

**Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) DT
Sub Team B
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 15 April 2010 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) drafting team Sub Team B meeting on Thursday 15 April 2010 at 18:00 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-raa-b-20100415.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

Present for the teleconference:

Steve Metalitz - IPC – Chair

Kristina Rosette – IPC

Tatyana Khramtsova – Registrar Stakeholder Group

Michele Neylon – Registrar Stakeholder Group

Statton Hammock - Registrar Stakeholder Group

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC chair

Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large

Philip Corwin - CBUC

ICANN Staff

Margie Milam

Marika Koning

Heidi Ullrich

Liz Gasster

Glen de Saint Géry

Absent apologies:

Tim Ruiz - Registrar Stakeholder Group

Elisa Cooper - Registrar Stakeholder Group

Woman: Is there anyone else having difficulty getting into Adobe Connect?

Coordinator: The recordings have been started.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you (Carol). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the RR - this is the RAA B Test Team call.

On the call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Shiva Muthusamy, Tatiana Khramtsova, Michele Neylon, Steve Metalitz, Kristina Rosette, Statton Hammock. And for staff we have Liz Gasster, Heidi Ullrich, Margie Milam, Marika Konings and Glen Desaintgery.

Thank you. Steve over to you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you very much Glen and thank you...

Glen Desaintgery: And we have - sorry. We have apologies from Tim Ruiz.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you Glen. And thanks everyone. I circulated a proposed agenda last - yesterday afternoon I guess. I don't know what time it was for you, but anyway, a little while before the meeting. So I guess I would ask if anybody has any additional items that they would like to add to the agenda? If not, why don't we go ahead?

And first item on the agenda is to approve a revised timetable. We obviously have slipped from our - the timetable we adopted back in January or February. And so once we had this meeting scheduled, I wanted to try to spell out what a revised timetable might look like that would enable us to wrap up our work, if at all possible, before the Brussels meeting.

One thing I wasn't sure about, and perhaps someone on the staff can advise me on this, I'm a little unclear on the deadline. How far prior to a GNSO Council Meeting our draft report would have to be submitted in order to be, even in theory, able to be acted on at that meeting? I'm not sure this is totally determinative for us, because I'm not sure - I mean, we obviously can't dictate the GNSO Council agenda.

But, for example, there is a meeting on June 10. And I'm not sure if anyone - can anyone tell me when we would have to submit our report in order for it to be right for action on June 10?

Liz Gasster: So it would be - this is Liz. It would be June 2, eight days in advance, typically...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Liz Gasster: ...for it to be considered at a Council meeting. And then it - unless it's a Council meeting, you know, a face-to-face Council meeting, like the Brussels meeting. And then there's a 15-day requirement.

Steve Metalitz: So that's - there's 15 days for that. So assuming that there was a Council meeting on June 23 in Brussels, which actually I didn't see that even listed on the calendar. But assuming that's the date, because it's the Wednesday of that...

Liz Gasster: Yes, I would assume so. All right. I doubt the calendar's really (unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Yes. So that's 15 days in advance of that. So that will be June 8 right?

Liz Gasster: Right.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. So those, I guess, if you, you know, look on the bottom of the right-hand column, those would be the target dates that we'd have to shoot at -- June 2 or June 8. So...

Liz Gasster: Steve, actually I should make one more point too. This is Liz again. Just that typically the Council too will - like when you make a - turn in a report, post a report, they'll take two Council meetings.

One Council meeting to discuss the report and discuss possible responses or actions as a result of the report. And then hold it over to the next Council meeting to actually act on it. That's what the typical process is used.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you for raising that. I - yes. I wasn't assuming that they would act on it the first time it's available. But that's good to point out.

So where I have a May blank deadline. In fact, I think we're looking at either June 2 or June 8 as our deadline. That doesn't change this timetable very much.

Let me just say that I think in order to meet this timetable we're going to have to go to weekly meetings, starting the 25th. I mean, if people are prepared to meet next week, we could do that too.

But what I've got here is to have a meeting the week of the 25th. If needed, have a meeting the week of May 2. I think that would probably be needed. Have a meeting on May 9 - week of May 9. And probably

have a meeting the week of May 16. And, you know, we might have to have yet another meeting.

But I don't think we've - we don't have a very good track record in this group of accomplishing a great deal on the list, which is disappointing. But I think that's just kind of the reality. So I guess what I'd like to suggest is if - is I'd like to open discussion on this timetable, but with the expectation that probably we're looking at weekly meetings starting the week of April 25.

Michele has his hand up. Anybody else want to comment on the timetable? Go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: It wasn't actually in relation to the timetable. It's just there's a few people who are having issues getting into the Adobe. Well, I think that they're probably having the same problem I had with a call a few days ago, where the system is saying the meeting has started and they can't get in.

Steve Metalitz: Kristina is that the problem you're...

Kristina Rosette: No. I'm actually stuck on the screen before that. I don't even get that far.

Statton Hammock: Yes. I'm in the same position Steve. Statton.

Marika Konings: This is Marika . You might have to clean the cache. So if you don't use Adobe Connect regularly, you need to clean the cache from time to time to get it working again, because from this side it looks fine. And

we don't see anyone wanting to go into the room. So you might want to try that.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Well yes. Again, this document was circulated yesterday so you'll find it on the archive or in your inbox.

Okay. Any other comments on this? Or are people comfortable with this and with moving to a weekly meeting? If we don't need it, we don't have to. But if we - but plan to move to a weekly meeting schedule starting April 25. Okay. I'll take that as a yes.

Well I'll tweak this to reflect the dates that the staff has given us, as far as the deadlines.

Now another thing I'd like to raise in this regard, and the staff asked if we could do this, is rather than set the meeting time ad hoc every single week, which means that the staff has to launch a Doodle poll and figure out what's available and so forth.

Can we try on the next Doodle to come up with just have a set meeting date and time for all of our subsequent meetings, or at least for the next several subsequent meetings? I'll work out with the staff the best way to do that.

But I think I agree with them. If we can say -- all right, here's our meeting. If we can have our dates and times for the meetings for at least the next several weeks all at once, that definitely saves everybody time and energy. I know it makes it a little harder and

people may not be able to attend every single meeting, but let's try - at least try to do that when we set the date for our next meeting.

