP equivalent in the ccTLD world, we just don't use it that often.

Alan Greenberg:

Several things. First of all the GNSO is no different than what Cheryl just described. I cannot count how many working groups and design groups and design teams we've had over the last couple of years, yet we charter very few PDPs and we pass very little consensus policy on a global scale. Maybe one per year, maybe it's increasing a bit right now. The working group rules we're talking about were developed by a working group or a design team or a something.

---

In the last couple of years we've redone everything in the GNSO because of the reorganization and all of that's been done in groups of some sort or another. So the concept that the GNSO, all GNSO working groups are developing formal policy is incorrect, that's false. Yes, any formal policy that is to be treated as a consensus policy under the Bylaws must be done under the certain set of rules for PDPs, but that doesn't mean it's the only thing the GNSO does.

And we've talked a lot here about the working group rules, I think of all the possible contentious things that's the least of them. The working group rules are likely to be moderately acceptable to everyone perhaps with some minor variation. The other parts of the process of how we create these groups, how we come to consensus if you look at the GNSO and the ccNSO are different but they're sort of the same breed. The ASO uses completely different methodology, absolutely different.

And that's I think what we have to be flexible about. The direction we're going in I think says we want to be able to work together on things that are important to ICANN and how do we do that. The DSSA is a good example because Cheryl's right, the charter was written by the three Chairs of the committees that were of the SOs and ACs that were involved. And then miraculously, unlike some of the other examples that have been in the press more as it were, each of those people brought the charter that the three people with a few friends had agreed to and each of them, forgive the expression, rubber stamped it.

None of them – alright, but the GNSO did not try to go through it and say “ah but we want to change the wording of one sentence here,” which is what has happened in other endeavors. And it translates to

---

thinking it out ahead of time and goodwill. And if we start with those two I think we don't have a lot of problems.

Jonathan Robinson: One quick question, the ccNSO work on policy, I mean that's clearly non-binding policy. How does the ccNSO view...

Alan Greenberg: That's not so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Some of it is binding policy. It's Cheryl for the transcript record. The most important different which was alluded to over lunch, is that the most binding policy on the operation of a ccTLD rests within sovereign territory and under governmental rules or otherwise, because not all of them belong in sovereign territory or government, that it is serving. The big departure point is the necessity, the requirement to have not just the public interest but the interest of their local internet community. And that's where work, and I'd love to think that the GNSO took a very close look at the work we're doing on the Framework of Interpretation Work Group, which is a cross community work group, between the ccNSO and the GAC – they let me in and I don't know why, pushy I guess, but I'm there as well.

And what that is doing is going through all of the terminology to do with delegation and redelegation. And one of the big chunks that we debated for endless amounts of time was the definition of things like "local internet community," "significantly interested parties" and the G



---

space should be interested in these terms. Because what's happening there is a whole lot of really good best practice rules applicable to a type of TLD.

Now once that's refreshed and out there and IANA's running on it, I don't know about you but I'd like to know all the details just in case it affected my life.

Jonathan Robinson:

So I'm wondering where we can take this from here because really, I mean we've got up on the board the question about multiple chartering organizations and that as everyone knows is one of the topics that preoccupied us. And frankly, I don't feel it's a – I think the way I'd like to view that is by putting that up on the board we recognized that that was something we spend some times on, we didn't have a uniform consensus over it by any means. We adopted some form of agreement that we would, as Alan would describe it, in order to achieve a lowest common denominator of agreement would proceed without dealing with that. And that was probably the most contentious thing.

But I wouldn't mind trying to use the last few minutes rather to flag up any other key questions or issues and also really thinking about the way forward, how we're going to move this on, and if there's anything we can do now or discuss now about moving this forward. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much Jonathan. This is Cheryl for the transcript record. And I will in advance apologize, I'm running the session at the top of the hour so I will need to leave. I've already said I'm keen and I believe that

---

At-Large community and the ALAC would be keen to be involved in the next steps, I think that's a no-brainer. You know the ccNSO is interested. We all have the email addresses and can twist the arms of ASO and other people so I'm sure we can pull this together.

But you've got to have a few driven leaders to make sure it happens properly. You need to make sure that who you get on it are not just there for decorative purposes but to do the hard yards, and there's going to be hard yards in this. But I also want just remind you while I slip on yet another colored hat, and Jonathan I promise next time we meet I'll have some real hats with me, and I just want to take you back to the ATRT.

Now the Accountability and Transparency Review Team worked very closely with representatives of NTIA. They were part of the team. They will be a part of the team for the next review team. And believe me, when we're talking about public policy development, public comment periods, public input into ICANN processes, the words "community" and "cross community" were frequently used. So it's not going to be a problem we're not going to have to deal with, so we might as well get ahead of the curve and get it right in advance of the next run, which will be in less than 15 months time.

