Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference
19 January 2012 at 11:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 19 January 2012 at 11:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20120119-en.mp3

on page

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan

List of attendees:

https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/GNSO+Council+Meeting-+19+January+2012

NCA – Non Voting - Carlos Dionisio Aguirre

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Stéphane van Gelder, Mason Cole, Yoav Keren

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jeff Neuman, Ching Chiao, Jonathan Robinson – absent, apologies, proxy to Ching Chiao

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Osvaldo Novoa, (joined late) Brian Winterfeldt, David Taylor, Zahid Jamil, John Berard, - absent, apologies.

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Wendy Seltzer, Rafik Dammak, Bill Drake, Mary Wong, Joy Liddicoat - absent, apologies, proxy to Bill Drake, Wolfgang Kleinwächter - absent, apologies, proxy to Wendy Seltzer.

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Lanre Ajayi

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers

Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Han Chuan Lee – ccNSO Observer – absent

ICANN Staff

David Taylor - VP Policy Development, Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director, Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor, Julie Hedlund - Policy Director – absent, apologies,Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director, Margie Milam - Senior Policy Counselor, Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director, Brian Peck - Senior Policy Director, Berry Cobb – Policy consultant, Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat, Olof Nordling - Director, Services Relations and Branch Manager, Brussels office

Alice Jansen – Assistant to Org Reviews

Guest:

Emily Taylor – Whois Review Team chair

Stephane van Gelder: Welcome everyone to the GNSO Council meeting. Have the recordings started?

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes.

Coordinator: Yes, sir, the recording has started. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Great thanks so we'll get started straight away. And we will ask Glen for you to do a roll call if possible.

Glen de Saint Géry: With pleasure, Stephane. Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Here, yes, sorry, yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Here, present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson is absent and he has given his proxy to Ching Chiao. Mason Cole.

Mason Cole: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yoav Keren.

Yoav Keren: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Stephane van Gelder.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present

Glen de Saint Géry: Zahid Jamil.

Zahid Jamil: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Zahid is on the line. John Berard has not joined the call yet. Brian
                    Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: David Taylor.

David Taylor: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Osvaldo Novoa has not yet joined the call. Wolf Ulrich-Knoben.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Bill Drake.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wendy Seltzer has not yet joined nor has Mary Wong. Rafik Dammak. Rafik is on the line he may just be on mute.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Joy Liddicoat is absent. Thank you, Rafik. And has given her proxy to Bill Drake. Wolfgang Kleinwächter is also absent and has given his proxy to Wendy Seltzer. Lanre Ajayi.

Lanre Ajayi: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Carlos Aguirre.

Carlos Aguirre: Yes here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: And Han Chuan Lee is absent. And for staff we have David Taylor, Liz Gasster, Rob Hogarth, Margie Milam, Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Olof Nordling, Alice Jansen who are representing the WHOIS Review Team. And we have Julie Hedlund I don't think is yet on the call.

Liz Gasster: Julie has sent her apologies; she's on vacation.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Liz. And thank you, Stephane, that is over to you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: And may I just add, too, Stephane, that all the SOIs for the Council are now online in the new form.

Stephane van Gelder: Great, thanks, Glen. So once again welcome everyone. A special welcome to those of us - those of you joining us at a time that is a little harsh. I'm thinking of our American friends and others who have had to either get up early or stay up late to participate in this call. As usual that is very much appreciated so thank you for doing that.

As Glen just mentioned there are - the SOIs have been updated by you all or by all of us on the wiki per the new procedures that have been put up - put in place there so thanks for doing that. Just if anyone has any update to an SOI please say so now.

Hearing no update does anyone want to review or amend the agenda?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Well, Stephane, Wolf Ulrich-Knoben speaking.

Stephane van Gelder: Please Wolf.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: I would like to add on the AOB a short, brief overview over the draft agenda for Costa Rica.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay not a problem. I saw your email on the list to that effect. And please just remind me at the end in case I forget.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yeah.

Stephane van Gelder: Any other requests to review or amend the agenda? Hearing none you will note the previous Council meeting's minutes and the link that you have on the agenda there for those minutes. Thanks to Glen for taking care of that as usual.

Moving onto Item 2 and there's a link to the pending projects list. And not much change but I have to confess that I've not had time to review the list since the previous agenda so we will be updating that for the next meeting. Any comments or questions on there?

Hearing none let's move to Item 3 and we have liaised with the WHOIS Review Team and the Chair of that team, Emily Taylor. Because it's, as mentioned in the agenda there's probably going to be some work for the Council to do on WHOIS at some point in the near future.

And as WHOIS remains a topic of much interest of the wider world and for the ICANN community as evidenced by recent letters and communication like the letter sent by NTIA to ICANN and others we thought it might be useful to have a discussion and update from the review team to the Council and have a discussion with them so that we could possibly ask questions and have on our radar possible policy development for other work that may come out of WHOIS work.

Now I know that Emily very kindly accepted to participate in this meeting but I understand that she's traveling and her participation may be difficult. Have we been able to get Emily on board, Glen?

Glen de Saint Géry: She's not on the call but we have Alice Jansen and Olof Nordling who are supporting the review team and they might have something to say. Thank you, Stephane.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks. Alice, Olof welcome; thanks for being with us. Could you possibly - I know that some slides have been sent to the list. Can you give us an update?

Olof Nordling: Hello, this is Olof and hello everybody. I wonder if in the absence of Emily whether Kathy Kleiman has - who is the vice chair if she has been able to join?

Glen de Saint Géry: She's not on the call, Olof.

Olof Nordling: All right well...

Glen de Saint Géry: Has she been sent the details to call in?

Olof Nordling: Yes she has. So that was the fallback option. But well I suppose that the third fallback option or whatever would be that we try to give a brief introduction to the slides which I think Marika is uploading right now.

So this is the WHOIS Policy Review Team. I think I can keep it pretty short on the introduction. This is one of the four formation of commitments reviews mandated as of the AOC. And it started in October 2010 without a specific deadline for it but a (unintelligible) deadline set for around about the end of 2011.

The composition as you may be aware is from across the community including the ICANN community and also including law enforcement agency representatives and independent experts in various matters. There is a scope of work and a roadmap which you can access and check out for yourself.

And now to the substance matter which is the draft final report published on the 5th of December last year with a number of appendices which you may not have seen if you looked upon it from the very start but they've been added later on.

And this is up for an extended public comment period which closes only on the 18th of March. And the final report, which will be based on the comments received, is aimed for being published at the end of April.

Very, very briefly about the findings from the review team. First of all the finding that it was difficult to find the WHOIS policy. It's scattered in many documents. There is no clear overall WHOIS policy. And also that the developments of the WHOIS policy has been comparatively slow. And new ways need to be tried and also communities outside the GNSO need to be included in that kind of development.

A finding that policy and implementation have not kept pace with the real world. And also there is a lack of accuracy in many of the WHOIS entries; quoting a study saying over 20% making it impossible to reach the registrant.

Also the uses of WHOIS have as consequence including law enforcement agencies have severe difficulties finding those who are responsible for the Website.

Further in the findings so the policy with respect to the particular privacy and proxy services is particularly unclear and must be clarified and codified. It's also a finding that ICANN has neglected to respond to

the need of the community regarding the accuracy and the response times for access and action.

The apparent implementation as a consequence does not help to build consumer trust and more could be done also to raise the awareness of - among the uses of this service and to improve its user friendliness.

Last but not least among the findings here briefly abridged is that the ICANN compliance department would need more resources. And there have been exchanges of letters to that effect as part of the appendixes.

Emily Taylor: Hello, it's Emily. I've managed to...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Hello Emily. Could you sort of take over. It would be...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: ...much more appropriate to have

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: ...review team doing it rather than having support staff just trying to channel your findings.

Emily Taylor: Well can I just say that I'm on a train with lots of tunnels so - and I'm not in the Adobe room so if you wouldn't mind, Olof, just running through the slides. I think that's going to be the least disruptive. But I'm

very happy to just make a few comments and obviously answer any questions that the Council members may have.

Can I just say - sorry to interrupt but thank you very much to the GNSO Council for opening up this slot to the WHOIS Review Team. We're really keen to have your views and your guidance on the draft report.

Particularly we have asked for input on the timings and who should be tasked with various recommendations but obviously of course on the substance itself. So can I hand over to you, Olof, to run through the slides? And I will just be here and dialing back in when I lose connectivity to answer any questions.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane van Gelder: And, Emily before - Olof, before you start, Emily, this is Stephane.

Emily Taylor: Hi.

Stephane van Gelder: Just to welcome you; thank you for...

Emily Taylor: Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: ...making this effort. I know it's not easy on the Eurostar. Well done and thanks for doing that. We do - I'm sure we will have some questions. We'll run through with Olof as you suggested and if your connection cuts out can I ask a member of the GNSO Council support staff to make sure that the essence of any questions that we

have are captured so that we can send them to the review team and Emily if we lose connection?

