

Transcript

GAC/GNSO issues related to International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Red Cross (RC) names discussion group teleconference **26 September 2012 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GAC/GNSO issues related to International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Red Cross (RC) names discussion group teleconference held on Wednesday 26 September 2012 at 1800 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-gac-ioc-20120926-en.mp3>

Attendees

Jeff Neuman - Registry SG group leader
Wolfgang Kleinwachter – NCUC
Lanre Ajayi - Nominating Committee Appointee
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Chuck Gomes - RySG
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
David Heasley - IPC
Jim Bikoff – IPC
Stéphane Hankins – International Committee of the Red Cross
Thomas Rickert - Nominating Committee Appointee
Osvaldo Novao -ISPC

Apology :

Avri Doria – NCSG
J.Scott Evans – IPC
Gregory Shatan – IPC
Mary Wong - NCUC
Brian Peck

ICANN Staff
Margie Milam
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IOC call on the 26th of September, 2012.

On the call today we have Jeff Neuman, Lanre Ajayi, Kiran Malancharuvil, Wolfgang Kleinwachter, Chuck Gomes, Alan Greenberg, (Jim) Bikoff and (Stefan Hanking).

We have apologies from Avri Doria, Greg Shatan, and J. Scott Evans.

From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much, and over to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Nathalie. And I also see that (unintelligible) (David Heasley) is also on the call, just for the record.

Okay, great. So today is the day that we had set for responses to the consent (call). And I believe that we have now responses from the IPC. And Chuck will talk about the registries. I've not heard anything from the registrars, which is not unusual since they - I don't think they've had a regular participant.

Alan has forwarded a statement from one of the members of ALAC. And Alan, I'll ask you about the status of that.

So we have not heard - is there anyone from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group that's on?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes, it's me, Wolfgang.

Jeff Neuman: Hey, Wolfgang, great.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Do you guys have a statement or a position that you're able to communicate during this call?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes, more or less, (yes).

So we have not formally agreed on a paper, but we have more or less a joint position.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, great. And then who am I missing? The IPC we have a separate comment. The (BC) and the (ISP)s we've not heard anything from.

So all of that said, I think we can still put - I still think we should put the document out for public comment after this call so that we can solicit more feedback. Either way, their (unintelligible) (express) whether there's agreement or disagreement with the recommendations.

Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Jeff, thanks. Two things with regard to the IPC. J. Scott did send a message in that regard that I think accomplishes what we needed.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I'm sorry. If I said IPC, I meant to say (ISP), sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And secondly, with regard to the registrars, in my opinion because they haven't actively participated in this group, the discussion group can still make a statement of some level of support -- even though they didn't participate -- based on the participants who were active in the group.

So anyway, that's it, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So why don't we then go through - so since we mentioned the IPC statement, why don't we just take a quick look at that statement.

I think their basic position is, as they discussed last week, the week before, pretty much in line, which is the fact that they do not believe necessarily that a (PDP) has to be done or that it's necessary. They think that there's enough there for the justifications for the protections.

But nonetheless, that they do support - they do believe that there's some level of consensus on doing the (PDP). So they are okay with the compromise so long as there's a temporary reservation of the IOC/RC names on the second level, pending the outcome of the recommended (PDP).

So I think that statement will be filed along with any of the other statements that we've received so that we could put those in the record and also as part of the public comment period.

So I think that's pretty much in line with what they said for the last several weeks. I don't have any questions on that. Does anyone have any questions on the IPC paper? Or statement, sorry?

(Jim) Bikoff: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes sure, (Jim).

(Jim) Bikoff: I was just going to say that one of the points that was discussed -- since I'm also a member of the IPC -- is that it would be better -- according to many in the IPC -- if the IOC/RC issue was not lumped in with the IGO issue, but kept separate, whether it's, you know, within the same (PDP) or separate ones. Since there are differences in what's been done in those two issue resolutions.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I was going to - thanks (Jim). And I was going to talk about that as well. So, I mean, I understand that view and I don't necessarily disagree with that view.

I think though our group really is tasked with just commenting on the IOC/RC and it's really up to the council as a whole as to whether they want to separate the (PDP)s or not. And I'm not sure that there's necessarily consensus in this group that they should be treated differently.

But let me turn it around to the other people on the call. So Chuck and Alan?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jeff, it's Chuck. Just in my opinion, one (PDP) is much more efficient and realistic than two. But in having read the statement that Jeff forwarded just a few minutes ago, and listening to Jim right now, there's no reason during a (PDP) that each of the categories -- IGOs and then Red Cross/IOC - - could be considered on their own merits.

I see no problem with one (PDP) accomplishing what you want and we could - that could be designed specifically into the charter for the (PDP), worked out during the process of the (PDP) or whatever.