Any other comments on scheduling or timing? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Go ahead Marika .

Marika Konings: Sorry. Just at the moment, for those having issues, another thing you might try is just using a different browser; that sometimes works as well.

Steve Metalitz: All right. Thank you. Okay, well good luck folks on that. I'll try to point to you if there's any other way to look at these.

Actually, the next documents, I'm not sure if they're up on the Adobe anyway. But they're basically are from the - our email archive, and so if there's questions, you can look at those.

I thought there was a - did - we did have some discussion over the last couple of days about Task 2 and Task 3. Recognizing that we haven't completed Task 1, because we have a document with something like 40-odd top priorities and that still needs to be done. We - I think we need to resolve how we're dealing with Task 2 and 3 if we can today, or at least make some progress on that.

I sent around -- again, just to remind everybody -- what Task 2 and 3 are. Task 2 is from the list of topics. Flag any topics that may require further analysis as to impact on consensus policy. That's the task we

were given by the Council. And now I - we seem to have two or three different views on how we should proceed on that.

Up till now, we've been trying to do Task 2 in tandem with Task 1. And you'll see on the matrix there are a few items where we've noted -- this seems to be handled by consensus policy; this seems to be something that's being actively discussed by another working group, and it was the PEDNR working group. So I think we flagged a few issues.

But now I see that Tim and Statton have suggested that in one approach. And I think the staff in the memo that they sent around may have suggested another approach. And then I put in a couple of comments on a third approach. So let - why don't we just ask, you know, let's just review these and see what the different options are?

So Statton are you - can you tell us how you think we ought to handle Task 2?

Statton Hammock: Well I've assist to supporting (Ken)'s proposal a couple days ago - a day or so ago; that we let ICANN legal staff take a crack at this. Just because I - it could take things off us having to go through it. Give it to them. Give them a chance to do it. Apparently, they had done it in the past as well and their input would be helpful.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. So your idea is that we wait until they do that before we complete Task - in other words, we kind of subcontract Task 2 to the staff?

Statton Hammock: I'm not saying we would have to stop work on what we're doing. But we would seek their input at this point in the process.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Margie, or someone else from the staff, would you like to kind of walk us through this aspect of the memo that you circulated yesterday?

I mean, looking, really, at Point 3 of your memo, which I guess is on the Agenda Page. Maybe you could let us know. Tell us what the staff view is on who should be deciding whether an issue is more appropriately addressed through policy development process than in RAA.

Margie Milam: Sure. I can address that. The memo basically walks through the requirements under the RAA. And we were just clarifying that, you know, a couple aspects that I think there's been maybe some misunderstanding on, on some of the participants.

And what we were pointing out was that although the amendments can touch upon consensus policy issues, the question really is, is it appropriate, given the amount of work that we have and, you know, and the length of the topics?

And so that the approach we took in the memo was to suggest that we look at the amendment and, you know, and where it's clarification of language versus, you know, a new policy -- this is just a - purely a recommendation -- that that would be the - where you draw the line. You know? And understanding that the, you know, there is work already underway in some PDP groups and some, you know, something.

Like, for example, you know, domain warehousing or something. You know? There's no work absolutely, you know, being done right now on

that, and that could be a subject of, you know, consensus policy development.

And so we were just clarifying that; that the way we view the contract, you know, you can address consensus policy issues. But we think it's more appropriate where you're talking about developing new policy to go down the PDP path.

Steve Metalitz: And what I took away from your memo was also that you thought this is something the drafting team should try to...

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Yes, that's right. I mean, I don't think that the legal department would want to go item-by-item in that review. You know? That's something that - because the question is, you know, is it required? And they, you know, it will just take them forever to get through that process.

And so I think it's more appropriate to have it be worked on the in the group, as opposed to seeking, you know, legal advice on it, because the legal opinion up until this point is, you know, anything that's been consensus policy is - and it can be touched, but we just don't think it's appropriate. You know? And think it's better handled through the drafting team.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you Margie. But let me just to round - kind of round out the picture, kind of walk through some of my comments on this.

As I said in the first memo, I think we do have a pretty clear divergence between Statton's suggestion that the staff handle Task 2 or be - get

input on - provide input on Task 2, and Margie's suggestion that the drafting team try to do that, using the standard that - that's in the staff memo.

And then Statton had mentioned that this, you know, that the staff had - the legal staff had weighed in on this question in the last go-round. So I went - kind of went back and looked at the process as Margie had sent around a memo earlier kind of outlining the process.

And I found this document that I think came out in - sometime in late 2007, in which the ICANN's legal staff went through all of the suggestions that had been made. They had a somewhat different process, because they said, "A public comment period." They didn't have a drafting team like we have.

But they went through all the suggestions and they classified them in several categories. And one category was where they thought they were either under discussion in context of the consensus policy already, or otherwise, because of their nature, could/should be handled through the consensus policy process. That's a quote.

And I'm not trying to defend that standard, because it's a little unclear to me what that standard is. But it's just interesting to note that of the issues they identified then that they thought were better handled through the consensus policy process, most of them are not in our list, at least as far as I can see.

And again, I'd welcome any corrections to this list that I circulated -- 14 items. And I think the majority of them aren't really in our matrix.

Then there were a couple in our matrix that we've already had flagged under Task 2 or we'd said something like -- there's PEDNR involvement; and it should be low priority. I think that kind of translates to the same thing, which is let's not focus on this as an RAA amendment. Let's let the policy development process continue on this.

And then there were - and there's really only one area where I think where we might have to - for some discussion of something that I don't think we've explicitly said is outside is something that has consensus policy implications. But that the staff apparently did think it fell within their standard in 2007. And that was, basically, requirements for verifying the identity of registrants at the time of registration.

And there's several different flavors of that, both in what was on the list in 2007, and then what's on our list. So that tells us two things, one, a lot of people think that's a good idea and think it should be in the RAA; and second, the staff three years ago thought that was something that was better handled through the policy development process.