Jonathan Robinson:

Wise words Cheryl, thanks. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

I guess I just want to remind people that in making rules to be used in the future, the GNSO, the ALAC, the ASO, ccNSO in the future are going

---

to be thinking, caring entities just like we are. We don't need to worry about rigidity. If we don't have a rule right now saying "you cannot have different charters," in the future if that particular ccNSO or GNSO felt that multiple charters for this group are wrong, they'll simply refuse to participate and nature will take its course and things will work out one way or another. We don't need to provide rigidity at this point. Those are going to be thinking entities who can change the rules if they choose to.

John Berard:

Spiritually I agree. This is John Berard. Spiritually I agree with Alan that thinking people can decide which course to take. I also think that those of us that might have suggested that we needed rules were also engaging in a little bit of rhetoric, right. So you ask for a lot and you get a little and you go away happy. So some framework is important. I'm hesitant though to suggest that a cross community working group is the domain solely of the Board to create. Essentially every GNSO authorized working group is cross community because anybody can participate. It's just that the result of the work becomes a decision on the part of the Council to thumbs up or thumbs down on the policy to put forward.

So I would suggest that any SO or AC could suggest a cross community working group and it would just be a question of whether the rest of the community wanted to participate or not. I do think that you were right Alan that is a solution without reference to the problem, specifically with the single charter. The single charter is a direct result of the pain and anguish that came out of the JAS Working Group. And it's perhaps

---

like an atom bomb for a housefly; no need to essentially make the hill too steep to climb so that we never even get to a point where we even have a cross community working group.

I also believe that the energy behind having them is going to be coming from external sources as much as internal. There is going to be an expectation that ICANN will be able to have its house and its affairs in order. I think a cross community working group is the essential aspect of that and I think we just showed that the sooner the better that we get on with it.

Jonathan Robinson:

Alan sounds like one sentence, thank you John.

Alan Greenberg:

It dawned on me as John was speaking that what we're really looking for here is a set of defaults. It entities in the future decide that it's not appropriate for that particular working group they can change them. We shouldn't pretend what we're doing is rigid. But we do want to give them a good set of defaults so that they don't have to reinvent everything from scratch.

Jonathan Robinson:

So I'll give anyone, Chuck did you have any closing remarks or? Alright, I think we're probably coming to the end of our time. I'm sorry we started a little later than we should have. It's pretty clear to me that we need to, we're in a position now to set a new course in motion and we seem to have got the buy-in quite proudly that this is a piece of work

that needs to be done. I think it seems to me that there's a sense of urgency about getting the work done. And what I'm hearing is that, without preempting where we get to, I'm hearing words like "framework" and "structure" within which these groups might work rather than too rigid a set of rules.

But let me not preempt where this is going to go. I think it seems to me that the next steps are pulling together a team, as Cheryl described, committed volunteers and able leadership to move this forward to the next level across the broader ICANN community. Any remarks before we wrap things up, there are a couple more minutes left. John and Chuck.

John Berard:

So what do we as a team, group, what do we do next? I mean, what's the output of this session? Where do we take what we think?

Jonathan Robinson:

My expectation is that with the help of staff we will reach out to the community and capture a set of volunteers to take this forward.

Chuck Gomes:

A suggestion, this is Chuck. I think it would be good if the, assuming that the different groups are supportive of this, whether they are or not actually, we can find out after the fact, I think the Chairs of the different SOs and ACs should consult with one and other, see which ones are supportive of working together on this. And then once you have the support of the leadership and they can get the support of their

respective organizations, we can start looking for volunteers. But I think it would be good to make sure that the leaders of the respective SOs and ACs, first of all find out whether they want to participate, I'm sure the ccNSO will, I'm sure the ALAC will, the GNSO will.

It's less clear on the other ACs, and that's okay, but we should at least offer the opportunity so that we know which of the groups are going to be participating on this and in what capacity, including the leadership capacity. It's probably a good situation for some co-leadership. But it's easiest I think to get the leadership of each group to buy-in first and they can get the buy-in from their groups and we can take off. But I agree we should get it moving because we're really way behind schedule on this.

Jonathan Robinson:

Thanks Chuck, I agree and that's a helpful suggestion. Thanks everyone. That was I think a useful session. It would have been great if we had slightly larger in person attendance, and I appreciate the work that Julie's done on keeping the chat room up to date with the lack of audio. And I look forward to picking this up in the very near future.

Julie Hedlund:

Yes this was recorded and it will also be transcribed, so that will also be made available in addition to what's in the chat room. Thank you everyone. This meeting is adjourned.

[End of Transcript]