But I think what your - if I understand your objectives correctly, it's perfectly achievable in one (PDP). Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Chuck. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. My recollection is the final wording we ended up with says a (PDP) for Red Cross/IOC, which we believe - or there's in inference just because of the way the preliminary issue report was worded that they will be lumped into a single issue report where the council chooses to divide that into multiple (PDP)s, or the people who draft the scope put it within the bounds of the (PDP) working group to separate the discussions. I think that remains to be seen and is out of our hands.

I know from an at-large point-of-view, there's going to be a very strong push to separate IOC from Red Cross regardless of how they're grouped with the other issues.

So I think all of that is up for grabs. And I don't - I think our requirement is that in the long term there be a (PDP) on the IOC and Red Cross issues. How council handles that is a little bit out of our scope.

Jeff Neuman: And let me go to (Margie) because - probably comment on that.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes. This is Wolfgang. You know, we had a discussion. And those of you know there is a majority of people in our constituency group that the IOC and the Red Cross are two different issues and those are the - in the government organizations are different issues.

But we think it could be done within one (PDP) and then taking into account the specifics of the various elements. So we would not be in favor of two (PDP)s, so I would fully support the position of Chuck.

Jeff Neuman: Let me go to - I don't want to get too bogged down into whether we separate the IOC and the Red Cross or whether we separate the IOC/Red Cross from the IGO. (Unintelligible) issue.

So let me turn it over to (Margie).

(Margie): Yes, just really quickly I wanted to say the same thing. As I've been working on the preliminary issue reporting converting that into the final issue report that should be published this week. It's going to be up to the council as to whether, you know, whether it breaks it out into separate issues.

But the issue report that we've written covers both, and so it could be one (PDP) and it, you know, and it's really up to council on how they plan to manage it.

So I just wanted to concur with what you're saying, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (Margie). And it's the same reason that, you know, there's also a statement from the (UPU) that was just sent in from Chuck. The (UPU) is a member of the Registry Stakeholder Group, but obviously they have a strong interest in IGO needs as well.

They have drafted some language, and I don't know if that could be posted, those revisions. Is that possible, Berry or (Margie)?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Give me a second, the PDF and I'll put it into Adobe Connect.

Jeff Neuman: Cool, okay. So while you're doing that, basically there's a revision in the first recommendation that lumps the IGO (PDP) and the IOC/RCRC (PDP)s together. Which I think is, again, kind of beyond the mandate of this (group).

I think the way it's worded right now is actually the right way, which is that we recommend (unintelligible) (PDP) for the IOC/RC protections. And it's up to council if they want to kind of comingle the two together, the two being the IGOs and the IOC/RCRC together. Or, as Alan has suggested and others, whether they separate the IOC from the RCRC, that's really up to council.

So when that revision comes up you'll see what I mean and why I think given the two comments, I think it's just best (unintelligible) council.

It's coming. For those of you listening to the recording, the email that Chuck Gomes has sent to the IOC/RCRC Drafting Team just a few minutes before this call.

Yes, so if you could see the recommendation, it now says the Drafting Team recommends that an expedited (PDP) is required to determine the appropriate protections for - well I think the word "for" should still be there, but for IGO names and abbreviations, as well as IOC/RC names and the names of other international organizations.

I think that it should go back to the regular - the language that we had there before. Because again, I mean, I understand the (UPU) wants to strongly encourage the (PDP) on the IGOs, but I think that's beyond the mandates for our group to put into Recommendation 1.

Does anyone disagree with that or have another point of view?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I agree with what you just said. We have not discussed the general IGO issue at all and I think we have no basis for making a recommendation that a (PDP) is necessary on the IGO issue.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: And I also agree, Jeff, so I'm not raising my hand to disagree.

But I did want to point out that that in my response to (Ricardo Guillermo) from the (UPU) -- which just occurred about ten minute ago -- I told him, I said regardless I think the results of - whether we use the original wording or their amended wording, I think the intent or the hope maybe of this group is that (PDP) or (PDP)s -- whichever happens -- for both occur.

So I don't think the end result is much different either way. And that's what I communicated to (Ricardo) and asked him to correct me if I misunderstood him.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think you're right as far as the end result. But I think using those words in our group's recommendation, you're really - we're going to be susceptible

to kind of scope creep. Even though the end result is likely the same, I just, you know, I want to keep our recommendations really narrowly focused so that the council can broaden it as much as they want. But...

Chuck Gomes: And I agree with you on that. And I will communicate to (Ricardo) that that's another issue that comes into play.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, all right. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Again, I'll support it. I think there's no basis for saying IGO.

I'll point out that in 2007 council decided not to act on IGOs in terms of a dispute mechanism which was being suggested. And one of the rationales was don't worry, it's going to be addressed in the new gTLD process, which it wasn't.

I can't imagine in this day and age council not approving a (PDP) at this point. I won't predict what the outcome is, but we can't bury our heads in the sand to the extent that we say, "No, let's not do it." So...

Jeff Neuman: I think that's right. I think it's a very low threshold for a (PDP), as we all know. But anyway, in any case let's not adopt that language from the (UPU) in the first paragraph.