So with that exception, I think - and that's something we - I'd be interested to talk about with. But I think otherwise, we've done a fairly good job of - I think some of what we've concluded or tentatively concluded about policy development process and consensus policies is probably parallels what the staff would say, or at least what they said three years ago. So I just that was - that might be helpful in this discussion.

So those are three points of view that we have here -- Statton's; Margie's on behalf of the staff; Statton on behalf of his support of Tim's; and then my 2 cents worth for what that may be worth.

So let me open the floor now. And I recognize that for some reason people have difficulty getting into the Adobe room. So please just speak up if you have a comment or question and would like to be in the queue.

Statton Hammock: Steve it's Statton. I have a question.

((Crosstalk))

Statton Hammock: On our matrix that we have so far, do we mark things? You said we had already marked some as being flagged for consensus policy. Do we mark that in the notes, or the implementation, or the stakeholder recommendations?

Steve Metalitz: If we mark it in the notes - so if you...

((Crosstalk))

Statton Hammock: Because I looked through the notes. And I'm trying to find one where say, for example, it is subject to - we believe subject to consensus policy.

Steve Metalitz: Look at 2.2. A couple observations. And then question whether it is...

((Crosstalk))

Statton Hammock: Question whether...

Steve Metalitz: ...a consensus policy, rather than through an RAA amendment.

Statton Hammock: Okay. So that's the language you use to flag a question. Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Well that's not consistent throughout, but that's one example. And then as I mentioned, where we say, "The PENDR is looking at this and it's a low priority." I think - I don't think it's a stretch to say that's another area where it may be - we don't think that should be at the center of the table.

Statton Hammock: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Again, we - as we've walked through this, I think every single time when we went through a section we asked, "Did anybody think that there were any - is anything here we should flag under Task 2?" And clearly, if there is something you think we've failed to flag under Task 2, we welcome your input on that.

Did anybody else have a comment?

I had one question to - really to Margie about the memo and the standard that's suggested there. And I'm trying to figure out how this would apply to the proposals that the staff has made, because unlike - I guess first, one thing is different in our process this year is that we have a lot of proposals that came from the staff, including the legal staff, but a lot of others. There's compliance staff and many others that contribute to this. And I think it's really been incredibly valuable to have this.

So, you know, on - I'm looking at that Item 3.1. Malicious conduct -- registrar duty to investigate. So one proposal that the staff put forward

is, "Certain language in the RAA requiring registrars to investigate within a time certain. Any report demonstrating harm from illegal, malicious use of a domain received by the registrar from ICANN or other credible sources." And it gives some examples.

And I just wondered if you, you know, your memo says that, "If there's a new policy position, rather than clarification of existing language or obligations, maybe you should go through a PDP process." How would you apply that test to Item 3.1?

Is that a new - this is - it looks like a new obligation that you're talking about for the RAA. Is that something that the staff is now recommending ought to be taken off the table and diverted to the policy development process?

Margie Milam: That's a good question. I don't - I think that with regard with respect to the malicious conduct issue, because it - a lot of our recommendations came out of (unintelligible). But they (unintelligible) ahead in the new (unintelligible) process. But that might, you know, be an area where, you know, that rule may not necessarily apply.

I mean, we didn't go item-by-item and evaluate it in that way. You know? But there's certainly a reasonable, you know, question or comment.

Statton Hammock: Yes Steve. This is Statton. I think that is - that's a great example to point out there. You know? It's not so flagged as a consensus policy issue. But I would flag it as such, you know, under the, you know, sort of guideline of, you know, new policy.

Steve Metalitz: Though you would, the staff isn't sure. And right, that's helpful.

Well let me just ask if there are any other comments or views from people on the call about this Task 2.

Okay. Well let me put - I'll give you my take on this. I mean, I think we heard from Margie that it's just not - it's probably not practical just to ask the legal staff to go through this point-by-point at this point in the process.

I mean, if they - I don't know how long that would take, but it's got to be - it can't be - it seems like unlikely that we be able to maintain anything like the timetable we've adopted if we did that now.

What I would suggest at, you know, of - I think there's been a lot of opportunities for people to flag these issues. But I'm happy to ask people again on the list, to let us know if they see other top - topics that they think, as Statton has said, for example, on 3.1; that they think ought to be taken off the table or moved away from the center of the table, if you want to put it that way, in RAA amendments. And instead, divert it to the policy development process.

I mean, let's get those views into the, you know, out on the table. And then we can discuss, you know, whether we agree with (unintelligible) which ones command a consensus.

I'll also say I think we've been a little vague about the - how we've carried out Task 2 up till now. I think Statton's question is certainly a very legitimate one; that we've said, "Well maybe this is a, you know, maybe this is a consensus policy issue on 2.2." You know?

Ultimately, if we think it is, we should say so. I mean, that's not determinative. But if we have a consensus on it, let's just put it out there as a declarative statement, rather than gee, maybe there's a question here. So let's all be a little clearer about this.

But let me just ask everybody to go through this matrix over the next week and identify any topics that they think should be taken out of the mix of the RAA amendments, or flagged as presenting these issues as in accordance with Task 2.

But I'm just not - I just don't think we can abandon Task 2 or turn it over to the staff. The staff will definitely have the last word on this. I have no doubt about that; that the legal staff, if, you know, they have plenty of opportunities to intervene in this process. So I'd - I would just suggest that we try to do it here and see if there's - if there are some that we can achieve consensus on.

Let me ask for any reactions or comments on that point or other views on this kind of Question 2 - excuse me, Task 2.

Statton Hammock: Steve I have a - Statton. I have a question. If we do that exercise as you suggest, then what? I mean, we, you know, conceivably will have, you know, a number - as many as the number of people in this working group provide their list of topics that they think we didn't properly identify as being, you know, a consensus policy proposals at - when we did a first task.

So after we get those divergent lists, then how do we - are we going to attempt to reconcile the list and - or just, you know, we have a - now a

sort of second list of things that we, as members individually, have come up with?

Steve Metalitz: Well I think until we see those lists, it's hard to say that. We may find those lists aren't so divergent. It may...

((Crosstalk))

Statton Hammock: That's true. That's true.

Steve Metalitz: ...that most people will agree on certain things.

Statton Hammock: Sure.