Emily Taylor: I think that's a very sensible approach, Stephane. Thank you very much. Because I'm just about to go into another tunnel now so I think it might be necessary but thank you. And thank you, Olof, for stepping in to do the slides; much appreciated as ever.

Stephane van Gelder: Olof, please continue.

Olof Nordling: Thank you, Emily. And it's an honor to continue. There are 20 recommendations and I'll enumerate those. The first one is a recommendation to have a single WHOIS policy in a single document that can be referenced easily. And it would be complete; inclusive of all the policies.

And second recommendation is on the data - WHOIS data reminder policy. That should include metrics to track the impact and metrics to inform the published performance targets over time to improve - to facilitate improvements also a finding or possibly an alternative to improve data quality.

Thirdly that WHOIS should be considered as strategic, even priority...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: ...perspective which has a number of consequences including allocating sufficient resources to have a fully resourced compliance department and acting proactively and encourage culture of

compliance and to have a senior executive responsible for overseeing the compliance.

Fourth to perform outreach on WHOIS policy issues to increase the user awareness. And that would not only be limited to the ICANN (surface) but go widely beyond that.

On data accuracy since that seems to be a deficiency today to have appropriate measures to reduce the number of unreachable WHOIS registrations and with targets set to 50% within 12 months and another 50% over the following 12 months. And also to have an accuracy report focused on the method of reduction and on an annual basis.

That was 6. On 7 which is on data accuracy to have an annual status report on progress towards achieving the goals as defined and to publish by the next WHOIS Review Team start as a baseline for them to act upon. And of course it needs to be statistically significant so include tangible and reliable figures.

Further on data accuracy, Number 8, there should be a clear and enforceable chain of agreements with the registries and the registrars. And the provision and maintenance of accurate WHOIS data should be clearly required. And it should be enforceable and with graduated sanctions including the registrations and the accreditation.

Further, Number 9 on data accuracy still, these requirements should be widely and proactively communicated over the community. And the registrants' rights and responsibilities document should likewise be circulated widely.

Now we come to data access. On privacy services they should include clear and enforceable requirements. Of course it should be consistent and strike an appropriate balance between the various interests. Include the privacy, law enforcement and the close-to law enforcement industry.

With a number of more detailed requirements - I know we've got very short time for this presentation so I won't dwell on those rather continue to 11 which is data access for privacy services.

There as well there should be graduated and enforceable series of penalties. And a clear path for de-accreditation for repeated and by serious breaches of the requirements.

On 12 on proxy services there should be a facilitation of the review of existing practices by reaching out to the proxy providers to get their support for this. And create a discussion which sets out the current processes clearly.

Thirteen, still on the same. The registrars should be required to disclosure - disclose their relationship with the retail proxy service providers to ICANN.

On 14 (keep) voluntary best practice guidelines for proxy services which should strike an appropriate balance and include the privacy industry and the law enforcement agencies and support. There are data about what those guidelines may include. And I won't enumerate those; you can read for yourself.

We go to 15. There should be an activity to encourage and incentivize the registrars to interact with the retail service providers that they actually adopt the best practices that have been agreed upon.

And on WHOIS policy referring to the first recommendation to be included on the policy document. (Unintelligible) clarifies that proxy means the relationship in which the registrant is acting on behalf. Verify that the WHOIS data is that of the agent and the agent alone obtains all right and assumes all responsibility of the domain name.

Common interface is the subject for next recommendation where there are two alternative formulations. The first is to improve access to the WHOIS data of dotCom and dotNet gTLDs, the only remaining thin registries. And for that ICANN should set up an interface Website to provide thick WHOIS data for them.

And the alternative (exposed) for public comment. ICANN should set up a dedicated such interface to allow unrestricted public access to accurate and complete WHOIS information for thick WHOIS data for all gTLD domain names. So there is a two-prong approach on Recommendation 17.

Now Recommendation 18 and this is recommendation to task a working group that to within six months to finalize on international domain name - internationalized domain names, finalize encoding and modifications to the data model and internationalized services, to give global access to gather, store and make available internationalized registration data, to make them more accessible and clearly accessible to the WHOIS user.

To report no later than one year from the establishment, to use existing IDN encoding and aim for consistent approach across the gTLD space. And also incentivize on a voluntary basis the same or similar approach for the ccTLD space.

More on internationalized domain names in Recommendation 19 where the final data model and services should be incorporated and reflected in registrar and registry agreements and that should happen within six months of adoption by the working group's recommendation by the board and also some ancillary provisions in case this cannot be achieved in time.

Further on IDNs Recommendation 20 - we're reaching the end after this catalogue area. So the requirements for registration data accuracy and availability in local languages should be finalized along with the effort to - on internationalization of registration data. And there should be metrics to measure accuracy and availability of data in local languages and if needed corresponding data in ASCII. And compliance methods and targets should be explicitly defined accordingly.

Those were the 20 recommendations but in addition the review team seeks comments on well, the acceptable timeframes for the implementation, the requirements and suggestions on which department, staff or within ICANN or supporting organizations should be tasked with particular recommendations and how to develop those further.

Input on all recommendations and of course with a special highlight on Recommendation 17, which is of a two-prong character and input on efficient mechanisms for monitoring progress in implementing the final

recommendations between the completion of this report and the start of the next review team and any other additional input and note.

For Costa Rica the review team proposes to meet face to face in Costa Rica to discuss the implementation details of the recommendations and also there is a note that there will be an overall interaction with the community organized by the review team tentatively on Monday the 12th of March to be confirmed.

And I think that is...

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks a lot, Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, there are numerous links in case you need it enumerated here before and the closing date for public comments is as mentioned earlier on the 18th of March this year. And well Emily Taylor is the Chair and I hope she's come out of her tunnel now? No she has not. And Kathy Kleiman is still not showing but it's very, very early morning for her. So but those are of course key individuals for any personal discussions you wish to have.

With that I think I should conclude...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane van Gelder: Olof, thank you very much. And thanks for that presentation.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane van Gelder: I think that - I'm not sure whether there'll be questions or not but I certainly have some. So in the absence of - and I see David has just raised his hand as well - in the absence of perhaps Emily who's gone back in the tunnel and Kathy - perhaps we can just put these questions to you and Alice and as suggested before write them down. Could one of the GNSO support staff please write them down and we will continue this conversation with the WHOIS review team obviously.

So I have just a few questions that come out of your presentation, Olof. First of all on Recommendation 1 I think there seems - one obvious thing that strikes me and there's a slight reference to it in Recommendation 18 - but I didn't see anywhere else any reference to it.

What about ccTLDs? I mean, if we're trying to do a single WHOIS policy surely ccTLD WHOIS is just as important to gTLD WHOIS. Obviously ICANN has more control over the Gs than the CCs, I understand that. But one of my questions would be has the review team looked at that and possible ways of including the Cs in this very important work.

Olof, Alice, do you want to answer these now - try and answer them - or would you rather I just went through the questions and we put them to the review team?

Olof Nordling: I think it would be - well I think I wouldn't do the review team justice in trying to channel answers to the questions. Of course it has been looked upon. The remit of the review team is focused on the G-space. That's pretty clear. But as you mentioned they have certainly made references to the CC-space as well in one of the recommendations.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay thank you. On Recommendation 2 there is - I constantly have questions as a registrar from customers asking why we are forced to send them - to spam them at least once a year.

And I was wondering if there has been any - the question has been raised in the review team on the actual usefulness of the data reminder policy that has been enforced for a while that before actually looking at the notices themselves and whether they are improving data accuracy, which is obviously very important, has that question actually - is it desirable to do this from the registrant's point of view been raised?

Olof Nordling: As I can recall and but I think you should...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: ...to Emily and Kathy and by an email or something. That aspect has indeed been raised during the deliberations of the review team.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. Once again, you know, we will collate these questions and others from other GNSO Council members and I will liaise with Emily to send them. So, you know, we understand you may not have complete answers.

On Recommendation 5 you - the group recommends appropriate measures to reduce unreachable WHOIS registrations. Did the group look at what kind of measures they were thinking of?

Olof Nordling: Again not trying to give anything but a hint of an answer, I mean, for example it was noticed what China had done some time ago and how that dramatically had improved data accuracy in WHOIS.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. Interesting. And...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane van Gelder: Sorry, who was that? Did someone speak? Okay. Well I've already hogged the mic for a while. I've got some more questions but let me put it out to David and Jeff and then come back. I'll put myself in the queue after Jeff. David.

David Taylor: Thanks, Stephane. I was just responding to I think the slide before last where the review team was suggesting a face to face in Costa Rica. And I thought that seemed an excellent idea if we can obviously fit it on the schedule which might tie in with Wolf at the end of this session. But that was my only point; it's such an important thing I think it's worth doing it face to face.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes I absolutely agree. It was going to be one of my suggestions as well. And we would have to check with the review team obviously as well what their possibilities are. But doing something over the GNSO weekend I would be very happy if we could do that. Thanks, David. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I was going to make a slightly related point but I also think we should actually meet directly or this should be a topic with the board itself. I think the WHOIS review team did some great work.