And I think the same thing holds for the second - I know it's being taken down for the second paragraph that's in there. I think the way we worded it is fine, which says that we recognize that there is this IGO final issue report that's going to be delivered to the council shortly. And in fact, maybe by the time this posted that'll already be there.

So I think our original wording is better there as well. People agree or disagree with that one?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I have a question on timing. I think the publication deadline for the Toronto meeting has already passed. Are we going to be able to discuss the IGO issue and the (PDP) there? Question for staff.

(Margie): Yes -- (Margie) -- if I can respond.

We look at that deadline as more for the more formal meetings. The stuff that relates to the GNSO working, you know, like motions and all that kind of stuff you go by the eight-day rule for being able to submit a motion.

So yes, from a staff perspective, we're expecting conversations on the issue reports.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Okay, great. So - all right, I think just going quickly through the comments.

Number 2 is the same thing. I think, you know, so it pretty much looks like with all the (UPU) comments that we're just rejecting all of their changes. We can certainly thank them for it in our rationale. We can acknowledge getting it, but our rationale is really just that -- as Berry's scrolling down -- our rationale is really just that, you know, it's beyond the scope of our group to consider the IGO.

At this point it's a council issue and not a Drafting Team issue. Especially because the final issue report should be coming out.

Chuck, you have an additional comment?

Chuck, are you on mute or do you have an (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that, I was on mute. I got another call I had to take and I put myself on mute.

Okay, I agree with what you say, so no disagreement at all in terms of scope for this group. But I do want to point out a little more significance, I think, in terms of results to the (UPU)s Recommendation Number 2 because it would add some list of IGO exact matches to the IOC/RCRC list in the temporary reservation period.

So I'm not advocating for that. I just want to make clear that that's what's being said here. I agree with our limited scope, so I'm not disagreeing with that, I'm just trying to fairly represent the (UPU).

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thank you, Chuck. And thank you for pointing that out too, because I just - we read it really quickly. You're right, that would e a huge substantive change.

And then in Number 3, again, it's the same thing. It's just it's kind of beyond the scope of this. We didn't discuss the IGO names and abbreviations. So for us to communicate anything to the GAC on the IGO just, again, wouldn't be - and (3B) is the same as 2. So yes, no, I think we could take this document down. I think we'll convey the thoughts of the group to the (UPU), thank them for their submission and not being dismissive at all, but just the reality of what we discussed and what our mandate was.

Chuck, is it (a new one)?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, it is. And I just want to close it for the (RYSG). The Registry Stakeholder Group does support the recommendation.

Jeff Neuman: Great, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: You know, there were those minor exceptions from the (UPU), but we support it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, great. I notice that (Thomas) and Osvaldo have joined the call. So thank you for joining us.

And we were just going through, you know, our respective groups' discussions. We talked through the IPC. We talked through the Registry Stakeholder Group.

I was going to next turn to Alan because I know Alan had submitted a paper from one of its members which actually was certainly - it's a lengthy document and I have not had a chance to read, it does a antitrust analysis.

But Alan, what's the status - before I ask you about that, like what is the status? Does the ALAC have a recommendation or it's still just in discussion?

Alan Greenberg: The ALAC does have a recommendation. It was an interesting meeting yesterday, but we did come (unintelligible).

The bottom line is the ALAC is supporting the recommendation. It was a difficult decision. And in fact, if the ALAC had rules similar to the GNSO where abstentions count as no votes, it would've been a tie.

Our rule, however, does discount abstentions and there was a majority of the votes cast that were in favor of supporting the recommendation.

Jeff Neuman: So just to drill down a little bit on that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Did you separate it out? In other words, did the ALAC support the (PDP) but not the moratorium? Or - sorry, the members that disagreed with the

recommendations, was there kind of a split there with respect to whether it was just on the (PDP) issue, just on the moratorium issue or both?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I believe there was close to unanimity on the requirement for a (PDP) certainly in the long term.

On the issue of the interim protection there was more of a split. As I mentioned before, if we were voting separately on the IOC and Red Cross, I think there would've been support for the Red Cross but not support for the IOC.

However, that has been discussed in this group. It never got enough interest in other members to include it in the short list that we kept on narrowing down. So it's not in the recommendation we're talking about today.

But the bottom line is the ALAC did support the recommendation as currently phrased.

My position with - my personal - we didn't discuss this and I'm not sure what the outcome would've been. Is I tend to agree with the IPC in that - or semi-agree in that I don't believe a (PDP) was necessary for the first round.

This Drafting Team was chartered. We made a recommendation on the first level protection, which the GNSO passed on. I think we were fully empowered to do the same thing on the second level, if we had chosen to. We didn't.

But in the long term, given there's clearly enough time to do a (PDP) before the second round, I believe it warrants a (PDP) because it is a (substantive) issue.

And my, again, personal opinion not discussed is I would've preferred to see in our recommendation that the organizations could register their own names.

