

Dave Archbold:

Good morning, everyone. My name is Dave Archbold and I'm Chairman of the Regions Working Group, and we're here this morning to run through briefly where the Working Group is at the moment and the input that we would like from the community on some of the ideas that we are putting forward for consideration in our final report.

To start with I'll go through a very brief history of how we got to where we are today. We started off with the ccNSO sending a report expressing concerns about the makeup of the ICANN geographic regions to the ICANN Board. The Board then set up a Cross-Constituency Working Group, and in its initial report the Working Group looked at all the ways that geographic regions were used within the ICANN organization. The interim report then looked at what we were trying to achieve when using geographic regions and to what extent we were actually achieving those goals. And that's a brief summary of the last five years.

So we'll now move on to where we are now, which is in the course of preparing the final report which will include recommendations for improvements if any; and it is to help us prepare that report that we are holding this workshop today. So the thoughts that we have so far: I think there is complete agreement that there is no single, independent authoritative list of countries and regions that ICANN can just adopt. They initially used the UN Statistics listings but in fact, in order to make it work with the ICANN organization there were significant changes made to that to the extent that some, well



nearly 30% of countries were in different ICANN regions from those that were allocated by the UN Statistics Office.

The present regional structure has got a number of problems, and in fact has never been fully, properly authorized by the ICANN Board. The original intent was that the structure should change to reflect the changing makeup of the internet community. It hasn't but I think a question that is quite valid now is "Does that matter?" and we can talk about that more.

Geographic regions have worked reasonably well for their original purpose, which was to ensure the geographic diversity of the ICANN Board; and perhaps not so well when adopted by some of the SOs and ACs. And another point that has been made quite forcibly during our deliberations, were we to consider changing the total number of ICANN regions there would be some very significant financial and organizational issues.

I'd now like to bring up an example of the type of organization, regional organization that we have been talking about, but I would emphasize that this is just something we are putting up in order to gain comment from you. In fact I've said that these were personal preferences though we have discussed them in the (inaudible). So first of all, Rob?

Rob Hoggarth:

Thanks, Dave. Rob Hoggarth, ICANN staff. If I can interject, in terms of an overall context the Working Group could make no recommendations or they could become very specific in their



recommendations. Right now nothing's been decided. What you're throwing out is within an issues matrix that the Working Group has created, this is one potential route or avenue that could be pursued. Is that fair?

Dave Archbold:

That's a fair comment, Rob, and perhaps that decisions matrix is in fact available on the website. Have you got a reference for that, Rob?

Rob Hoggarth:

Yes sir, and in fact after your presentation I was going to post the matrix in the Adobe Connect room so folks can see it. There is a link to it and people can download the matrix coming directly from the session page on the GNSO Wiki, it's on the Working Group Wiki, and it's in the ICANN San Francisco meeting session webpage that's been assigned to this session.

Dave Archbold:

Thanks, Rob. Alright, let's go back to these things that we have put together as possibilities. First of all, there's a feeling that there is a genuine need for a formal, top-down regional structure for use with ICANN Board membership. I got confused with my buttons just now – I tried to change my slide by pushing my microphone button. It didn't work.

One possibility would be to adopt the present structure of the Regional Internet Registries – that's the RIRs – and there are good grounds for doing so from sort of a logical point of view. ICANN is a technical organization and the RIR infrastructure is a technical infrastructure. So it makes some sense to do so, and we'll look at



the consequences of doing that in a moment. However, there is a need for flexibility and we recognize that, and a proposal would be that within certain constraints which have not yet been defined, countries should be allowed to self-select providing their government agrees.

Having got this formal top-down structure, which is pretty much what we've got at the moment, SOs and ACs may be able to use that structure if they wish or perhaps be able to adopt some alternative method for ensuring geographic and cultural diversity subject to Board oversight.

And then quite separately, we have the possibility of introducing bottom-up special interest groups, which could be temporary or long-term, but groups of countries with shared interests. Some examples are small island states, Arab nations, Caribbean countries. Now, these are all sort of state-related, but equally special interest groups could be idea-related; a special interest group for people particularly interested in IDNs for example, where you could have cross-constituency and gross-geographic countries coming together to promote a common interest.