Steve Metalitz: Say 2.2, where the first task this question was raised, I would probably agree with that and say maybe that's, you know, a (unintelligible) policy issue. I don't know.

But let's see first if how much divergence there is. It may be we - all we can say is we had divergent views on it and here's what they were. You know?

I think that the Council chose to word flag. It didn't - we're not - what we do in this process doesn't determine the issue. We're just saying, "Someone ought to look at this." You know? "We think this may be better suited for the policy development process."

And if we can come to a consensus on some of those, great. If we have divergent views, we just report our divergent views, I think. I

mean, I'm open to other suggestions on how to proceed on that, certainly.

Okay. Then unless there's anything else on Task 2, let's talk, at least briefly, about Task 3. We had just to review the bidding. We had a straw man that I put forward that called for a negotiating group of - that included ICANN staff, the registrars and representatives of effected groups that were not parties to the contract. There was a strong pushback against that.

And Tim from (unintelligible), who came forward another proposal that we talked about last time. I don't - we had to - I think a good discussion on that, but I'm not sure we updated that document to reflect that. But basically, I think he was talking a - registrars and ICANN negotiating this on their own, but reporting back periodically to a larger group. And I know that had some support.

And then I proposed, in response to Tim's latest proposal on this, was something a little bit - I mean, I actually put forward two proposals.

One is that the group be constituted as I suggested, with the three - a three-sided table if you will. But that there be the opportunity for ICANN and the registrars -- who are ultimately going to be the party signing this contract -- to have confidential sessions if they need to, where confidential information is being discussed. And that there be some procedure for them to step out of the room and do that and then come back into the room.

Or another way that - another suggestion I put forward was that those - that the ICANN - the registrars be the parties to the negotiation, but

that these other groups, other effected entities be granted observer status in the negotiation. And we have a fair amount of experience and rules about what observers can and can't do in GNSO processes generally. And I'm not expert in that, but I know Council members are probably quite familiar with this.

So those were two proposals that I made sort of as a counter to Tim's counter. So that kind of reviews where we are. And I will open the floor for any comments, questions or propose - further proposals - different proposals if people have them. They want to speak on this?

And again, please speak up if you're not - whether you're in the Adobe or not, it's probably easier just to speak up if you want to be heard; want to get on the queue.

Statton Hammock: Steve this is Statton again. Did you just - did you say there was precedent for having observers during the negotiation between two contracted parties and the - within the ICANN...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Well...

Statton Hammock: ...process?

((Crosstalk))

Statton Hammock: Because that strikes me as kind of funny to have - that that would be the case. But I'm not - been involved in ICANN as long enough to know if there's - that's ever occurred.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. I don't think that is what I said. I said there's a lot of precedent for having observer status in a lot of GNSO processes. I didn't...

((Crosstalk))

Statton Hammock: Yes, right, okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...in the contract negotiation.

But, you know, I mean, I think just (unintelligible). Just earlier this week, there was a rather hastily assembled call for ICANN and the registries to talk about changes to the Draft Registry Agreement; that would be that all new gTLD registry operators would be required to sign. And ICANN was quite eager to have observers participating in that. And they, you know, big outreach process.

In fact, they did that also with the consultation that was held in Washington on January 7. So that - I mean, that - it's not - no. That is not a negotiation technically speaking. But in fact, I think it's somewhat equivalent to it. And that the goal was to come up with a contract that ultimately two parties would sign.

And a lot of entities that were not anticipating being parties to that agreement were invited into the room to give their views. So way I think that that's something of a precedent, but I agree. It's not exactly the same as...

Other comments or questions? I see Michele has his hand up in the Adobe room. So Michele did you want to say something on this?

Michele Neylon: Well yes. I have to disagree with your comments there about the registry discussions regarding the new TLDs. I mean, what's currently going on there is a lot to do with the entire new TLD project, which is - yes. At the moment, it's all kind of out there, up in the air a bit.

So it's like kind of, you know, what we're going to do in the situation, in the future. I mean, it's like with a vertical integration with all these other things. I don't - I wouldn't see them as being parallels. I can understand how somebody might wish to use them as a precedent, but I wouldn't accept them as being a precedent.

If it was a case of renegotiating the contracts for existing registry operators, for existing TLDs, but that would be a totally different kettle of fish.

Steve Metalitz: So the distinction you're drawing is that in this case there isn't a relationship - I mean, since these are for the new TLDs, there is not a relationship that...

Michele Neylon: Yes, exactly, because, I mean, for - well the thing is, theoretically speaking, I could end up running a registry for new TLDs. You could end up running a registry for new TLDs. I'm not saying that either of one of us wants to. But it's - at the moment, it's all to play for. And God only knows who is going to end up running registries.

And it's not just a case - the registry contracts have in the new TLD space, will also have a direct impact on the registrars and the registrants. I mean, all three, plus ICANN and everybody else, that

entire - how that entire kind of ecosystem is going to develop and - is up for debate and discussion at present.

Whereas, within the case of the existing contracts that may exist between the registry operators and ICANN, or any contract that exists between ICANN and the registrars, you're talking about an existing contract.

Kristina Rosette: Can I get in the queue Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Kristina did anybody else want to be in the queue at this point? Go ahead Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Just two points. And I understand the point that you're trying to make Michele. But I don't think it's - the analogy is completely on point in the sense that if ICANN were to renegotiate, let's just say an existing contract within an existing new gTLD, it would not be possible for an entity that is currently a third party to kind of choose to become a party to that agreement. It's simply not possible.

That's not the case, though, for the RAA. Any entity that potentially in the future wants to become a registrar is going to be bound by that agreement. I mean, theoretically, I could decided to become a registrar.

But it's a bigger point that I am concerned about -- and I put this out in an email earlier today -- is that part of the reason we are where we are right now is because a significant portion of ICANN community found the process through which the 2009 RAA amendments were completed to be objectionable and inconsistent with the

representations that were made as to inclusiveness and participation. That's why the CSG blocked the amendments the first time they came up to a vote for Council.

The reason we ultimately decided to agree to them - and I can't speak to the NTCN TSG, because I know that one of their issues was also the Registrar Rights Charter, which Group A is working on.