It's not there and I'm not totally unhappy in the public comment period. And in fact when the board chooses to implement something, you know, there's opportunities for that to go in if there's enough reason...

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...that that supported. So I can certainly live with not including that. I believe it could be fixed at a later stage despite our recommendation if all parties agree.

So yes, the ALAC, despite a lot of discussion and despite some people vehemently believing that we should not provide any preliminary or interim protection, the final vote did indicate that we are supporting the position.
Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Alan. And can you - just for the record, can you just send a short email to the list with that view?

Alan Greenberg: I will. Oh, you asked me about the comment on the paper I submitted. That is a paper submitted by one person. I have some problems with it because there used to be more comingling - similar to the (UPU) comments that there seems to be more comingling of the long-term IGO issue with the immediate issue there. But it's very much the opinion of one person and, you know, the points may be relevant or not, but it has not been approved by the ALAC.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks then, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: And the preface clearly says that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Okay, thank you.

Let me now turn to Wolfgang. If you're ready to just talk about the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group's position at this point.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: As I said already in my first intervention, the broad line is similar to the (Unintelligible) Advisory Committee. We can monitor (unintelligible) just a recommendation as it stands now. We believe in the long run we'll need (PDP) and we have some different opinions, you know, for the interim period.

As I made also clear, we think one (PDP) would be enough. But the (PDP) should be - give space for individual treatment of various categories and we are the belief that if it comes down to very concrete discussions, then the IOC case is different from the Red Cross case. The Red Cross case, and then we have Intergovernmental Organizations, IGOs, which are different from international organizations.

So this has to be all discussed if it comes to one (PDP). But for the moment, I think, you know, the text of the recommendations, the language as it stands has been, let's say, a rough consensus in the constituency.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks Wolfgang.

And Osvaldo, do you have any feedback from your group?

Osvaldo Novoa: Yes. Our group supported - so they all supported the proposed recommendation. We would have liked to include all the IGOs in general, but we know it's not possible at this moment. And the recommendation (unintelligible) I think is a good compromise.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thank you, Osvaldo.

Let me now turn to - I think I've covered the - let me just go - (BC), still no one on from the (BC)?

Okay. So before I get to the comments from the Red Cross and the Olympics - the IOC, can I just turn to (Thomas). Do you have any thoughts you wanted to have included in the record or statement or anything?

(Thomas): I think my position has not changed since I made my last intervention (unintelligible) (cost). I have an issue with granting rights or (granting) exceptional treatment (via) moratorium or whatever we (unintelligible). But the second part, leaving it to a (PDP), I fully support that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Do you want to draft a short email? Because I think after we go over this we'll talk about what we want to post. But I want to make sure we can post the written comments of everyone, if they want it included in a record.

So I'm assuming you want that included in the record in the public comment period. So if you want to draft something really - it doesn't have to be very long. You don't have to go into the whole thing, just whatever you want expressed.

(Thomas): More than happy to do that, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, (Thomas).

All right. Have I missed any other group?

All right. Let me go then to...

Lanre Ajayi: Jeff, this is Lanre.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry?

Lanre Ajayi: This is Lanre.

Jeff Neuman: Oh Lanre, sorry, I apologize. Yes.

Lanre Ajayi: No, that's fine. I just want to say that I attended the last call where the recommendations were put together. And that I support the recommendations that there should be a (PDP) and that there should be an (interim) (unintelligible) of the names of IOC/RCRC.

I just wanted to (conduct) comment.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thank you very much. That's helpful.

Let me know turn to the email that's up on the Adobe right now. And I think, (Stefan), when you initially forwarded you might have sent it to a list that doesn't get posted to everyone, so I reposted it just in case. So you may have gotten it - or this group may have gotten it just before the call, but he actually sent it about an hour before.

So hopefully you'll have it and it's up there on the screen. (Stefan) or - if you want to kind of just quickly go over the statement, and if there's any questions or comments.

Stefan Hanking: Thank you very much, Jeff. So good evening, everyone.

Well yes, this was prepared fairly rapidly. I'll just go maybe through the main points because it may be, you know, there wasn't enough time to read it.

But I think our position is, you know, we obviously would've felt, you know, that the needs for the (PDP) is not required because, you know, as we've tried to illustrate in our (unintelligible) communications, you know, the global public interest is very clear under international (humanitarian) as we've described in past documents.

Now of course this group's decision is to go ahead with the (PDP). So, you know, and the basis of the recommendation is acceptable to us in the sense

that, you know, the designations will be reserved until such time as the (PDP) comes forward with its conclusion.

I noted in my paper that I felt there might be - but I may be reading this wrong. That in the last part, in the third part of recommendation which describes how the proposal will be represented to the GAC.

It seems to me that what is written there is not entirely (inadequacy) with what was discussed last week and what is in Paragraph 2. Because (unintelligible) suggest that the reservation or the temporary block or however you decided to finally call that may be decided upon.