Now, just to go a little bit further with the RIR structure, it does have some potential, let us say that, in that we have had strong representation that there should be no changes to the makeup of the African region; and indeed, if we follow the RIR example there would be no changes. There are 54 countries currently in the African region and those same 54 countries would still be there.



Asia-Pacific, which is perhaps the widest-spread geographic region, would reduce from 73 countries down to 58. There would be in fact 11 gains and 26 losses, and it might be interesting just to have a quick look at some of those gains. And you can see that the gains tend to be the territories, and that's an example of where the national governments may wish to influence whether or not that change is made. I'm looking particularly at some of the French overseas territories where their political relationship with the mother country is somewhat different to that between the UK and the UK overseas territories.

So those would be the gains; the losses are perhaps more interesting. Where a number of countries such as Armenia, Azerbaijan who already feel that they are more European-related than Asia-Pacific related would move into the European region. What is perhaps not quite as clear is that there are a number of Middle East countries that would also move into the European region and I think we'd be particularly interested in feedback from some of those countries, whether they felt that that was appropriate or not.

Moving on to Europe, the losses there would be largely the overseas dependent territories, and what I'm showing on the screen here, obviously the annotation in brackets is where the losses would move to. And you can see, many would move into the North American Region if we followed this structure, which leads me on to the North American Region. We can go into any of these



but there's a limit of how much we can do. Just looking at the North American Region there would be significant gains there in numbers primarily from the English-speaking Caribbean.

So just finally, looking at those numbers, the North American, currently eight, would go up to 27 which was perhaps no bad thing. Latin America would drop slightly and Asia-Pacific would drop quite a lot. Africa would stay the same. But I emphasize again this is just one possibility. It is to put something on the table to allow people to make comments and come up with their own ideas. And at that point I think I will end and ask if there are any questions or comments.

Edmon Chung:

This is Edmon. I should have followed this a little bit earlier but I didn't, but I wonder if Rob you were going to say something first but I wanted to get a better sense of whether when this was discussed, whether any type of fuzziness is, a fuzzy way of defining regions has ever been discussed. I see that you mention that one of the ideas is maybe SOs and ACs could have some changes, but can't we look at these borderlines which should be fuzzy lines rather than strict lines by whichever candidate that put forward in saying that if they're in the fuzzy border they would put forward and say "This is the region that I sort of stand for" kind of thing?

Dave Archbold:

I think we've got to look at the particular use that the region structure is being used for. I think where we have probably moved to is that the formal structure at the moment is needed primarily,



almost exclusively for the ICANN border; in other words, the original purpose. And that is already a little bit fuzzy because NomCom for example has some discretion about how it adjusts things to meet the overall diversity requirements.

Beyond that I mean we already have, if you look at the SOs and ACs, GNSO already has moved away from strict adherence to the structures and has said they will use best endeavors to ensure geographical diversity, and I think that's more or less all it says within the bylaws for the GNSO. GAC of course doesn't have one; ALAC, strictly followed; ccNSO at the moment, strictly followed. While I say "strictly followed" there is the ability for some countries, particularly the overseas territories, to self-select if they wish and move from one to another, so there is some flexibility there.

So I'm not sure if I'm answering your questions entirely. My own personal view is that over time we will move progressively away from perhaps a formal structure and more into the special interest group-type scenario. But I don't think we're there yet by any stretch of the imagination.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. We (inaudible) and suggest so darn polite. Thank you, Keith. Just on that point, regardless of how the decision gets made around these edges – and self-selection is a very good model which I'm happy to work with in fuzzy borders on – it has to be across the board. So you can't select and then switch. There's got to be a hard line on you've chosen this



representational space because... I think it'll get very messy if you could do one region for one purpose within ICANN and then another in another, but the special interest groups model is the opposite I guess concept to that. So that's just my particular view.

Dave Archbold:

Keith?

Keith Davidson:

Hi Dave, and sorry I wasn't here right from the start, but I think just a few points. It seems to me by coming up with one model it'll just throw up a series of different or just another set of problems in a different sort of way, which is fine in itself; but yeah, the sort of oddity that I just spotted most of all was how you would possibly claim that Antarctica would be attached to North America. It makes absolutely no geographic sense whatever.

But yeah, notwithstanding that there's two questions that I do have. One is regarding the regional organizations like AP TLD and Centre and obviously we would be fighting over the Middle East which is not unusual in historic terms, but again, whether or not anything that ICANN does would affect the way that the regions would have to structure, or whether they would be free to maintain their own existing boundaries.