My concern is that there's an expectation - and as you saw the NTIA letter - that once there's a final report the board is just going to adopt all the findings as-is.

And I'm worried about some of these recommendations going around the policy development process and also some of these being requirements that I think the review team and some governments expect that the board could just unilaterally implement changes to the contracts with the contracted parties which they don't have the right to do.

And I think there is this expectation in the community that they do have this right because the AOC created this notion of the review team and therefore the board could just kind of step in and use that as the multistakeholder approach and a substitute for, you know, policy development within the GNSO.

And so I'd like to add this to the board agenda because that to me is, you know, it's great to have the review team and some of the recommendations I think are very logical and don't need a policy or view like trying to come up with the unified document and making sure that the community knows what the policy actually is as it exists today.

But changes - some of them need to go through the policy development process, some of them need to go through the process in the registry or registrar agreements to change them. You can't just unilaterally do that just because as review team that says that.

So that's something I'd like to discuss with the board and make sure that governments and others don't have the unrealistic expectation that

the board is just going to unilaterally impose this on the community simply because the review team came and made these recommendations.

Stephane van Gelder: Yeah, Jeff, thanks. I think that's a very fair point. I mean, the China question, for example, I think we will have some kind of a reaction to that. And it certainly should be in our view I think or in my view certainly as a person view it should be taken in the larger context of what China has done with dotCN and going from 40 million to 3 million registrations which I don't think has ever been seen before in the domain name industry.

So that zone, that TLD has been - has had an extraordinary couple of years. So I'm sure the review team needs to look at that in that wider context. David, you still have your hand up.

David Taylor: I do but I'll take it down. Sorry.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. So perhaps I can just carry on with my questions and continue to ask Glen to write those down so we can send them on to the WHOIS review team. On Recommendation 10 which is one that deals with privacy services and there's a recommendation there that there be balance between the wishes of law enforcement.

I suppose although I don't see it on the slide but I suppose it was in the report on the needs of - to protect the individuals' privacy and access to personal data. I was just wondering how that balance would be measured because this argument, you know, if you put law enforcement and individual users in a room I don't think you'll get much balance out of the conversation.

So I'm just unclear as to how that balance can be measured. I agree that there needs to be balance I'm just not sure how we'd get there.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. I think that's the level where there is agreement that there must be some balance. And I won't even try to explore how that can be achieved.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. I just have one more question. On Recommendation 11 and 17, which is, as you pointed out, Olof, one that's probably key to the WHOIS Review Team. There's mention on Recommendation 11 of de-accreditation for breaches.

And then Recommendation 17 talks about asking ICANN to do - from what I understand and I may be wrong to basically step in and do a kind of proxy thick WHOIS interface because the registry in question has a thin WHOIS.

In both cases I notice there's little onus on registries themselves. And I'm just wondering is that just not coming through from the slides? On the de-accreditation are you talking about just registrars or registries as well if registries that have an obligation to provide a WHOIS service breach it for example? I don't know if that's been looked at.

And on the Recommendation 17 why has this not - I don't know that it should be done, I'm not saying it should or shouldn't I'm just asking myself reading this why is it ICANN's responsibility to do a thick WHOIS instead of the registries; why does the group think that should be up to ICANN?

I know VeriSign has some very good reasons for doing a thin WHOIS on dotCom and dotNet. I'm not saying that should change; I'm just asking that question of why if people think those TLDs should be thick ICANN should be doing it. That's my questions.

Olof Nordling: On those two questions I'll forcefully dodge and ask you to put them to Emily and Kathy for the appropriate answer. Thanks.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Olof. Thanks a lot for doing this, for being with us. Emily, I don't know if you are back or still in the tunnel but thank you as well for your time. We will certainly continue this conversation. Wolf, I will ask you to have a look at the possibility of putting in a slot with the review team during the weekend or at some time during Costa Rica.

I will also, as I usually do, make the point that all my questions and comments there were my own and not as Chair of the Council. And with that just ask if there are any more questions on this or can we move on? Seeing no hands, hearing no one we'll move on to Item 4 and once again thanks to the review team for their participation in our meeting.

Item 4 is the first motion that we have on the agenda today and that is a motion looking at the IRTP Part B - the IRTP Part B policy and Recommendation 9 Part 2 of that policy.

You have seen, I hope, some email traffic on the proposal that staff submitted with regards to Recommendations 8 and 9 Part 2. We're dealing with 9 Part 2 first. We'll go to 8 afterwards. There are a couple of motions made by Mason and seconded by Jeff on those. And the

first motion then we will consider now. I'll ask Mason to read the motion and then we'll discuss it.

Mason Cole: All right thank you, Stephane. The motion - the first motion is on the adoption of staff proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation Number 8. The motion reads, "Whereas on 24-June, 2009 the GNSO Council launched a policy development process on IRTP Part B addressing the following five charter questions:"

"A, whether a process for urgent return or resolution of a domain name should be developed as discussed within the SSAC hijacking report with a link to those reports to follow."

"B, whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed especially with regard to disputes between a registrant and admin contact or AC. The policy is clear that the registrant can overrule the AC but how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar."

"C, whether special provisions are needed for a change of registrant when it occurs near the time of a change of registrar; the policy does currently deal with change of registrant which often figures in hijacking cases."

"D, whether standards or best practices should be implemented regarding the use of a registrar lock status, e.g. when it may, may not, should or should not be applied."

"E, whether and if so how best to clarify Denial Reason Number 7; a domain name was already in lock status provided that the registrar

provides a readily accessible and reasonable means for the registered name holder to remove the lock status."

"Whereas this PDP has followed the prescribed PDP steps as stated in the bylaws resulting in a final report delivered on 30-May, 2011." Excuse me. "Whereas the IRTP Part B working group has reached full consensus on the recommendation in relation - or the recommendations in relation to each of the five issues outlined above. Whereas in relation to Recommendation Number 8 the GNSO Council resolve that its meeting on 22-June to request ICANN staff to provide a proposal designed to ensure a technically feasible approach can be developed to meet this recommendation."

"Staff should take into account the IRTP Part B working group deliberations in relation to this issue. See IRTP part B final report. The goal of these changes is to clarify why the lock has been applied and how it can be changed. Upon review of the proposed plan the GNSO Council will consider whether to approve the recommendation."

"Whereas ICANN staff has developed a proposal in consultation with the IRTP Part B Working Group which was put out for public comment with a reference to a link. Whereas comments were received from the Intellectual Property Constituency and though received after the comment deadline were nonetheless considered by the GNSO Council and the proposal was submitted to the GNSO Council."

"Whereas the GNSO Council has reviewed and discussed the ICANN staff proposal in relation to IRTP Part B Recommendation 8. Resolved the GNSO Council recommends to the ICANN Board of Director that it

adopts and implements IRTP Part B Recommendation Number 8 and the related ICANN staff proposal as described in the link in the motion."

Stephane van Gelder: Mason, thanks a lot for doing that. Let me open it up for discussion. Does anyone want to question - make any - sorry, ask any questions or make any comments?

Wolf. And I should point out that - well, Marika, you'll probably point this out but Mason has just read the one motion. But not to worry; we will read - Mason, I believe you've read the motion for Number 8 - Recommendation Number 8...

Mason Cole: That's correct.

Stephane van Gelder: ...and we're dealing with Number 9 first. But because you've just read that motion perhaps I can suggest that we swap those two agenda items. I don't know why I drafted the agenda in that way anyway. It's not too logical. But would anyone object to me dealing with Number 8 before Number 9? So Item 5 goes before Item 4.

Okay let's hope we haven't confused everybody and ourselves. And so we'll be voting now on the recommendation that's on the motion that Mason has just read which is motion on Recommendation 8. Wolf, you had a question.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes, thank you, Stephane. It's just for my understanding. I have followed a little bit the - this email exchange from staff around those - these motions. And I wonder there's a - this, you know, the resolve which says that it includes a staff recommendation that it refers to that what was the exchange between staff regarding the comments from

different - a party of the community like the IPC and others. Is this related to that or just for my understanding I would like to know that.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Wolf. Marika or someone else? Can anyone from staff answer this? Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So the staff proposal that is referenced there is the original proposal that was submitted to the GNSO Council before the IPC made its comment. So it is actually for the GNSO Council to consider whether any changes need to be made to those proposals based on the comment submitted.

I did send earlier this week to the list the staff's view on those comments. And I think especially in relation to this recommendation staff agrees that there might be some merit in considering some of the comments of the IPC. I think there's a specific suggestion where we also would suggest that the registrar stakeholder group is encouraged to provide its feedback on that proposal.

So in relation to this specific one there might be a need to update that proposal if the Council agrees with the assessment that staff has made of those comments.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Marika. David.