So in the interest of congruence between these two paragraphs, I would suggest that the words may be taken out.

I don't know whether this makes sense to you, whether you see what I'm referring to here.

Jeff Neuman: (Stefan), can I just interrupt there? Can you - Berry post the statement so we can just take a look at what it would be without...

Stefan Hanking: Yes. My problem is, you know, I actually have today - if you look at the text and you go down to the third recommendation, the Drafting Team recommends the following be communicated to the GAC.

You see that?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Berry, can you scroll - do we each have control of this or - no.

Stefan Hanking: Then it says - in the B Section it says that a temporary registration block may be placed.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me throw it out to the team. I think your comment makes sense to take out the word "may." Does anyone see any issues with taking out the word "may"? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I don't necessarily have issue with it. I think our intent -- when it was worded that way -- was it all depends on timing, okay. If we wait until the council approves it before we communicate with the GAC, then we wouldn't need the word "may."

If we communicated -- which there could be reasons to do it sooner than the council approves it -- it would be a "may" until there's council approval of the approach.

I don't, you know, I don't know that - I guess all I'm saying is it depends on when we start communicating with the GAC.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think (Stefan)'s issue -- which makes sense -- is that it seems to - just reading it as an outsider, it seems to say that it's up to someone's choice as to whether to block it or not. And I don't think that was the intent either of the group.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, our real recommendation is in two, and we specifically say, "Put a temporary reservation on the names."

So that part is clear. But you're right, reading it cold, it's a bit misleading because you may walk away with the point that we're being flexible, whereas the wording of two does not imply that flexibility.

Maybe we need to change it to, "A temporary restriction has been recommended to be placed," if we don't want to say anything more definitive.

Stefan Hanking: You know, the reason I underlined this - this is (Stefan Hankings) again. The reason I underlined this is because my understanding of the discussion last week was that, you know, to some extent, you know, one proposition balances the other.

And, you know, my understanding of the discussion that was held last week was that you - on the issue of conditionality of one to the other, that they were - my understanding of consensus that, you know, one would not go without the other because - and I think there were a few comments made that, you know, during the interim period we should not or, you know, we should not leave the designation IOC and Red Cross Red Crescent without, you know, any form of protection.

So, you know, that's the reason why I picked that up. And indeed I do understand fully that the recommendation is in the second paragraph. So, you know, my view was simply to render (paragraphs) be congruent with what is in Paragraph 2.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I think - or Alan, you want to respond?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Not really respond, but as (Stefan) was talking I was rereading it. And I noticed the tone in A and B are different. One is saying the GNSO, you know, at this point we don't know what the GNSO is going to recommend, yet in the first part we're implying it. So the tone is different and they probably do need to be rationalized.

Jeff Neuman: How would you do that?

Alan Greenberg: It's not quite rationalized, but by changing B to say, you know, "Temporary restriction, temporary registration block has been recommended to be placed." At least says that we're saying something definitive.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Another possible way to deal with it in 3, notice we start off the Drafting Team recommends the following be communicated to the GAC.

And instead of saying, like in A, that the GNSO recommends, we could say the Drafting Team recommends. Or maybe we've got that covered up above. And the problem may be in A where we say the GNSO recommends.

Again, it all depends on timing and when we communicate with the GAC, okay?

If the council has already approved our recommendations, it makes it real easy to fix the language here. If we communicate with the GAC beforehand, then we have to be a little more cautious in terms of how it's worded.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. If we're going out to public comment, the GNSO is not going to approve this in Toronto. So we're going to see the GAC, if not formally communicate with them prior to that.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: This is Wolfgang. You know, we should avoid any type of confusion. So it could be consistent as possible. But on the other hand, what Chuck proposed to make the differentiation between the Drafting Team and the council would be an option.

On the other hand, you know, it would be probably unfair to push the council in a position that then, you know, at the end of today there could be a contradiction between the Drafting Team and the council. And I think what the GAC is playing is (all them) trying, you know, to get a justification for their own decisions by, you know, provoking confusing messages from different constituencies, which would bring them in a better position because they (unintelligible), you know, I give you this advice and then more or less you have to follow.

But it means - it's a rather delicate thing to, you know, have -- on the one hand -- the consistency. On the other hand also, you know, when Chuck refers to timing, you know, when we first talked to the GAC and the council is unable to make a decision, then probably we could, you know, give the impression that the Drafting Team is - more or less (pre-decides) then what the council has just a (rubberstamp).

It's a little bit delicate. I do not have a final proposal, you know, how to maneuver on this. The best thing is just to refer the language we have produced in two and to say, you know, this is - was that in two and this will be (communicated) to the GAC. And we reserve probably, you know, the right of the council in its own wisdom then to decide otherwise that we say, "This is not in our hands, but this is what is at the moment what we say at this stage."

Jeff Neuman: I think what we can do is just, again, this statement's going out for public comment this week and it's going to be subject to public comment for a few weeks, at least. So we can always amend it in the final statement when it goes to the council. We can always amend it after the public comments anyway, and we can amend it based on what's actually going on at that moment.