But the only reason that we agreed to vote to approve them was because it was our understanding that there would be -- and it was the intent that there would be developed for the next set of amendments -- a process that was different. And if this process is not going to be different, we're going to end up right back where we started. It will just take longer.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you Kristina. Other comments? Or do people have other thoughts on this topic?

I'll recognize myself while people are deciding whether they have something else that they want to say.

I would just go back also Michele to your second point. I think these negotiations and what emerges from them also affects the entire ecosystem. Certainly, entities that don't - aren't registrars and don't intend to become registrars have just as much stake in how these come out, these - how this discussion comes out as entities that aren't registries and don't intend to become new gTLD registries would have in the discussion that just took place this week.

I mean, and I'm - I feel confident I was not urged by ICANN staff to get involved in that meeting and to that discussion because they thought I was interested in applying to run a registry. Though, I'm not sure that the - this is quite a sharp a distinction as you suggest.

Other comments on Task 3?

Is there - are there any react - I know that I - this was not circulated till less than 24 hours ago, but I wonder if there's any reaction to proposals I made about observer status. I guess we've already - I've already heard some reaction on that.

Or on the proposal; that it just be a three-sided table, but with two sides able to leave the room when they need to and have a private discussion.

Okay. Well let me ask the people to give their thoughts about this on the list. I guess I would encourage Tim -- who is not here -- and Statton -- if you can pass this along to Tim -- or Michele -- who can pass it along to Tim -- let's take his proposal and try to incorporate some of the discussion we had last - in the last meeting.

In fact, I know - I wonder. Maybe the staff could do that, based on the transcript of the last meeting. And try to flesh out Tim's proposal a little bit more. Is that something the staff could try to do?

Woman: Yes, Steve. I can do that.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks. And then let's, you know, we'll have to put that on the - back on the agenda for our next meeting to have further discussion about

Task 3, I think, because obviously we haven't resolved anything even on an interim basis here. But I appreciate everybody's comments and viewpoints on this. And let's see if we can have further discussion on the list as we often say.

Unless there's anything else that people want to say on Task 3, I'd like to talk, at least briefly, about our activities in Brussels. We're aiming here to finish our work before Brussels.

And we've already been asked whether we could take responsibility for some type of workshop or program in Brussels to explain what we've done; to walk through the list of topics, and give our - explain whatever our views end up being on Task 2 and our views on Task 3 as again, as a discussion forum.

And presumably, that would happen at the Brussels meeting before the GNSO Council Meeting, so it would be before the Wednesday meeting so that the Council would have the benefit of that discussion.

And this would be an open meeting as I understand it. You know? Anybody who attends the Brussels meeting or is there by remote participation could join.

So although we are far from completing our work, I don't think it's too early to be thinking about this. And I'd like to solicit anybody's suggestions for how we ought to structure that.

Or, I guess, I first ask the staff -- am I on the right wavelength here, in terms of this being a likely step? Assuming that we get our draft report done before Brussels, wouldn't it be that we - that would make sense

for us to plan to - some type of workshop or similar public forum on this topic?

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Yes Steve.

Woman: Go ahead Margie.

Margie Milam: Oh, okay. Yes. I do think that that would be an appropriate step. There's a lot of interest in the amendments process. And I think that will be a session that would be very well attended.

Steve Metalitz: Did someone else wanted to speak? I thought I heard somebody else.

Woman: Oh, that was Liz just jumping in when Margie answered the question.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Woman: And we just would want to plan a, you know, a room, and try to get a good time and all of that challenge.

Steve Metalitz: Other comments on this?

I mean, I guess my - I'll be glad to say a little bit of what I've thought about on this. And that is that we might, you know, most of our topics here came from one of three or four sources. And we might think about asking representatives of sources, if you will, to be part of this presentation. And then, obviously, members of the drafting team as well.

IPC had a working group that made a number of suggestions. The law enforcement group made a number of suggestions as we know. And then the staff group made a number of suggestions. So those would be three kind of obvious presenters on some of these topics. And then others from the, you know, our group could certainly be (unintelligible) and, you know...

You have to plan this much detail right now. But at least get the idea on the table and to - and ask the staff to try to work with us to find the best time and - date and time for this. Again, prior to the Council meeting on Wednesday in Brussels, And see if we can move forward from there.

I guess I - I'll ask this on the list as well, but maybe it's useful just to ask those on the call today, who's planning to be in Brussels, and therefore, a potential recruit to be part of our workshop once we...

I - my plan is to attend the Brussels meeting. I don't know if anybody else knows yet whether they're going to be there. Cheryl will be in Brussels.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Do go ahead.

Woman: Well first, I'll be there.

But second, and I guess this is really a question for staff along with my preference, in that I don't know that to what extent it would be

anticipated that whatever session we would have would cover both Teams A and B. I, frankly, have no idea where Team A stands on its work.

But my preference would be, frankly, to just limit it to this, simply because there's a lot of substance here. And there's a lot of diverging views. And I think it would be important to have as much time as the schedule will permit to really allow people to talk, and discuss and understand.

Margie Milam: Yes. I'm sure - yes. And this is Margie. Yes, I agree. This topic is going to take a lot of time. And I don't think that there's anything, you know, pending that - from the other group that would necessitate it having inclusion in the session. So I'm - I think that's the - probably the right approach.

Woman: All right. thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Other thoughts on this topic? Michele has his hand up and I assume it's on this topic, so go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Just to confirm that I will be in Brussels, assuming that Iceland doesn't explode in the mean time.

Woman: You could take a boat.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Let's move on beyond that please. You do realize that both Ireland and the U.K. are completely shut down. There was - there are no planes in the skies.

Woman: No, I know. That's why I was suggesting you take a boat.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yes. But I mean, I don't think - I think the boats will be a little bit in demand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sorry Michele. I have images of you in a rowboat.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Floating for me, I'm sorry.

Michele Neylon: Oh, come on now Cheryl. You've seen me in a tux so...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know. I just saw the image of you in a tux and you were in the rowboat (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Oh, God. What an image.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. I hope you're wearing a life jacket anyway.