David Taylor: Yeah, thanks Stephane. I suppose just following up from Marika there exactly. The one thing I'm a little bit confused about is on the motion where we talk about the comments - the IPC comments were nonetheless considered by the GNSO Council on the proposal

submitted. I wasn't sure whether we had all considered those. We may have done.

But I notice that, you know, Marika, on certain - on our Option 2 which we'd proposed there that she thought it could be beneficial and exactly she said and suggested the registrar stakeholder group could review and respond.

And obviously our comment is in late so, I mean, it's very hard to review and respond with deadlines and timelines like we've got. So, you know, we're generally for the whole thing but we just think it's, you know, beneficial and hence we put the options in and we rushed those out amongst quite a few IP lawyers. So I don't know how we can build them in or how we take it from here.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, David. Yoav.

Yoav Keren: Yeah so this is - I wanted to relate the same thing. I think the Option 2 that was raised there is a good idea. The only thing - we would need our group's view on it so I'm - what I'm trying to understand is whether the IPC is asking to change the motion?

Stephane van Gelder: David.

David Taylor: Very good question. We were putting in our comments because I suppose we thought it would be good if the motion was changed. We're not - and I don't have specific instructions to put in a friendly or anything like that. So, you know, I can't go any further than that but we did put in those comments.

And when we saw Marika's comments back on it we thought oh good that's being taken on board. So it would work itself through I suppose. And we were looking for a registrar response which we then...

((Crosstalk))

David Taylor: So I, you know, I don't know. I'm happy to handle it however we thinks best to handle it to be honest.

Yoav Keren: What I think is that, you know, Option 2 for me it sounds reasonable but since we didn't have enough time to consult with Stephane and Mason, this is something that we need to get our group's review. Although I personally think it's okay; there might be different opinions. The only way I see out of this is to defer the motion. And, you know, I'll be happy to hear others what they think about it.

Stephane van Gelder: So there is, I mean, it's possible that we can either defer the motion if there's a request to do that or once again the motion itself approves the staff proposal that was made before the IPC comments. So even though those IPC comments are - have been identified and that's very clear, I'm not sure the motion itself pertains to them.

So we may consider that moving ahead with the motion is okay and the IPC comments are therefore discussion. I think, Yoav, you asked the right question; does the IPC want to - did the IPC make those comments with a change of motion in mind?

And I think this is all happening a bit - there's not enough time for both David to go back to his group, us to go back to ours, so we may just choose to defer. I think those are the options before us. And let me just

put the question out there. Is there a desire to defer this motion or go ahead and consider it that way? Let's here from Marika first.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I mean, one other option would be as well if indeed there is agreement that there should be some further consideration of the IPC comments in relation to this specific recommendation an option could be as well for staff to amend its proposal and include indeed the reference to I think the multilingual option.

And indeed if there's support from the Council for the Option 2 that could also be worked into a revised staff proposal that, you know, we could submit then for the next Council meeting. And I guess this motion could then be updated accordingly. So that would be another option to consider.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Marika. And that would mean a deferral then for sure. It would actually probably mean that we take the motion off the table completely for you to redo your staff proposal and then do another motion. Yoav, were you still in the queue?

Yoav Keren: No, no sorry; I'll take my hand down.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I just want to comment that, you know, I keep hearing that you should go and talk to the registrars. I believe the staff proposal also involves the registries; it's not just registrars although the staff response only included a reference to the registrars.

I'm happy if you want to remove registries from anything but I don't think that's the proposal. So can you please include the registries on any of these discussions especially in light of the WHOIS Review Team recommendations that they want to hold the registries more accountable for this. So please consult with the registries as well. Unless I've misread the proposal.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay thanks. Alan is next.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think I - my suggestion is akin to Marika's that the motion says that Council has considered the IPC comments which Council hasn't done at this point. And so I think the motion needs to be taken off the table since staff is agreeing that maybe they need to make some changes.

I don't think this is just a deferral which, you know, especially if it's considered the single deferral that's allowed. It sounds like the motion was premature given the IPC comments and the result of them. And it's got to be taken off the table for staff to consult and perhaps revise the recommendation before it comes back to the GNSO.

Stephane van Gelder: Personally I would agree with you. Mason, you are the proposer here. Would you - what do you want to do? I mean, the discussion that's been happening, does that make you want to change anything or withdraw the motion or whatever is being suggested.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I mean, I'm sorry, Mason speaking. Just given the input here perhaps the better move would be for me to withdraw the motion and resubmit one that more accurately reflects what - the status of where

we are. So at this stage, Stephane, I would be happy to withdraw the motion for now.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay thanks so we'll do that. Marika, did you have something else you wanted to say?

Marika Konings: Yeah, yeah, this is Marika. So actually in response to Jeff's comment because basically staff is basically looking to anyone to, you know, respond to the proposals or, you know, the assessment that staff has made for - of the IPC comment.

So the reason why the registrars are specifically mentioned as it would relate to a registrar requirement. So I think we'd be interested to hear from them as well how they see that would be implemented. We definitely would appreciate any input before we make any changes to the staff proposal to really make sure that they have the broad support of the GNSO community.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks. So this motion is withdrawn. I will now ask Mason to go back to Item 4 on our agenda and read the motion that is - sorry for the confusion - the motion that's on the motion wiki page, the second IRTP Part B motion. So that is the one that pertains to Recommendation 9 Part 2.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I apologize, Stephane, for reversing those. Just chock it up to be 3:00 am where I am. All right this motion is on the staff proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation Number 9 Part 2.

Okay, "Whereas on 24-June, 2009 the GNSO Council launched a policy development process on IRTP Part B addressing the following five charter questions:"

"Whether a process for urgent return resolution of a domain name should be developed as discussed within the SSAC hijacking report with links to those reports."

"B, whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed especially with regard to disputing a registrant and admin contact or AC; the policy is clear that the registrant can overrule the AC but how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar."

"Whether special provisions are needed for a change of registrant when it occurs near the time of a change of registrar; the policy does not currently deal with change of registrant which often figures in hijacking cases."

"D, whether standards or best practices should be implemented regarding use of a registrar lock status, for example, when it may or may not or should or should not be applied; whether and if so how to best clarify Denial Reason Number 7, a domain name was already in lock status provided that the registrar provides a readily accessible and reasonable means to the registered name holder to remove the lock status."

"Whereas this PDP has followed the prescribed PDP steps as stated in the bylaws resulting in a final report delivered on 30-May, 2011. Whereas the IRTP Part B Working Group has reached full consensus

on the recommendation in relation to each of the five issues outlined above."

"Whereas in relation to Recommendation Number 9 Part B the GNSO Council resolved that is meeting on 22-June to request ICANN staff to provide a proposal for a new provision on locking and unlocking of a domain name taking into account the IRTP Part B Working Group deliberations in relation to this issue. See IRTP Part B final report Recommendation Number 9 Part 2."

"Upon review of this proposal the GNSO Council will consider whether to approve the recommendation. Whereas ICANN staff developed the proposal in consultation with the IRTP Part B Working Group which was put out for public comment with reference to a link."

"Whereas comments were received from the Intellectual Property Constituency and though received after the comment deadline were nonetheless considered by the GNSO Council and the proposal was submitted to the GNSO Council."

"Whereas the GNSO Council has reviewed and discussed the ICANN staff proposal in relation to IRTP Part B Recommendation Number 9 Part 2. Resolved the GNSO Council recommends to the ICANN Board of Directors that it adopts and implements IRTP Part B Recommendation Number 9 Part 2 and the related ICANN staff proposal as described at the link in the motion."

That's the motion, Stephane. I would just put myself in the queue for just a small point of clarification on the motion.

Stephane van Gelder: All right please go ahead, Mason.

((Crosstalk))

Mason Cole: So I've got in the motion that the Council has considered the IPC recommendations. As Alan correctly pointed out that's likely not the case, I probably misworded the motion I, what it really should say is that the council has accepted those proposals, the deadline notwithstanding. So I don't want any confusion on the part of the wording of the motion.

Man: And should we changing that then?

Man: I would be happy to change it.

Man: Okay. What's the wording that should be changed?

Mason Cole: Well I would propose that it say that whereas comments were received from the intellectual property constituency and no received after the comment deadline were nonetheless accepted by the GNSO council.

Man: Okay. Jeff would you have a problem with that, secondary to the motion, it's a one-word change.

Jeff Neuman: I don't...

Man: In the second to last whereas, considered becomes accepted.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I, my, the word accepted is kind of, the only comment I have on that is it makes it sound like the council has then, is incorporating their

comments and I'm not sure is accepted the right word? I mean I agree with the concept that we, even though it's late but we're considering them.

So I guess it's okay if it doesn't convey the notion that we've accepted that meeting, we accept the substance of them.

Stephane van Gelder: Mason?

Mason Cole: How about the word received?

Stephane van Gelder: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Well don't we say that in the paragraph above that, that they received? Well don't we say that in the paragraph above it, that they received, well I don't want to make...

Man: No I think, yeah you're both making that in points why don't you just leave it as it is, I mean it's pretty, it seems to me as though it's clear the comments were received and they were considered.