So I would still say that - just say that a temporary registration block be placed and just leave it at that, as (Stefan) had recommended. I think we're kind of getting a little bit too much into the weeds here.

Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Just a couple things. In A and E where we say the GNSO does this, we probably shouldn't - we don't have as a discussion group the ability to say that the GNSO says these things. So you might want to fix those two references.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So we could say - (3A) just needs to say - you can actually take out the words, "That the GNSO recommends." You could just say - because the whole preface is the Drafting Team recommends the following be communicated to the GAC. You can start A with, "A (PDP) be initiated as soon as possible." But you don't even need those words.

And, let's see, for E...

Chuck Gomes: E's pretty easy too -- this is Chuck -- because we can just say, "Feedback from the GAC is welcome."

Jeff Neuman: I mean, that's almost, you know, that's - yes, that's right, that's right. Yes, "Feedback is welcome from the GAC."

Alan Greenberg: Jeff, it's Alan. Just one comment. Although Item Number 3 was sent to the ALAC -- and I suspect to the other stakeholder groups and constituencies -- our discussion focuses solely on 1 and 2.

So I don't think anyone on our side, and I suspect some of the other groups are going to be perturbed if the wording in 3 changes. It was not the focus of the - the subset of discussion that was held. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Okay, and I don't think we're changing any (substantively) anyway.

So Berry, do you have those changes? Not the posts, but did you make note of those?

Berry Cobb: Yes. So what I have is the latest. So starting off, the Drafting Team recommends the following be communicated to the GAC. A, a (PDP) be initiated as soon as possible to cover possible protections for IOC/RC names within the first and subsequent gTLD realms.

B, that a temporary registration block be placed pending ICANN board approval on exact match IOC/RC names pending the outcome of the (PDP) or ICANN board resolution.

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me. Shouldn't that be pending GNSO and ICANN board approval then?

Berry Cobb: Yes, I asked that question in the chat and I didn't get a response. I wasn't clear on the exact order or (open) that approval.

And then lastly, just modify E to state that feedback from the GAC as soon as possible in this position as welcome.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So let me go back to B and let me - do we even need to modify a pending ICANN board approval or pending GNSO and ICANN board approval?

Because obviously it's always pending that approval, you don't need to state that. The Drafting Team is recommending that a temporary registration block be placed, right?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan, agreed.

Jeff Neuman: So Chuck, is that okay or...

Chuck Gomes: Well we may have to be careful there, sorry. But because remember the idea is if a (PDP) recommends some policy and the board approves it that is different than the temporary reservation then, you know, circumstances would change.

And I think that was why we tried to put that language in there, which is a little bit different than just the board has to approve it.

In other words, the temporary registration may change depending on the results of those things.

Jeff Neuman: What do you mean the temporary registration will change?

Chuck Gomes: Well reservations may change.

So okay, so we've got a temporary reservation for these names. If the (PDP) results in recommendations that the names not be reserved and the board approves that, then the temporary reservations will go away.

I think that's what the pending was intended to address.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Berry?

Berry Cobb: Jeff, this is Berry. And I kind of repeat the same thing at the tail end of Line Item B as well. So I think it's kind of being redundant to have - that a temporary registration block be placed on exact match IOC/RC names pending the outcome of a (PDP) or ICANN board resolution.

We still have the pending in there on the tail-end because we don't know what the eventual outcome will be.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And that's what I noticed too. But Chuck, you think this still has a difference in meaning?

Chuck Gomes: It's Chuck. I think so. I think that was what our original intent is.

But I don't need to be hardnosed about this, you know. If others think that that's not the case, I don't think we need to spend too much time on it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So yes, so I think my recommendation is to take out the first pending ICANN board approval (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: And Jeff, this is Berry. I placed what we have proposed in the chat now.

Jeff Neuman: "Temporary registration block be placed on exact match." Yes, I think that's right.

Okay Chuck likes it. There you go. Good then.

Okay, so everything else - I think now we've gotten - all right, (Stefan), I'm going to go back to you because we only covered your first point.

Stefan Hanking: Yes. Yes, I probably wouldn't go through, you know, the different points. But maybe the other point I wanted to make is (unintelligible) discussion we had also last week.

I mean, we appreciate how Chuck and Jeff have delicately referred to the implications of the - of the final issue report on Intergovernmental Organizations.

I mean, I'm not necessarily recommending to change that. But I'm just a little bit curious, you know, what exactly we mean by, you know, the council should consider this development when deliberating Recommendation 1 for (PDP) and the implications of that.

I do realize that it is not the role in mandate scope of this group to discuss or to engage. It's all on the terms of reference or the brief for an eventual (PDP).

But again, you know, I find it important that, you know, I would find it useful and important that we clarify, you know, that each case - whatever's decided in terms of scope of the (PDP) has to be examined on its own merits and separately.