Michele Neylon: I think I've got my own buoyancy at this stage.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Anything else on the Brussels topic?

Okay. The last item we have on our agenda is really just to mention that we did receive and Glen circulated - I think there was three or four

letters from various groups -- Interpol and the Octopus group -- which I - it sounds kind of menacing. And I think, I don't - we don't want them in our rowboat anyway.

And there were a couple of other's letters that were supportive of the law enforcement proposals. And I guess this is a follow on to the statements in the GAC communiqué about the law enforcement proposals. So, yes. I think there's a letter from Interpol. A letter - a message from the Octopus Conference, which is part of the Council of Europe. And from the G8 Lyon-Roma Group High Tech Crime Subgroup. So you all have those.

And I don't think there's any action necessarily required. I think we determined last - on our last call that these law enforcement proposals are the same ones that we've been looking at throughout and had a whole session on with Bobby Flaim from the FBI.

And so they're definitely in the mix. And I don't know that we need to do anything more. But just wanted to note for the record this very strong statement of interest and support from these various international groups - law enforcement groups on these proposals.

I don't know if anybody else has any additional thoughts on this. I see Cheryl and Michele. Cheryl go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Steve. I think what it does do and what we should know, that I agree. This is no particular action item to say to come out of it. But having cabled those documents - and I think it's very important that, you know, it was very specific from the GAC's point of

view that they do be passed on to us for our attentions and at least note.

It is a mechanism of bringing considerable warning to us. And (unintelligible) knows that the (EGAC) is highly interested in the particular aspects of the work we're doing. And to that end, it probably a very good idea to get presences from that particular part of the spectrum in the Brussels presentations as well.

Steve Metalitz: Excellent suggestion. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes. The thing that I've - the thing, I suppose, that concerns me as small this is, but unless I'm misreading things, the documents that have been circulated are identical to the ones that we discussed previously.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: So I supposed what concerns me there is that although we discussed our concerns and tried to understand what exactly they were looking for, and as opposed to what they were asking for, which is they're all the same thing. It - they seem to have just kind of shoved that out there without making any changes whatsoever and that does concern me.

And as well as what some of you know, coming from a country which doesn't have the GAC representative or any other representative, I feel a little bit powerless.

Steve Metalitz: Cheryl did you...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. I was writing. I thought Michele might pick up a point that I realized I'd dropped before I passed the microphone on. And I certainly hear what Michele says. But I did want to mention, of course, whilst I understand this may be a gathering of the troops and trooping of the color exercise on the issue by GAC to defend that. And that's fine too. Let's have a game just implied.

What is important is that we did have that meeting with Bobby. And there were particular action items and closing of loop issues. There was a whole bunch of things that he said, "Oh, thank you for that perspective. We will now take that into consideration. And we will get back to you on this."

So we actually go back and close that loop. We need to revisit that whole area of discussion, because it was a dialog where both aspects of a regional points of view shifted. And there was an undertaking for us to have further input from them. I think we need to make that happen.

Michele Neylon: Just coming back on that, if you don't mind. I mean, the thing from my perspective was, you know, if I felt that the conversation we'd had with Bobby was very, very productive. And that - and I felt a hell of a lot more comfortable after that.

And then when you see these documents coming out months later, with absolutely no change, no consideration, nothing further on anything that we had discussed with him, it's quite depressing. I mean, I could come up with a special word, but I think I'll just stick with

depressing. And you've got to think to yourself, you know, "What is the point?"

I'm bashing, you know, we're trying to understand what it is that they're trying to achieve, seeing how best to do so in a manner that works for everybody. But then throw this thing out. And well, it's not particularly encouraging.

Steve Metalitz: We have comments on this?

Margie Milam: Yes. Steve it's Margie. After we had the call with Bobby Flaim and, you know, we can look all that after that, I actually went back, read the transcript, and updated our notes to include some of the areas where he made some concessions on. You know? Where their proposals might, you know, vary. So I know that the latest version of the document we have, you know, includes some of that information.

I actually did not see a document like - that explains their current position. It just seemed to be a high-level, you know, description of what they were looking for. But it's possible I missed it.

The only detail that I was aware of was the documents that were shared by Bobby early on, you know, in where ever October of last year. So Michele or anyone else, if you've actually more detail, please forward it. And I'll, you know, take a look at it.

Steve Metalitz: I think we've confirmed that there is no additional document. We talked about that last time. There isn't a new document. At least that's what I was told by Bobby and...

Margie Milam: Yes. And I was told the same thing. So that's why I felt pretty comfortable that our spreadsheet, you know, included some of those concessions. And I think, you know, and I wasn't going to pull it up right now, but I know that I revised it to incorporate some of that; the discussion that we had.

Steve Metalitz: All right. Well, you know, the ball is kind of in our court in this sense; that I think when we get our revised version of the matrix, I think it will reflect some of the - hopefully, it will reflect a lot of this. The discussion with Bobby and other input so...

Part of this is a communications gap that probably some of the people sending these letters aren't aware of what we've been doing. Even though the matrix has been on publicly archived, mailing list isn't exactly, you know, prominent so that...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not front page - it's not front-page reading for the majority of the world, surprisingly enough.

Steve Metalitz: So they really - and they'd just be unaware of this. But I think - I guess - I think our best way of taking this view onboard is to move as quickly as we can to finalize our document - or our draft document and get that out there. And get the actions of the law enforcement people, as well as everybody else.

And also as Cheryl has suggested, if - assuming we have a workshop in Brussels, let's get law enforcement input as well.

And I see Cheryl and Michele have their hands up. Was this - is this something...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no. We both put them up again. But I'm going to cede to the depressed Michele, because I need to support my depressed colleague. So you're first now Michele. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Oh, thank you Cheryl. But I think the thing Steve, I think you're being very generous to them about this, because the - whether the documents that they're using for the basis of all this has changed or not, wasn't what concerned me most in the last few weeks.

I mean, some members of law enforcement were speaking of various events across Europe. And they made references to various things that were in that document. And the things that we had discussed with Bobby that, you know, could be - I'm not talk - looking in case of her toning it down. But let's just say modify it in such a manner that you would end up...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yes. We're looking at breaking the Internet.