Mason Cole: Well I'm fine with it how it is, I just don't want any confusion on the part of the council and I, and Jeff I'm sensitive to your concerns that it not be conveyed that they were accepted as though agreed to so is there a better word?

Jeff Neuman: Well what about...

Stephane van Gelder: I think the way you've drafted it now Mason is pretty good but I mean does anyone else want to comment on this, for example anyone from the IPC? David Taylor.

David Taylor: Yeah. Hi Stephane. And it's a bit difficult, I think we're setting up less of a problem with this one but it's basically what we've said was that the IPC believes that stronger protections should be in place to protect IP holders before ICANN accepts this recommendation.

But we didn't set out what stronger protections, so again it's there, that's what we thought, that's the comment which if I don't know how we work this through if the council is aware of those comments and agrees and says yes we agree stronger protections or do we think that what's in there is insufficient.

Our view was that stronger protections should be there before we accept the recommendation but we, you know the general recommendation is a good one.

Stephane van Gelder: So do we need more time on this? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika because I have a question for David because I don't know if you had a chance to look at the staff's response because we were wondering if you know the comment was related to the same provision that is in there because what is in there currently to protect indeed registrants and indeed avoid that, you know if you haven't read the agreement or are not aware of the locking provisions that there at there's a maximum five-day turn around time which is required.

So from staff's perspective we feel that would, that addresses your concern but I'm not sure if indeed it does or whether you feel that it isn't sufficient as you know what is currently there.

David Taylor: Yeah. And again we haven't had a chance to consider that officially so I mean we've some of us have looked at and had individual thoughts but we haven't got back on that.

Stephane van Gelder: I'm seeing some chat traffic that's from the NCSG asking for a vote but I do wonder if this is not more of the same with the other motions that we're just slightly not had enough time to really look at this in detail, I don't know, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I was just going to say that haven't we by just discussing this right now haven't we now met what the motion says where it says the GNSO council has reviewed and discuss, or sorry the, they were nonetheless are considered by the GNSO council.

And I don't necessarily agree with the notion that stronger IP protections are needed in that provision so I think we could just vote and approve the motion as is, I mean that's my recommendation.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. Any, in this case I'm told by staff in this instance things are slightly different because there's no recommendations from staff to implement any further changes beyond the staff proposal that's already been submitted, so perhaps we can vote on this one. I am going to ask is there any opposition to us taking a vote on this motion? Hearing none I will ask Glen to proceed and we will do both votes unless there is opposition to doing one. Hearing no opposition I would ask Glen that you do a voice vote please.

Glen De Saint Gery: Certainly Stephane. All those in favor of the motion on the adoption of the staff proposal on the IRTPB Recommendation Nine please say aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Glen De Saint Gery: Is there anybody opposed to this motion? Are there any abstentions? So the motion passes unanimously with those on the call but may I note that John Berard is not on the call and has not registered a proxy to the best of my knowledge and Osvaldo Novoa is also not on the call and has not registered a proxy to the best of my knowledge.

If anybody knows differently about John or Osvaldo would you please say something now so that we can record the vote correctly?

Thank you Stephane, the vote passes. The motion passes.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you Glen. Thank you very much Glen. Thanks to all. Let's move onto item six then and this is an item on the Cross Community Working Group Drafting Team.

We've had a team looking at possible sort of principles for cross community interaction of the GNSO and we have seen several cross community working groups start up in the past and often they have raised questions sometimes called issues so awhile ago the GNSO council decided to look at a possible set of guidelines or principles on how we should engage with that type of a group.

And we had, the group has come up with a proposal and I want to thank the group for doing that work and Jonathan Robinson has been leading that effort and he's unfortunately not able to be with us today but a motion has been put forward on this, it hasn't been seconded yet so before I read it in Jonathan's stead I would as is anyone willing to second this motion?

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff, I'll second it.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. Would the Wiki please be updated to show, thank you very much? So I'll read the motion where the GNSO from time to time has participated in cross community working groups to address issues of common interest to other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees.

Whereas the GNSO council decides to develop the GNSO group perspective with the regard to the role, function and method of conducting joint activities for future projects that respects and preserves the recognized roles and responsibilities assigned to each SO or AC under the ICANN by laws whereas on the 6th of October 2011 the GNSO council approved a charter and the formation of a drafting team to define a way forward for the effective chartering, functioning and utilization of such cross community working groups.

Whereas on the 4th of January 2012 the drafting team provided to the council for consideration draft principles to cross community working groups link provided.

Now therefore be it resolved that the GNSO council hereby approves the draft principles for cross community working groups with it's own guidance and requests staff to disseminate them to the chairs of supporting organizations and advisory committees asking them to provide input to the GNSO council within 60 days on both the principles themselves and the route forward for community-wide adoption or development of a related set of principles for the operation of cross community working groups.

Resolved further that the GNSO council thanks the drafting team members for their work in developing the draft principles and disbands the team.

And with that I will open it up for a discussion. Now I, do we have other members of the team on the call? Bill?

Bill Drake: Hi. Well I guess the first point to follow-up on the, this conversation is that the NCSG would like to defer this because we are having an internal discussion about the best way forward and there's a variety of different views, moreover since Jonathan's not here I think it's more appropriate for us to do it when he's around.

That said I'll simply reiterate what I was saying long ago and far away at the early end of this process, which is that like a number of other people in (unintelligible) who spoke to it while I understand the thinking

behind the whole initiative and the kinds of concerns that were raised at the time of (unintelligible), etc.

I'm still not entirely convinced by the need to specify the requirement for a single uniform charter and I think that that's the kind of thing that might be viewed by other (unintelligible) as potentially inhibiting or even sort of implicitly imposing in the view of some people what we want on them.

I still tend to think that it's possible to view cross community working groups more as a sort of platform where one engages a set of issues in a holistic space but then people perhaps in different groupings might have somewhat different agendas and particular dimensions that they want to be able to respond to and I think we ought to have the flexibility for that to happen.

So I just wouldn't pre-judge the situation by saying up front that that's required. So there was a discussion in the drafting team about some language, some kind of big old words about where possible or something like that and I would've had thought that that would be useful. Perhaps also it would've been useful to think about if there were situations where there was not a single joint charter at the outset how exactly things should be conducted.

But again I recognize that there are a lot of different lines of thinking about this so it just seems to me better to have a face-to-face discussion in San Jose and see if we can't try and square the circle and also maybe take on board some thinking that might be prevalent to know their SOs and ACs at the front end rather than waiting to post

hoc coordinate with them and find out that they may or may not like what we've come up with, so I'll just stop there for now.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Bill. So we will defer the motion as requested, which doesn't mean that we can't carry on discussing the topic now and I agree that, I mean I'd ask some questions on the list when the group published its document and it's clear that with Jonathan not present it may be more difficult to have the discussion that we intended to have so we'll defer the motion but Alan had a point that he wanted to make.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I'm reiterating what Bill has said but I'll add a little bit more to it, which I think changes the picture a bit, and I admit I was on the group and this was not an item that I was successful in convincing the rest of the group to do.

I believe that the multiple charter issue, although I don't think multiple charters at the start of a cross community working group are very likely, I think that there are situations where they may be possible and practical. There are others where it would be deadly but I think that any principles that we state to begin with should go into it with some level of flexibility, so words like if possible or generally I think would cover that.

I'll specifically mention that these are principles which later on for any given cross community working group the GNSO would have to approve the specific charter. If the GNSO felt at that time that multiple charters for a given group was a bad item it could simply refuse to participate in a cross community working group if multiple charters are there.

So we are taking an option away from some future GNSO largely driven by the experience with (Jazz), the only case where there has ever been multiple charters and which actually ended up being very successful with the GNSO not objecting to the items that were added by the ALAC and it's version of the charter.

So I think this is an overreaction to something that's happened, it's visceral, I think it's taking away flexibility from some future council and there's no real reason to it because any future council can veto multiple charters if it feels they're inappropriate at the given time. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Alan. Any further points on this? Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: I'll speak up as another member of the group who supported the single charter requirement, I think because the charter is the document that tells everybody else outside of what they need to pay attention to and what they are bound by when the group concludes, or at least bound to have participated in you know this is your chance to talk about these issues, I think it's appropriate and helpful in the management among all groups for there to be a single charter.

In responding to some of the other questions that I saw around this is not I don't think the GNSO council trying to impose its views on everybody else, the idea is for this cross community working groups to be collaborative and their input into what goes into that single charter is as valid as what GNSO members put in it's just once the group is chartered there should be a single agreed upon scope for it.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Wendy. And I'll try not to draw any attention to the fact that on the chat you and Jeff seemed to be agreeing with each other a lot today, but any further questions on this?