But I don't think this has implications for this at this point and stage. But again, you may recall, we did make the comment that, you know, it's important that, you know, that the specific cases be given, you know, individual review and individual conclusion.

And I don't know whether that element in any way requires (here) to be reflected or not.

So that is one comment.

And then I made an additional comment which relates to the identification of the designations as they are referred to under Section (22123) of the Applicant Guidebook.

Was in Paragraph 2, it refers to the (UN6) exact match IOC/Red Cross Red Crescent. And if I look at the list which is in the guidebook, it's not entirely bad.

But I, you know, if the text here remains the same, I don't think it has many implications because it's clear that it's the designations that are in the Applicant Guidebook in that chapter.

And then finally, we - just for the record, we did include and remind of some of the issues which had been addressed and tackled in the past within this group, but also within the GNSO recommendation of last March for top level in terms of, you know, other languages. Because that is implied within the Geneva Conventions, which protect the designation Red Cross Red Crescent.

You know, the desirability. If the (PDP) is going to examine first and second level, to consider the notion of a (string) similarity review.

And then the last point (unintelligible) is indeed this question of the entitlement to be preserved for the components of the Red Cross Red Crescent (moving) to register second-level domain names under the new gTLDs.

It's just a fact that, you know, Red Cross and Red Crescent actors do own second-level domain names, so we are restricting.

But I understand that, you know, from the discussions that at least in this group, the concept is that these issues will and would become a part of the brief for consideration in the (PDP) process.

I think this sums it up, Jeff, I'm afraid. That's all I have.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you, (Stefan).

Alan, you have a comment on that? And then I wanted...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just a quick one on the separation and the fact that ultimately everything needs to be looked at in its own merits.

Given what I said about ALAC's position, I certainly wouldn't be unhappy if we put a preamble in our recommendation to the GNSO when we actually make the recommendation that, you know, the fact that these two were merged together and they're, you know, constituted differently in different sets of, you know, conditions.

I wouldn't be unhappy if that's there. But that would be on a whereas or a preamble, it's not in the actual recommendation. So I don't think we need to worry about it today. And I suspect it will come out in the public comments in spades.

I sympathize with what (Stefan) is saying, but I don't think need to change the recommendation to account for it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Alan.

I just want to talk - the comments that's going on in the chat. I don't know if I missed this earlier, but it's just talking about the comment period.

Do we want to point that out about the (21/21)? So when we put the statement out for comment, there's a 21-day comment period followed by a 21-day reply period, which my poor math is at least 42 days.

Chuck was talking about some steps.

Sorry, let me - this is a little off topic, we'll get back to that.

Let me get back to - (Jim), did you have any other comments from the IOC that I might've sent that weren't submitted?

(Jim) Bikoff: No. I think we're generally aligned with the IPC position. And I think, you know, we're pleased to go along with that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Okay, so if everyone that just went over their position orally on the call could just submit a very short - doesn't have to be very long at all, a short statement if they want that attached to the main recommendations document.

I think the plan then is to put this document out in the Drafting Team. And behind this document put the - all the other positions that have been expressed that may differ from the recommendations.

My question is at this point it's kind of hard, I mean, it's hard to do a readout of whether there's a consensus, because there's all opinions broken out in

different places. But I'm not sure we need a consensus on the substance to put it out for public comment.

And I think there's a consensus that we want to put this out for public comment. I haven't heard any opinions to the contrary.

So what I could say is - or we could say in the preamble for this is that the Drafting Team would like to put this out for public comment for discussion in Toronto and beyond as to be, you know, on what - I'm trying to think of the exact words, but maybe Berry and I can work on it.

But without indicating that there's a consensus or even a rough consensus on these recommendations at this point, just the fact that the group wants to put this out for public comment, and that a number of groups have already expressed support for the statement and even possibly with those.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Maybe I missed something, but I didn't hear a lot of people saying they or their groups are not supporting this. (Thomas) has said he doesn't support the second recommendation. ALAC and NCUC, based on earlier discussions it was not clear whether they're supporting it, but I've heard that they are supporting it. Or I've said and heard.

So who is it that this point - as far as we know, and we did issue a formal consensus call on the list. So if people didn't send anything in or are not on this meeting, who -- other than (Thomas) on the second half -- is not agreeing?

Jeff Neuman: Well we also have some groups we haven't heard from, but (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Well you issued a consensus call if they didn't answer.

I think we have the basis for saying we are not - we don't have unanimity but we have a consensus. Certainly a rough consensus, although I don't think we need to use that word.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think Alan's right, at least what I've heard. But one value of doing that, Jeff, is that there's a strong case that can be made for the council to start moving ahead and doing some things in parallel to speed this up. Because if we do everything linearly, we wait until the end of the comment, at the reply period, and then we wait for the council to act. And then we draft a charter. And then we get members of the group and elect a Chair.

You know, we're going to be well into next year before we get this thing going, and we cannot afford that because new gTLDs are going to be introduced.