But if the fear I have with some of the stuff that's - that law enforcement are trying to push is that you'd end up in a - you could end up in a situation where, sure, you might not have any bad guys, but you wouldn't have any space for any good guys either. And that's something which does concern me a lot.

And I don't believe that to - it would be going easy on them will actually help us in any regard. And obviously, since I'm not a shy little wallflower, I'm more than happy to take that up with them myself.

Plus, I think it would be useful for us as a group to formally go back to law enforcement and say -- look guys, you know, you had this conversation with us; we have notes; we have transcripts of the conversation you had with us. Have you changed, modified, taken onboard, done anything with anything that was discussed, or are you going to blindly continue down this route as if you never actually had the conversation with us in the first place?

Steve Metalitz: Well Michele, I guess what I would suggest is that if you think we need to respond more formally than we have, I'd invite you to draft something, and put circulated on the list and let's respond.

Kristina Rosette: Can I get in the queue after Cheryl please Steve?

Steve Metalitz: You can. But as I indicated, I have a hard stop now so I'm going to...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...off here. I'm going to pass the gavel, if I can, to Margie. Margie are you in the position to Chair the rest of the meeting?

Margie Milam: Yes, that's fine.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thanks everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Bye Steve.

Woman: Thank you.

Margie Milam: Okay. Go ahead Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: No, no, no. Cheryl go ahead.

Margie Milam: Oh, Cheryl. Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, we're easily confused aren't we? Thanks Margie.

Look, I just think that what we should be doing is (unintelligible) particular issue into an opportunity. I (unintelligible) see it. It's a good point for us to revisit our discussions, and conversations, and our perceived perceptions and assumptions we made when we met body - Bobby. And I'm sure, whether we'll have a hell of a lot of time to do that and do the other body of work between now and Brussels.

So I was going to propose that not only in Brussels should we be looking at the particular - with particular granularity at most of the work we had - we are doing. And hopefully, our report by then. And digging in a public format way to - with granted - granularity to - with the whole set of issues.

But it might be quite appropriate to have because of GAC's interest, and people having a mismatch on GAC reactions about oh, this all sounds very good because it keeps us safe. And besides, law enforcement thought it was a good idea type responses, to thinking more deeply about -- yes, but at what cost; and how is it going to actually work?

These are sorts of questions which are very, very fruitful to explore in a panel or hypothetical situation. So we might actually look at two proposals.

One, the straight workshop system that we discussed earlier. But I wouldn't mind putting on the table a possibility so it does involve GAC. It does involve proponents from industry.

And so if like Michele's happy if he gets his rowboat there to sit at the table and do this, to have this whole frank and serious discussion in a public forum, even if it's in a little mini hypothetical or shortish sort of panel.

It would satisfy community interest and needs. It would help raise the skill set and knowledge of us all. It would be very accountable and very transparent. And I think it would get a big kick from the nervous Nellies in parts of the GAC.

Margie Milam: Kristina were you next in the queue?

Kristina Rosette: I believe I was. I think that is an excellent suggestion Cheryl; which suggests to me that at a minimum, I guess we're looking at probably

Monday afternoon in a practical manner, because I think, you know, the GAC folks don't really start working until Sunday and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree. And if you don't think that GAC is interested in, they wanted Monday afternoon. And I'm happy to bring it forward in the Joint (FLAC) Chair's forum for that reason. If it were...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: Well, and quite frankly...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...if the workgroup wants it.

Kristina Rosette: Well and I speaking personally, would shed no tears if the - replaced the - that kind of joint (ARAC) - the ACFO thingy that (unintelligible). But I do think that's an excellent idea.

I guess the only other question that I would have is, you know, I had - have kind of been trying to figure out exactly what - when are we going to be done? And whether the expectation of those of us in the group is that once we have presented our report to the Council, we have the session, is the expectation that the Council then picks it up, or that we would go back?

Only because just looking at the original resolution, we're coming close to being at a year behind.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I know it's recorded, but can I just say shit happens? Be there.

Kristina Rosette: Well I know but I guess I would personally like to keep it at, you know, a year or less, other than more.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll just lead back to my previous comment.

Woman: So yes. And if I could follow up on that. I mean, you know, that you talk about sending it to the GNSO Council. But, you know, we also may want to open a public comment period on this as well. So, you know, that extends your time period as well if that were - be one of the steps undertaken.

Margie Milam: Michele you have a question?

Michele Neylon: Well two things. First off, I would very strongly support Cheryl's suggestion. I think that would - I think, you know, I think getting - if you can get law enforcement's GAC ties and other interested parties from industry, whatever, in the same room, to have an open and frank discussion, debate, argument, whatever. Then I think that would help a lot, because I personally feel that a lot of these - a lot of the people within politics are easily swayed by the what-are-the-poor-children type arguments.

I mean, we've already seen this...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: We've already seen this happen in Europe with the data retention directive. And if you're not familiar with it, I mean, it's - it would be - I - the spirit of it was - is not apparent. The spirit of it is fantastic and commendable. The reality is that it puts an enormous burden on a

whole range of entities. It actually doesn't solve the problem that we're trying to resolve in the first instance.

So the entire thing is like rice. You've got the thing for, you know, looking after the poor children. Of course - and that's, of course, the Catholic church is involved. And then you...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...can forget that. It's another (unintelligible). So anyway the other...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Oh, my. How we going to keep...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...with regards to timelines and everything else, while I appreciate that people would like to get things done quickly - I can't remember which working group that was in.

But, I mean, I think we're better off doing is doing a properly rather than quickly, because ultimately, if you want to make significant changes which are meant to improve things, then you're better off doing is doing this in such a manner that you don't have to revisit again - revisit it again as soon as you've managed the gas.

Sixty or 70% of the markers - the market I signed up. By the market, I mean, as in registrar controlling add back percentage of the markets,

which I think in some respects is what happened with the last amendment.

But no sooner had it been agreed on, then people were unhappy and wanted to go back on us. So rather than that ending up in this kind of ridiculous cycle where you go through an entire RAA revision cycle. You eventually manage to get something out the door. And then almost immediately, you have to start all over again, which I think is a little bit silly.