Hearing none the motion having been deferred we will move on to the next agenda item and we're back looking at the IRTP Part B this time recommendation seven and let's try and make some time here. Marika you had an update on the, on this recommendation seven of the IRTP Part B working group on specifically on the requirement to look at the main (unintelligible) UDRP.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika and I can definitely catch up on some time here because basically a call for volunteers went out I think a couple of weeks ago and on the screen you'll see the members that have signed up to date. You can see that there are some constituency stakeholder groups that are not represented so if there is still interest you know please feel free to share that call for volunteers again with your membership and encourage people to sign up.

We hope to have a first meeting with the drafting team next week to then everybody provided them with the charter template based on the new GNSO working group guidelines the staff has developed a template that should make it easier for drafting teams to develop charters as it basically highlights which elements are required and already pre-populate some of the elements that you know are part of the GNSO working group guidelines and are standard for every working group.

So you know following the first meeting we need to assess how much time it will take to you know come up with the charter and then it should be submitted to the council for its consideration and in due time.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. Thanks. Does anyone have any comments or questions for Marika at this time?

Marika Konings: And this is Marika if I can maybe just add if there is any further guidance the council wants to give to this drafting team because what I've done is basically I've collected the information from the IRTP Part B recommendation and the report that relates to the specific recommendation as well as some of the elements that were included in the UDRP Issue Report relating to this item, but if there's any other specific guidance that the council wants to give to this drafting team on, you know, the subject matter you know.

Stephane van Gelder: Yeah. We can hear you Marika there's a noise in the background but. Have you finished?

Marika Konings: Yes. I have.

Stephane van Gelder: Right. I wasn't sure that you were still on, sorry because of that noise. Okay. Does anyone want to ask any questions or make any comments? It doesn't appear so.

I will thank you Marika for that presentation and move on to Item 8, we are looking at the Outreach Task Force Charter once again, this has been the topic of discussions amongst this group for a few weeks now and we have had some motions that we've not reached agreement on.

And as a way of trying to move this forward the leadership team has suggested that we re-discuss during out weekend sessions and I believe well, I haven't got the schedule in front of me but you'll correct me if I'm wrong but I believe you set aside a slot for doing that, which is the first one on the Saturday morning and that we'll be looking at later, I hope I'm speaking from memory so I hope I'm not wrong.

And in order to set up a (unintelligible) for that discussion I have asked Liz to update us on the very latest on this so that we can all go into that conversation with this fresh in our minds and able to possibly look at a way forwards.

Liz if you will.

Liz Gasster: Thank you Stephane, it's Liz and I'm substituting for Julie today. I'm just going to quickly go through a few slides that you should see on your screen of just a background, you may recall that in July 2008 the board approved the GNSO improvements recommendations report, which included a directive related to outreach which was to develop global outreach programs aimed at both increasing participation in constituencies and in the GNSO policy process.

So subsequently the council formed the Operation Steering Committee which directed the CSG work team to develop an outreach program as well as, you know other responsibilities over the course of the year in 2011 the OSC sent to the council recommendations for a global outreach program and task force.

The council asked staff to convene a charter drafting team, that charter drafting team presented a charter to the GNSO council along with

motion to approve, which was then deferred. In November the motion was defeated, there was a new motion submitted by the commercial and business constituency but that has not been seconded and the, and no action has been taken.

But we still do have a collective responsibility with regard to the board recommendation, the board governance committee working group report, the GNSO Improvements report that the board approved.

So while there are no new motions at present there's still the notion that at least the board would expect some activity on this at some future time and so the next steps as Stephane says would be subsequent discussion and hopefully this is useful background for that. Thanks.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you very much Liz. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Can I just as I'm making my comment can we go back to the first slide because the comment I think I have is that, well I'm sorry, not that one, didn't the board governance, yeah and so what they said was that the GNSO should work on this outreach effort, not necessarily the GNSO council.

And I think what we're seeing is that there's no agreement within the council at this point that this is necessarily a council issue. So I don't want to make it sound like it's the GNSO community is not addressing this issue nor does the GNSO community think this is important, in fact if I understood the business constituencies motion last time, which wasn't seconded, or their point which is that the GNSO community is

engaging in outreach they're just doing it at the constituency level as opposed to the council level.

I mean I'd like to hear from the rest of the see whether we feel like simply because the board governance committee hasn't made a motion in 2008 whether this is really something we need to keep addressing over and over again as a council or whether this is something we as a council just send a message to the constituencies and say hey this is still out there, do you guys have activities that you guys want to engage in or recommendations and leave that to the constituency level.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Jeff and I would add to that that my understanding is that it's not because we've had a request from the board governance committee that dates awhile back, as you just mentioned, that we absolutely have to provide an answer if we are unable to provide an answer then that's our answer.

And I would expect that to be an acceptable answer, it's happened before on other policy matters, it's happened on other initiatives so I don't see why it couldn't happen here but I also understand the point that you're making that this could be devolved to, sorry wrong choice of words, sent to the individual GNSO groups, maybe they want to comment or maybe they have specific things they want to say. Bill.

Bill Drake: Thanks. Well in response to Jeff I guess the Outreach Task Force if one favors that kind of a framework, is of course something that the council would have to vote to adopt and I guess the question is whether one views that as a useful construct and we've said before

that we did, we NCSG but obviously that was not a consensus position.

But obviously I think it needs more discussion I don't think the arguments for the wealth of merits of doing some sort of coordination at the level of the GNSO generally through something like an OTF versus just doing stuff at the level of stakeholder groups has really been joined in a, any kind of broad way I don't think there's been a real discussion, most people were not really actively engaged in the outreach working group and so on and probably weren't following the arguments that were put forward, etc.

So I just think it's, it would be useful for us to have that conversation. There's another complexity as well which is you know this has been raised by a number of people, there is some other initiatives going on within ICANN apparently at the level of the SOAC chairs with the staff and so on related to outreach.

And a number of people at NCSG have been puzzled by that because for one thing we've been unable to get any documents to find out what the discussion is and how that's going, and so that makes it a little bit hard for us to understand how whatever is done in the GNSO at whichever level fits into the larger picture.

So I hope that before San Jose we can get greater clarity about what's being done across the board in different parts of ICANN so that we can think in a little bit more coherent manner about how anything we might do we'd articulate with it. So for me I hope that we can have that conversation in San Jose in a useful way.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Bill. Sorry I'm having problems coming off mute today. Wolf.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yeah. Thank you Stephane. Yes I let me say agree to all of this because, and this is why it is necessary really to discuss it and to speak about that, those things which are unspoken.

So that means that there is a, that that was, which was came up in 2008, you know when the process was started, that was I remember very well because that was when I also started well to cooperate on GNSO level so and I remember very well all the other things as well, the other improvements projects have been dealt with in the same way as it was, which with the OTF charter so the council had something to do with that.

Also I also agree that in between we have changed the council and each council has responsibility for that what he is doing at the time he has been established right now but all this has to be discussed and that's the goal to discuss it, to put it on the table in San Jose and discuss about that and discuss also the responsibilities of the council versus responsibilities of the GNSO stakeholder groups constituencies.

So it's, it's for me it is very clear that we have to do this in order to let me say to avoid misunderstandings and mistrusts I would say also for the future, but that's the only thing why I put it on the table and I'm very much looking forward well to discuss that and hope that we can go forward in a good way. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Wolf. Just one thing I didn't say, when you say it's very clear to me we must do this what's this, discuss in San Jose or is there another this?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: No this in San Jose, discuss in San Jose.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. Thank you. Sorry I wasn't clear on that. Thanks. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah thank you. I'll call attention to a comment Liz made in the chat saying it's not the board governance rule that we're following here but a decision made by council several years ago, so at this point council has to take some action to honor its previous commitment, and that may be to reverse the commitment and say no more outreach is necessary.

And I say this to someone who advocates strong proactive outreach but regardless council needs to make, put a current discount and needs to put a current stake in the ground of saying how it's going to handle it even if it is to reverse the decision taken in 2008, there's plenty of precedent for boards and council reversing decisions.

But one way or another it needs to put a stake in the ground as to how this is going to be responded, or how the original requirement is going to be responded to. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Alan thanks. I agree that something needs to be done and I just would reiterate my earlier point that one answer is there is no answer, that is a possible answer and I don't think it's either approved or reversed the previous decision, although I appreciate yours and Liz' explanation on the history of this because we don't want to miss that.

Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Stephane. Just that I think it's really good to remember the date when all this work started so it's basically started at (unintelligible) in January 2009 so it's three years ago and there was as, and I'd say some commitment from the GNSO council about outreach for the GNSO council instructing. I think that's really bad precedent to go backwards just because don't like the outlook. It takes - some kid.

Stephane Van Gelder: Don't know what's going on there, Rafik, but I'm worried.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. How to say? I think that this precedent that we don't reach the commitment that we agreed events long time ago. I was not on the council 2009, but we have to keep that commitment and to reach what's set as goal. People worked hard for - like during two years to have outcome. It go through the council many times. The council send the questions. There was comments, et cetera. I think it's not really fair that we go back at the late stage.