And then the third thing is probably more important to me than anything else, and that is that it really doesn't matter what the structure is. Gaining some sort of equity with numbers of ccTLDs is probably quite a good objective, but the end game is the governance structure of the ccNSO and its ability to appoint people





to the ICANN Board, and that being an appropriate and representative model. So I'm just wondering if you're thinking ahead to those issues as well.

Dave Archbold:

Right, I will go back. You made three points if I can remember them all. The first one, I mean we have done nothing about allocation of countries at all. What I showed you there was if we went to the Regional Internet Registry model, that's the way they've got it. So I disclaim any responsibility for that; it was just if we went to that model, that would be the result. So that's that one.

The middle one was- Yeah, I mean I think some of the regional organizations predated ICANN anyway, did they not? Certainly as far as the ccNSO is concerned; I'm not sure about some of the other groupings. My own view is that it wouldn't affect those at all. I mean Centre already, taking Centre as an example has members from way outside the ICANN European Region. I mean Canada for example, I believe, is a member of Centre. Yeah, fine. So you know, they're not paying any attention to ICANN regions at that state.

Keith Davidson:

Except that generally the regional organizations have a clear boundary of where you can belong as a full member, and then there's an associate membership offered to anyone who wants to. So we, for example, in New Zealand, firmly belong to AP TLD and associate ourselves with the Asia-Pacific Region. However, because our common law heritage is dependent on European law,



we find a lot of the legal and regulatory issues discussed in Centre make a great deal of sense for us to engage in so we do so for that purpose.

So there's those sorts of issues, but there seems to be more an alignment... Or if I can put the background of the regional TLD organizations, they were created to provide a voice for ccTLD operators outside of ICANN, pre-ICANN, in Centre's and AP-TLD's case, but to provide an independent, non-aligned organization to discuss issues of commonality across the regions. That has watered down as the ccNSO has developed and gained members, so the fear could be by changing the model that you may end up forcing the regional organizations to redefine their boundaries, which may or may not be appropriate. But it's a discussion that probably needs to be have.

Dave Archbold:

I mean all I can give is a personal view rather than a group view because we haven't discussed that within the Working Group at this stage. I think it would be presumptuous to tell the regional organizations what they should do, and I wouldn't think that is the Working Group's intent at all. Once the Board decides whether or not it wishes to pick up any of the recommendations that the Working Group makes it would then be up to the regional organizations themselves to decide if they wish to make any changes or not.

Keith Davidson:

Okay, and then the third question was the representation model for governance purposes within the ccNSO.



Dave Archbold: Again, the answer is somewhat similar. I don't know whether the Working Group would feel comfortable about making recommendations about specific SOs and ACs. I would suggest probably not. That it would look to make recommendations for the ICANN-wide scenario, perhaps make some polite comment but no more than that; and it would then be up the SOs and ACs to adopt what they wish to do from there on.

I'd like a comment from the other members of the Working Group on that, by the way.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob from ICANN staff. I guess the one point where there would have to be some connection would be, and I think this was a point, Cheryl, you made during another session – a selection. You know, if you went to a self-selection model or came up with something like that, the selection would have to extend across the ICANN community. So if a country were to make a selection based on their ccNSO activities it would then have to... And so there would have to be a clearinghouse or some database that would allow folks to confirm that.

Dave Archbold: I agree, and that would... I mean if accepted by the Board, this idea of (inaudible) then that would have to change the ccNSO procedures, which as a self-select thing, well, that would be superseded by an ICANN-wide one. So obviously there are going to be some changes.



Edmon Chung:

This is Edmon speaking. I'm curious, I definitely haven't thought through this, but why does it have to be... Well, what I'm hearing is that once the selection is made the border hardens. What I wonder is if throughout the governance structure we can still have – that's why I call it a fuzzy border. Can't we take a look at it? I mean in terms of the Councils or Committees or the Board that it be by candidate; when they stand as a candidate they would declare which particular region they represent in their candidacy if they happen to be on the fuzzy line.