So, you know, that's just my personal take on it.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, no, no. And just, you know, to the extent that anyone thought I was saying, you know, we maybe get it done quickly if they had (unintelligible) right. That wasn't at all what I intended to say.

And I guess I had a follow-up question for you Michele.

Michele Neylon: Sure.

Kristina Rosette: I have no idea what you're talking about when you're referring to these more recent law enforcement statements. Are there transcripts or report anywhere?

Michele Neylon: There's been a bunch. I monitor a lot of key words, both on Twitter and Google, so I see a lot of the - these articles appearing.

There was a law enforcement meeting in the U.K., I think, within the last month or so. And just the - what was being reported in a lot of the kind of the press was kind of - seemed to me to be almost verbatim.

Like sections pulled from the documents that we've seen. And it be -
and various people within law enforcement.

I mean, some of them would have been kind of unknown entities. But
others are known entities. They're the kind of people that I'll end up
bargaining with at the DNS abuse forums; those kind of people. Oh,
they're great guys. Don't get me wrong.

Plus, you know, it was - I can probably - I'll see if I can dig something
out. A few links. But with - there are several ones mainly in the U.K.
press that I saw this stuff appearing. I think, you know, the likes of say
Guardian Technology, BBC Technology and Computer whatever the
hell it is; a few of those ones. I think U.K. ones.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Michele Neylon: I don't think I saw any on the register. But it was mainly in those ones.
If I get a chance, I'll see if I can dig you out something.

Kristina Rosette: That would be great.

Michele Neylon: I think there was some meeting or other within the last month or so and
this sparked off this entire thing. So it was like kind of out of nowhere. It
was like suddenly, boom, law enforcement, you know, flexing their
muscles.

And the way they were doing it is as a - it just - it gave me the distinct
impression - okay, obviously, I'm going to be slightly more sensitive to
it than somebody who isn't a registrar - or who is - or who doesn't get
all the stuff from (Eurispa). And, yes, I just kind of went, "Oh, hold on a

second. You know? What the hell is this about?" This is like kind of, you know, that entire dialog never happened.

Kristina Rosette: Yes.

Michele Neylon: And - or some of the side conversations I've had with law enforcement on various events over the last couple of years, because I deal with the - with some of these - well I don't deal with them. I bump into them at other events in Europe.

So I don't know. It's just - it does more - it just concerns me that you would end up with a similar type scenario as is at - what happened with the data retention directives in Europe. And which if you're not familiar with them, you know, it was a kind of - you've got an EU-wide directive, which has one body of text but, of course, totally ignores the technical implementation of it.

And then you have each member state going off and implementing it in its own way.

And the variance in the implementation is scary. It varies from 6 months to 2 years. And it doesn't actually solve the problem, because they're talking about retaining certain logs. But they're also talking about not changing a whole load of other things.

So you end up in this ridiculous situation where somebody's able to go back to the constituents and go, "But look what we've done. Aren't we great? Aren't we wonderful?" Pat on back. And all the ISPs and everything else are going, "Oh, my God. The only people who are going to gain from this are people who make hard drives and mass

storage arrays." Because we're going to end up having to store this data for a stupid amount of time.

And by the way, nobody's actually worked out how on earth you're going to be able to extract the data from the logs. And if you ever - and if you...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Stop bringing (unintelligible) into the issue Michele. You know that doesn't work in politics.

Michele Neylon: Oh, here. I'll give you one little story that's - I'll keep this brief.

About a year ago we were contacted by the Irish police to help in an investigation of some kind of serious crime or other, which involved something to do with some Web site that we hosted.

We host thousands of Web sites. And to be perfectly honest, I have no idea what we host and I'm keeping it that way.

And they sent down two guys from Dublin. Now we're an hour and a half drive from. So they sent two guys down in a car. So they - at the time for them to come down, they came into our offices, introduced themselves and then disappeared for lunch. Came back again.

And then had to spend like two hours with one of my technical staff trying to - so my technical staff were actually explaining to them what the hell they were looking at, because it wasn't simply a case of them collecting the logs. They didn't even know what they were looking at.

Then you give them the log file and go, "Here. Here's the log file." And they're scratching their heads going, you know, "What is that?"

So you're going to have to go off and teach them TCP/IP, and basic HTTP codes and, you know, various other things. I mean, the entire thing was just ridiculous. But, you know, that's the fun part of us. You know? Fun and games. Fun and games.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It sounds like we need to market - if I may. Sorry. I didn't put my hand up. (Unintelligible) hidey-pidey demanding of me for my next meeting. She's trying to get (unintelligible) to set up for two hours time. Difficult to work. They send me nasties occasionally. No it's not.

Look, I think what we do need to do is post to the list the concept of a two-prong approach, a traditional workshop, which I think should if at all happen before the all-singing, all-dancing, more exciting for the public, and press and everything else, topic of the law enforcement needs.

And so I think we need to look at scheduling and timing, in fact, very carefully; that I'm happy to take it forward, you know, at the (Croft) chairing level, which does have mandated influence on time tabling, as some of the staff will know quite frankly. Time tabling at these meetings to get a good in view on the mandate, if that is the feeling of the wider workgroup. But I would need to know that relatively fast.

So if we could get some feedback from the list and some others.
Clearly, Michele and I and those that's on the call think it's a good idea.
But there's more to be considered than just us.

Margie Milam: Okay Cheryl. I will - I'll send a note to the list and we'll solicit additional input on that. But I appreciate your volunteering to push that Board, if that's where the working group ends up...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. I'm more than happy to volunteer. I'll moderate. I'll do a song and dance routine. I'm very, very keen on getting this one sorted.

Margie Milam: Great. Well...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I appreciate that Cheryl.

Margie Milam: Oh. So now we're about 15 past the hour. Should we go ahead and close the call. Or is there's anyone that wants to make final comments before we sign off.

Woman: No.

Margie Milam: Okay. Well thank you everybody for...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Cheryl...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...please call me. Oh, my God.

Margie Milam: All right. Everyone have a good week. Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Good-bye.

Woman: Good-bye. Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

Michele Neylon: All right. Bye. Bye-bye.

END