I can understand that there is some concerns, but why now? That's the question that's really, I don't find any convincing answer to it. So maybe if we can find a way in San Jose to work on that. But I heard from (unintelligible) about mistrust. It's important to build trust, but let's -- how to say -- show some goodwill from each - every side. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Rafik. Mary is next.

Mary Wong: Thanks (unintelligible). I agree a lot of the comments that have just been made by various colleagues. I do think that it's unfortunate that three years down the road we're still talking about it and nothing's happened. And I know it's very important that we make a decision that something either happens or it doesn't happen.

So I'd like us to focus on what is the most effective and efficient way to get us there. It may be - and I think (unintelligible) discussing the issue in Costa Rica, but it may be worth looking at the council forming a small team either of counselors or comprising counselors represented from all the groups including those that might have been on the OTF with a very clear deadline that in view of two things, one, perhaps some new development in the last three years, second, the concerns, mistrust, and issues that have been made, and come up by a date certain with a recommendation of various options for the council to vote on and either move forward or not move forward. I do think we need to bring this to a close.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. And Yoav is next. Mary, Rafik, yes, no, yes. Your hands are down. Rafik, did you have another point? No. Okay, thanks. Sorry. Yoav, please.

Yoav Keren: Yes, I've said that before, and I keep hearing the same thing again and again, is that because people did a lot of work and were on a working group and came with different recommendations, the council couldn't just say no. And I - just as a principle, I really disagree with that. And I think that we're not here just to stamp working groups' recommendations.

I think, first of all, things change. The fact that in the - you know, that's one of the problems in our - in the policy process that we have, that sometimes it takes a lot of time and people change. So you have different counselors, different councils. There were changes in the market. There were people, different people, in - maybe in the constituencies back then, whatever.

And actually, even on the outreach, I think that with - in practice, if you look at it, how many people over the world heard about what ICANN does three years ago. Now with the new gTLDs, more people know about it. That's for sure. Know about ICANN and other things. Maybe not on all the things that we want, but more people know about it. And maybe that can conclude with more people taking part in the ICANN process. I don't know.

But bottom line, I'm going back the principle. I really disagree with that notion that we can't say no for something. And I'm okay - I really think what Stephane said about there are cases where there is no answer, it's okay and nothing happened. So that's - I just wanted to state that again. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much Yoav. Bill?

Bill Drake: Just on the last point, I don't think I would insist either that simply because a group worked on something that therefore there is an obligation to do it. But there, I think, an obligation at least to have a probing discussion about the merits of what the group put forward. We've not really had a collected discussion around the OTF model in any kind of coherent way.

We had a process where people put something forward and nobody was arguing against it. It seemed unproblematic. And then, suddenly at the 12th hour, was no good, and we didn't really get a very clear understanding of exactly why it was no good.

So, that's all. I mean, I think it's just a matter of due process and being respectful to the time of the people who participated in the effort to at least, if we're going to put something aside, make an affirmative and informed judgment to do so after having considered it properly. And I don't think we've actually done that yet. So, that's why, again, I would suggest that we have that conversation.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Bill. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Just I want to answer to listening to his comment. If I understand well, so we can take time, but we can say no later. So what I can conclude that we have the best recipe to not do anything in the GNSO, just let's take time for any projects, for any working group, for anything, and then we can, oh, no, we cannot go ahead and let's go backward, and then we have the same issue lasting for a long time. We don't find solution. And then that's why maybe people don't anything or understand anything about ICANN, because we take so much time.

It's not because the problem of consensus, but the problem that we have some people who don't go - want to go forward. We need to find the solution. We said that we need to find some answer to the outreach program. Some people work it. People from all constituency and stakeholder group, and all constituency and stakeholder group have time to comment and they commented for a long time. And these go through many times through the GNSO council.

So I think we have enough time for the community to comment and to be involved. So at the end, the GNSO council is not here to micromanage the work of the community but to help the community toward the defined policy and also to provide enough recommendation to let stuff go ahead. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Rafik. Your comment, I'm tempted to react, but I won't. Yoav?

Yoav Keren: Yes, well, I just wanted to say two more things. I'll try to keep it short. One - just to clarify, I have no problem with having the discussion. That's okay. I just - I was just talking about the general idea of the fact that if a working group brings us a recommendation, we as council can decide different than those recommendations and not accept them.

And Rafik, to what you were saying, I'm the last one. And believe me, the one reason that I'm here on this council is that I don't like the fact that things take so long at ICANN. You may have - haven't heard me in other cases in ICANN, but I'm one of those that were pushing the idea since 2000. And we just came out with them now in the new gTLDs in 2011. So I'm the last one that wants things to continue in this way.

But - and - but this is - I'm just saying that, okay, it's an initiative that was on a working group, came with a solution that is not accepted by the council. That doesn't mean that it's not - the council - the fact that the work was done in - don't get me wrong. I appreciate the work that was done. But we as a council in one of our previous meetings decided not to accept those recommendations. I'm okay with reconsidering it and talking about it in Costa Rica. I don't have anything against that.

I'm just talking about the general notion that we can decide different than the working groups. That's it.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Yoav. Because I can't ever help myself from making comments, I will make one. On - a person comment to what you were saying, Rafik.

I don't think it's fair to say that - I understand your frustrations. We've all felt them on some - at some level and some discussions. I just think, personally, as a volunteer who's put a lot of time into the ICANN process, that we should be careful to remember that this is what we call the bottom-up consensus-driven process. And sometimes, those discussions will take time, and we will take the time to make sure that everyone's views are heard and that consensus can be - can evolve from that.

It is frustrating, I agree, at times, but I don't think we should characterize a council as just refusing to do anything and standing still, which I don't think much fair to any of us. But there we go, and that was a personal comment.

Zahid?

Woman: Stephane, Zahid has been disconnected. I'll make sure that we call back to him.

Woman: Yes.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay. And then, we'll go to Mary and come back to Zahid.

Mary Wong: Okay, thanks Stephane. So, I'd like to just follow up on what I said earlier and picking up on Bill's point in the chat. My recollection was similar, that even though we voted against the motion that there was some sense that there are to be continuing discussion and that a new motion might be forthcoming, but definitely that more time was needed.

So I really think that the discussions that we as a council or we as (unintelligible) committee would have in San Jose needs to have some deliverables. And it may be - I'd like us all to consider that between now and then. We've got a bit of time. But that those discussions - you know, frankly, it could be the equivalent of locking representatives of the groups in a room until they come out. And they can come out either with a motion, competing motion, or even a statement that the council could read. And the statement could be something like what Yoav said, that there's no consensus, we're not going to do anything, or something like that.

But I do think we need to have a date and we do need to take action even if that action is declaring that no action is going to be taken. Otherwise, it's going to be really hard, at least for some of us, to explain it to the community given that outreach is such an important issue not just within the GNSO but broadly speaking across the community and specifically with the new gTLDs. There's a whole bunch of things here. I really think we need to set a date and have a deliverable.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you, Mary. So, let's go back to Zahid, if you're online now, Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you, yes, just two points. I mean, on the outreach issue just following up what Mary said, I think our only issue within the (unintelligible) and some others have been that we're concerned about the fact that what does this mean for individual constituency's outreach? Does that injury it? Does that reduce the resource available to them? And that's the only issue. And there may be other concerns out there, but I would feel comfortable if in a motion something of that nature (unintelligible) is put in. That's basically all I have to say about that.

On an earlier point just made that, you know, we as a council and the role of the council is just we can reject whatever come up from the working group process. I think - you know, it's every different council called meetings, et cetera, that we - that I attend, this pendulum swings one way and then back another. Because initially, we - I think from the restructuring perspective, we were supposed to be policy managers and not policy, you know, makers.

So if we're going to have people devote hundreds of hours of time in working groups, those working groups are going to come up with maybe consensus-driven proposals which come up to our - you know, come up to the council. It's going to be very difficult for us to just completely outright reject them, because, you know, we're not a policy making body from what I understand. I wish we were. I mean, I completely agree with all the different changes in the restricting of the GNSO, but our role is restricted to management.

So, you know, we need to sort of strike a balance there. If the intention of the restructuring was just for us to be managers, it's difficult for us to maintain the proposition that we can do whatever we want despite

whatever comes up from the working groups, because the community is going to be quite upset. They're just going to say, "If we spent hundreds of hours, what's the point if all of it can be simply ignored and rejected?" And this is something I've said about other aspects as well, not just this one.

But I think we need to sort of at some stage discuss what exactly are we supposed to be? Are we managers or policy makers? Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, very much, Zahid. Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Stephane. May I just for all of you let we postpone this discussion to (unintelligible), because it was just (unintelligible) today and we all understand that there is a must to discuss all these points. And so that we have the very last ten minutes right now to discuss the San Jose agenda, and you will see we have left space for I think at least an hour for this discussion about the OTF. And it would be very helpful.