I don't understand why we can't go about that. It is a stable state but it is a funny line that we're talking about. That's sort of what I'm bringing up. I guess I haven't thought through what the problem is with that. Let's say, I don't know, take Jordan for example. A candidate coming from Jordan, going to the Board, identifying themselves as coming from the Asia-Pacific Region. And the next year, a similar guy from Jordan says he's coming from the European area. Is that a problem and what problem would it be is perhaps what I'm trying to-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl for the record, Cheryl-Langdon Orr. Let me put the question back – the same guy from Jordan continually flips between the two to keep position on the Board, or in whatever role. Even if you've got term limits, you can only do two terms representing this particular organization. By allowing a shift well, "I'll spend two years representing this region, then I'm going to spend two years representing that region, and then I'm going to spend..." You know, it's that risk.



Dave Archbold: I think that's already covered in ICANN bylaws cause it applies to the person, not to the representative role. True, true.

Keith Davidson: That does raise the interesting point in my mind and we're probably dragging you away, off topic here, Dave, but the reason for the strict structure to get the ccNSO rolling was this idea that we'd have four ccTLDs from each region with the Rock of Gibraltar being the last ccTLD that joined that enabled the formation of the ccNSO. Having achieved that and having achieved a ccNSO Council that's truly geographically diverse there's perhaps less need, unless there's something that would need to be talked through in the ccNSO sense, but there's less need for these strict boundaries as a representative model.

And perhaps as that structure has matured they would assert their own geographic spread of representatives as a natural selection process for their representatives.

Dave Archbold: Okay, (inaudible), you're obviously honing in on the ccNSO and I understand that. We've got to look right across the board – point one. Secondly, I think there are a number of options that the ccNSO could if it wished consider, like moving away from its present if you like siloed constituencies and go to a model much more like the ICANN Board where the electorate is the world if you like, and then it is balanced by NomCom appointments. That's one possibility. And then your regions become even less important at that level, yeah.



Edmon Chung: This is Edmon speaking again. I guess just in response to Cheryl's question I asked, and just adding on to Keith's as well, two things: one is theoretically you can already do that because of the passport and address kind of thing; but in the issue of a single person trying to switch sides, if you will, we can have something on top of which to ensure that once an entity selects then that entity should be hardened. But the border, what I'm saying is the border can still somewhat be fuzzy.

Rob Hoggarth: It might be helpful, and I know that – this is Rob. You had on a previous presentation talked a little bit about special interest groups and so I wanted to make sure you had that as an issue that you touched on in the next thirty minutes.

The other piece, and I think it might help some to understand what the Working Group has done to date, to talk just very briefly about some of the research you all did, because what's important to appreciate is in the Working Group's efforts, they looked at what are the real purposes of geographic diversity. And then we talk about representation, we talk about participation, we talk about operational-type activities, and that's been a real challenge I think for the Working Group, yeah, to figure out what's important in what context, how does it all work?

Dave Archbold: I think what I would like to talk to, actually, is pick up in the time we've got left this idea of special interest groups. So if we can move away from the formal regions which is one side, and move



more towards special interest groups... An open question of on the face of it, special interest groups seem like “a good idea,” but I’ve then got questions. What does this special interest group have to have before it gets recognized by ICANN? Could Cheryl and I decide that we have a special interest group in I don’t know, promoting Australia, and just the two of us? Well, and Keith, then, (inaudible) promote Australia.

[background conversation]

Dave Archbold:

Yeah, what I’m getting at is should there be a minimum number of people interested in a special interest group before it gets recorded as a special interest group? And then the second question if we want to is “Okay, fine – we’ve got the ten or the five or however many, it is now an officially recognized group, but what does that mean?” What does “recognized by ICANN” mean? We know what the group wants to do – it wants to promote and enhance or gain more members to increase participation, but what does it mean from the ICANN point of view?

Olga Cavalli:

If I may, this is Olga for the record, maybe Rob can correct me or say that I’m wrong - the concept exists already. It’s the constituency concept if I am not mistaken, which is a group of people that has gathered by a particular interest. Say in GNSO we have a constituency concept, which is challenging for the geo concept because then you have some constituencies with very few representatives; like registries/registrars, we’re just changing



slowly. In Latin America you have only six registrars, for example, and almost no registries, only ccTLDs.

So in my understanding the concept of having a common interest does exist, and it's conceptualized in the constituency. Say for example now there is a new constituency for not-for-profit or something like that, organizations, and you want for consumer interest. So isn't that existing already? That's my question.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, it's about the interests, the common interest, but the interest... One provides the interest must be regarding something in the ICANN agenda. That is a specific push part of it, and then you have all the thresholds that are required to make that. So there is already a framework existing. As long as it is an interest that is within the ICANN agenda, and you can get people to rally around it and you have the thresholds, etc., then it works.

Dave Archbold: Okay, fine, let me give another example then. We create, between the Pacific and the Caribbean, all small island states are a special interest group. What are the small island states special interest group's expectations of ICANN at that stage?

Carlton Samuels: Now, that is where the rubber hits the road-

[background conversation]

Carlton Samuels: Well, says the biased man, she's absolutely right based on this. Thanks, Cheryl. The interest is now for us to convince ICANN





that the roles we play and the interests we have actually are nearer to the ICANN agenda, and that's the difficult thing. We have to say to ICANN "We're small island states, we are interested in access to the internet and we have a specific reason for that access. It's about development for us, it's about actually just communicating, keeping closer together because of the impact of distance and time and the ocean on us."

And you could figure out a couple more things that could happen there. So you know, assuming that the ICANN Board agrees with us, that this gets us nearer to the ICANN agenda, then we're in.

Dave Archbold:

Keith's been waiting there for ages. Keith, please.

Keith Davidson:

You know, a thought I've been having and really, I mentioned to Dave over the last year or so, the SO/AC model is failing rapidly as a purpose for getting the operational aspects of what we do done. For some people, they come along and they make the same presentation at one ICANN meeting to twelve different groups during the course of that meeting.

And so to me there's an idea of structural separation that needs to be done, and that is that really we have issues that confront us and it's those issues that should dictate the agenda; and then draw together during the course of an ICANN week back into a concept of our SOs and ACs, which is more about the governance model and the methodology that we select people. And to me, that would



save us all an awful lot of time in terms of you go and address the issues you need.

Now for ICANN and for ICANN staff that's a really sad sort of concept, because you call for the issues of the day and then you've got to decide on meeting rooms depending on issues with no idea of how many people are going to turn up or what. But notwithstanding that, I think fundamentally, nowadays with all of the things that are in front of us it is more likely to be a useful structure that ICANN-wide, these are the topics, these are the issues, and you pick and mix where you go and what you do; and then you only have a brief half day or day in your constituency.

Rob Hoggarth:

A broader question, Rob again from ICANN staff. As part of the research that the Working Group did, they identified... And we're basically chartered by the Board to say "Look at geographic regions. We need to do this as an organization every five years." What's come up though in the context of the research that the Working Group did is that there are other ways, and you're talking about one of them, to divide or to understand what's going on.

There's geography, there's culture, there's language, there's interests and issues, and I think the fundamental perspective was finding a mechanism or a framework for ensuring there is a diversity of those points of view. And so I think one of the challenges in the Working Group in terms of deciding whether to make recommendations and to do so is how do you want to create that framework?



And I think the special interest groups go not so much to what you're interested in, an issue, but do you have, as Carlton put it, a unique cultural or language or geographic quality that merits because of that uniqueness some diversity and some oversight on the part of ICANN to make sure that there's an opportunity for that point of view to be heard?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. What strikes me here is some experience I've had [break in audio] but not comfortable with those particular words in the title. And I think part of what we're getting caught up in, which is where we ended up into the constituencies area, is the purposing of this. When I was very clear in my mind the first time I saw your presentation, I just inserted "sub-region" in my mind.

Now we probably need another word from that, but let me share with you what was done in another international organization. We had a system that went along the following lines. There was a macro-map model that said "These are nations," it had to go on a national area, right? But we have regions and we have districts, and you can actually have sub-districts that can grow up and become districts.

And so it strikes me that we might have an opportunity to have a macro geographically divided region that fits some intelligence that fits most of our representational model needs, but we fully encourage sub-regions and intra-regional groupings for specific



purposes. The obvious one there is the islands. Now, enough critical mass, enough input, whatever the criteria are – you’re just straight up there as a region in your own right.

But I just would like to explore that. It brings in the rationale and the reason for the thinking, but it stops us getting caught up with the fact that so many of us use geographic regions within ICANN for so many different things; where the real killer app – using the term advisedly – is getting seats in some form of control mechanism either on a Council or on a Board. And that you really can’t muck about with too fast until we get to the Utopia that I would love to see as well. Thank you, Keith.