And I would like to prepare that for the discussion in San Jose. And so I hope that we can have a very fruitful discussion there again.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. We'll do just that. And move on to item nine, the WHOIS accessibility item. And we have Wendy as council liaison to the group that is looking at this. So perhaps, Wendy, just to go into this quickly and try and make up as much time as we can, you can just - do you want to just give us an overview of that response? Or is there anything you want to tell us on that?

Wendy Seltzer: Sure. Thank you, Stephane. And I think I can do this in under 20 minutes allotted.

Very briefly, the WHOIS Survey Working Group has been working on surveying the technical requirements that community members see in the WHOIS. And so, in response to the council's request, we considered the request that we look at - that the group look at WHOIS accessibility and returned the conclusion that that was a policy matter rather than the technical matters that we should be focusing on.

And given the chartering of this group to focus on technical functionality of the service, we thought that this group was not the appropriate place to add questions about WHOIS accessibility. We note that there are several other places where WHOIS is currently being discussed, including in the council's discussions of the WHOIS review team report, currently out for public comment, as one place where that - those questions can be addressed.

And there are other discussions of WHOIS in the context of the registrar accreditation agreement. But as a policy matter, it wasn't - the group didn't feel it was appropriate for us to comment there. That's all I have to say.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, sorry. It's my getting off mute problem again. Any discussion on this, please? This is something that another point of - that we'll have to take some decision on at some point. Okay. Well, perhaps we will look at this again during the San Jose weekend session. And a perfect transition there to that. Sorry, Wendy, please go ahead.

Wendy Seltzer: I just didn't want to close without giving thanks to Liz Gasster and Berry Cobb for their help in supporting the group and in preparing the document that you have in the Adobe Connect that lists the other places where this WHOIS is currently being considered.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. So, let's move quickly on because we're running out of time to Wolf's AOB item. I'm told that Bill, you have an AOB item, but I've missed it. So I'm trying to find it in the chat. Perhaps you can just tell me what it is.

Bill Drake: Right now?

Stephane Van Gelder: What was it you wanted to do?

Bill Drake: We - NCSG people would like to raise again the question to whether it's not possible that there be transcripts of the GNSO council meetings.

Stephane Van Gelder: I believe there are now at every meeting.

Man: Yes.

Bill Drake: I thought there were not. I thought we had this whole...

Stephane Van Gelder: No, we have...

Bill Drake: Okay, then I stand corrected and we stand corrected, and we'll go look for them. Bye.

Stephane Van Gelder: That's no problem. Just to explain, because we did have a discussion and it's sometimes hard to follow e-mail discussions. I was under the impression that there wasn't, and indeed there wasn't for our teleconferences and it was not the norm.

There was a request. I forget - I think it was Wolf or someone else who requested. We looked at it. It was possible to do it, and it's been done for the last -- Glen, you'll correct me if I'm wrong -- two or three meetings.

Glen de Saint Gery: That's correct, Stephane.

Man: Yes.

Stephane Van Gelder: So, those are...

Glen de Saint Gery: I'll send you the links, Bill.

Stephane Van Gelder: Tanks, Glen. So, those are available, Bill. And thanks for bringing that up, because I'm sure others have missed it as well.

Wolf, over to you, please?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you, Stephan. Just briefly, I have sent it to you this morning, the draft agenda for the GNSO session in Costa Rica. And let me just highlight some things.

So, it is the - as usual, we have discussions. We have reports from the different working teams and discussions about that. And this is what is on the agenda.

And then, we have also - the good thing is so we have planned (unintelligible) start at 10:00 only in the morning to give people who arrive early in the morning a chance now also to participate from the beginning.

And then, we have different updates from the different working teams on Saturday. And what we did is we - there are additional working teams as you can see on Saturday at the end of Saturday's (unintelligible). So, for example, the (unintelligible) working team (unintelligible) working team with your opinion that it would be more useful to give those teams a chance to be represented at the public council meeting.

So, that is our proposal now to put it on the agenda of the public council meeting as well as we did with the WHOIS update. But today, I have learned just from the discussion about the WHOIS team that it will be useful to have a separate point to separate item during the weekend session and discussion with that - together with that team to talk about their recommendations. So I would - I am going to try to insert that into the agenda.

So the - Saturday seems to be not too many items, but they are heavy items. And they are useful to be discussed. The first one is - which is seems to be very useful also in particular since the council has been - since in Costa Rica, many, many members changed in the council, that

we're giving an introduction to the new PDP and discuss also the experience so far with it.

And the new gTLD program is on the spot there, and we have given place a big space for three hours to that. And I think it's also very useful to discuss it and very interesting to hear for ICANN and for (unintelligible) what's going on. Is he opening up the window for the application?

So - okay, then Board and GAC meetings are in the afternoon, the joint meeting is Board and GAC. And we are still discussing here in the council leadership whether - because I put one point after the Board and GAC meeting. It's a kind of wrap up from the council to come together again to wrap up the Board and the GAC meeting.

I'm of the opinion in this case that if I remember the last time there were really, really important issues which have been discussed during - with the Board and the GAC. I've (unintelligible) the RAA and others. So that might be useful directly come together after that and update ourself and to wrap up ourself. Is that not only to put it on the agenda as the wrap-up session later on in the week on Thursday. But it's just a proposal from my side. So, it - I would like to hear from you offer your input.

In addition, what I'm requesting you is for input for the joint meetings with the Board and with the GAC and with the CCNSO that we could prepare an agenda for those meetings as well. Did I miss anything so far? No, not yet. So I will (unintelligible) for comments. Thanks. I see Jeff is first and then Mary.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Wolf. And thanks for doing this and putting it out there. You know, I think - and I was certainly guilty of this at the last meeting as well with the way I set it up. I think we've kind of moved away from what the weekend session used to be. It used to be a working session as opposed to just a bunch of updates.

I think we - what showed last time at the GAC meeting and the time before that at the Board meeting is that we were woefully unprepared for what has happened during those meetings. That there were such little discussion on the substance that we knew would come up at the GAC meeting or the Board meeting because we spent so much time on updates.

I would propose first of all that anything that's just an update that there's no actual action item or working item at that point that we should just get that submitted in writing from the groups and not necessarily do an update. I think we can eliminate a lot of the stuff without having a half-hour update.

I think as much as I am involved and my company is involved and others in new gTLDs, I think there's no real reason at this point to schedule more than a half hour on new gTLDs. I don't think it's fair for ICANN staff to give us, the council, an update that it wouldn't give to the rest of the community. And I don't think they're in a position during the RFP period to actually give the council any insight that it couldn't give the entire community. And therefore, I think the discussion as we've heard is going to be very limited, certainly not three hours' worth.

I think we need a lot more time on the IOC Red Cross issue because the GAC is going to want to discuss that and to a resolution. So we

need much more time than a half-hour update. I think it actually needs to be a working session and then maybe up to two hours, because the GAC is going to really want to discuss that.

I think we really need to have a lot of discussion on the - and Mason's going to kill me on this, but on the RAA stuff so that we as a council can look like we're unified in how we go into the GAC. I think what happened at the last meeting was pretty much atrocious that we had council members discuss things during the GAC meeting that they wouldn't or didn't discuss during the GNSO session. I think that that should never happen.

I don't think the GNSO council members should use the GAC meeting as a time period to bring up new things that haven't been discussed. It's okay to have a difference of opinion and discuss that during GAC, but it's not okay in my view to surprise the rest of the GNSO council with your comments.

So, I just - I think that we really need to spend more time working on the issues, especially on the issues we know that are going to be brought up with the GAC and the Board.

Stephane Van Gelder: Jeff, some very powerful arguments there. And may I ask that as an exceptional measure on this, but so that we act on something that I'm sure most of us agree with in terms of preparing for the weekend session that you were - tell me if you don't have time to do this because we do do a rotor for this. But could you work directly with Wolf? Because what you've just suggested is a major rethink of the way that weekend's just been drafted by Wolf.

I think it would be very useful. I agree with everything that you've just said. I think if we can get in more direct council working time and preparation time, then that will be beneficial to us. And I do think that we suffered from lack of preparation in -- where were we last time -- Senegal and that showed.

So could I ask for you to help Wolf? Is that something that you could do?

Jeff Neuman: Absolutely.

Stephane Van Gelder: That's great.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Jeff, thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks to you both. Margie? And I'll ask you all to, Margie, Mary, please keep your comments very short. We're already over time.

Margie Milam: Thank you, Stephane. It's Margie. Just I wanted to echo what Jeff said specifically with regards to the RAA. We will have a final issue report published by then. And so - and it's going to be a very active discussion item, you know, throughout the week. So that's all I wanted to say, that that probably is something that needs to be covered during the weekend session.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much, Margie. Mary's taken her hand down. Any other comments? Hearing - seeing none. I will apologize to you for being five minutes over time, but I think the discussion was very useful. Well, thank you all for your participation, council and staff and community members that have helped us today. And speak to you all next time. Thank you very much and good bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Yes, bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: ((Foreign Language Spoken))

Woman: Thank you, Stephane.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Good bye. Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Tim?

END