Edmon Chung:

This is Edmon. If the special interest kind of concept is as Cheryl mentioned, then the concerns are much less I would say. But when you talk about special interests, it seems like I sort of agree with Olga’s observation. First of all it might be already in the constituency model; second of all, it’s very hard to determine and how you plug it back into the governance structure; and third of all, I wonder whether the charter of this group, if that would be perhaps out of the scope of the charter of this group to look into. Not to say that we can’t say “Okay, we found this thing” and hand it back.

One thing, though, I’ve heard surprisingly in the last few months a few times, and I wonder if this group has thought about, is between developed countries and developing countries. That has been an increasing call for some balance in terms of the governance



including the Board and the Councils and different areas of governance in the ICANN structure, to have some considerations for developed countries versus developing countries.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Edmon, I hear exactly what you're saying and this is why I wanted to move away from those "interest group" terminologies because we're moving away from the macro areas here – the culture, the linguistics, the sub-geography and the economics. I think it's a comfort zone, and maybe we need to think about this in those very restricted overarching terms. And then it keeps us away from models that are necessarily important particularly in SOs and the GNSO in particular.

Dave Archbold:

I think if all we have to resolve is the name that we call things we've done pretty well. It is, in fact because we already have constituencies with a particular meaning you don't want to use that. I take the point about special interest groups, but I don't like sub-regions because I see it as being cross-regions, interregional.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Intraregional, cross and intra, that's fine. We can fiddle with that later but it's the concept we need to get.

Dave Archbold:

Indeed, yes. No, that's what I was- Yeah, I think there is some commonality on the concept, yeah.

Okay, any other comments? Any comments from the floor, new or otherwise? Please.



Edmon Chung:                   Actually just a question – Edmon again. I’m wondering what the next steps are in terms of-

Dave Archbold:               Well Rob is going to give you the links to the document that is already on the website that we’re looking for comments on, so this was a trial balloon if you like that we needed comment feedback on so that we can get a final document or a final report draft out for public consultation. So we’re looking for response to the trial balloon. We’ll take that into account in our deliberations so that we can put together a draft final report. That draft final report will then be out for public consultation. And I’m looking at Rob because he keeps me straight on such issues.

Rob Hoggarth:               Yes, you introduced – this is Rob again. You introduced an interesting concept just then that I’ll touch on in a second. Overall what Dave described is an issues matrix that the Working Group has created. It’s a list basically of 31 issues that they’ve pulled out of the interim report. Remember, this was a three-stage process. There was the initial report, the interim report which identified a lot of issues, and now the potential final report.

The 31 issues or matters are now listed in a matrix, and in there the issue is listed, comments, further context for it, and then suggestions. The document that’s on this session webpage that you can pull down as a PDF and download yourself, includes that column where right now the Working Group members have



populated that third column and thrown out a number of ideas, including Dave's concept of following the RIR model.

That's going to be the tool the Working Group then uses to develop the final report. What's listed in there now is not set in stone; it's simply there as Dave as said to spur discussion within the Working Group and within the community.

Now, what you just introduced is an interesting concept, Dave, is the group is going to be working on a final report. The previous reports, there was a midterm stage before the final interim or the final initial report was drafted in which the community was asked for comment. And when we've been talking internally within the group I think there were discussions about a final report done by Singapore.

An interesting comment that you raised, and based on conversations at this meeting, you might want to adjust that to what you just said which is a draft final report before Singapore, give the community some final opportunities to comment and react to it; and then the Working Group has discussions after Singapore and develops the final, final report that is no longer a draft but a final report that gets transmitted to the Board prior to the next ICANN meeting.

Dave Archbold:

Now, my memory is we also said we would transmit it to all the SOs and ACs prior to going to the Board.



Rob Hoggarth: That would be fine, too. That's entirely up to you all.

Dave Archbold: I think we committed to doing that.

Rob Hoggarth: So that's, Dave's outlined that structure. The timing is from now until that draft final report is done, conversations between Working Group members and their communities – you know, Carlton and Cheryl and the At-Large, providing that mechanism for input to them so that they can share perspectives with the Working Group.

Dave Archbold: Any other comments?

Rob Hoggarth: No, nothing online in the Adobe Connect room.

Dave Archbold: Well, if there is no further business I will declare the meeting closed.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you.

[End of Transcript]