Jeff Neuman: No, I think that's right and I think that's a discussion that needs to take place at the council in Toronto as to, you know, there's no rule that says that you have to have - to have to vote in favor of (PDP) before you actually draft the charter.

In fact, it is foreseeable in the rules that the (PDP) work team worked on years ago -- or four years, I should say -- that the charter could be presented to the council at the exact same time as the council votes on whether to initiate the (PDP) or not.

Alan Greenberg: Jeff, it's Alan. If you look at history, that's the way it was always done.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I guess in older history, you're right. In more recent years it's been (PDP)-initiated, work on the charter - or (PDP)-initiated, work on the charter, charter voted on, then (PDP) actually starts.

Alan Greenberg: I think - it's Alan. I went over those documents in preparing my presentation to the ALAC. And I looked at Marika's presentation she sent the council on the history of recent (PDP)s. And in several of them, you know, the (PDP) was approved and worked began because the charter was included in the approval.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Alan Greenberg: So there's plenty of precedence.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And I agree with that. The problem is this Drafting Team was only formed to respond to the GAC proposal.

And so what I will discuss with the GNSO in Toronto is whether they want to create a Drafting Team to work on the charter or whether they want to use this Drafting Team to work on the charter, you know, that's a discussion I think that'll take place (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Jeff, it's almost a foregone conclusion that there will not be a vote on the (PDP) in Toronto.

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Someone is likely to say, "I want to defer to the next meeting." There is nothing to say we can't on the presumption that a (PDP) will be started, let's start a Drafting Team and get a charter quickly.

The Drafting Team is going to be not quick. There's going to be a lot of contention there anyway.

But there's nothing to say in Toronto that the Drafting Team can't be created. You know, if (PDP) is refused, the work is lost, so be it.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And Chuck, I just saw your comment about - yes, so I think that's right. Chuck just said he suggest that I raise the issue of speeding it up before Toronto. So I will do that once this has been put out for comment.

So later this week I'll put that issue out so that we can have some discussions on the list of how we can make it go quicker.

(Margie)?

(Margie): Yes, I had a couple things I wanted to raise.

One, in the GNSO operating rules and procedures, it does say in exigent circumstances, upon approval of the initiation of the (PDP), the council may direct certain work to be performed prior to the approval of the (PDP) charter.

So I think that is what we were trying to do when we developed the new rules was to have flexibility. So I think that that, you know, is something you can keep in mind.

And then the other thing, you know, I apologize, I wasn't on the last call. But my question is is there really a need for public comment at this point?

Sounds like you guys are pretty close to consensus on an approach. And as you may recall, there was public comment on earlier week of this Drafting Team and there was also public comment on the preliminary issue reports that dealt with these issues.

So there's been lots of opportunities for public comment. And I just, you know, I'm not sure it's necessarily required, although obviously you guys have the right to ask for it if you'd like. And I was just trying to think of the timing issues and trying to just kick work off as quickly as possible as a reason to perhaps not do a public comment.

Jeff Neuman: So we were - as you know, we were heavily, heavily criticized for not doing a public comment period after our recommendations at the top level.

And I do believe that public commentary is important, especially with respect to the moratorium, even though the board pretty much said as much, that there should be a moratorium.

I'll turn it over to (Stefan) and Chuck. But I think that we should put out the public comment period, but that doesn't mean we can't work on things in parallel.

So (Stefan), Chuck, you want to comment on that?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I'll let (Stefan) go first if he wants to.

Stefan Hanking: Actually I want to raise different points.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I'll go ahead. Thanks, (Stefan).

You know, the public comment period -- as long as we do things in parallel -- probably is fine as long as we don't get to a situation where the GNSO wants another public comment period before they act. That would be really unfortunate, I think.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. Jeff got dropped both from the (AC) in the room.

So thank you, Chuck. (Stefan), would you like to go ahead and start with the next topic?

Stefan Hanking: No, I just had one point, which is I noted often the last call that we, you know, we have - I'm not sure we've raised the implications so clearly of the recent resolutions by the board. But I was curious, you know, that the decisions that

are currently being taken in full (advocacy) with the recent resolution of the board said.

I don't have it before my eyes, I can't find it, it's in the pile. But what the board seemed to have said was that it was waiting by a certain date, which was the 31st of January -- if I'm not mistaken -- to receive, you know, any comments or, you know, paramount considerations that would hinder a decision by the board on the reservation of the resignations, the IOC and Red Cross Red Crescent.

So I'm a little curious, you know, what will then have precedence, yes? Because if we engage, you know, in the long-term process and by 31st of January, you know, the board is committed to make its decision, you know, what will happen.

But I don't know. It's a side comment. I don't know the dynamics of this within ICANN well enough. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Chuck, and I'll catch up. Sorry for dropping.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. In response to (Stefan), I think that if the recommendations that the discussion group is putting forward are approved by the council, that there should be - and that the board approves those -- especially with regard to the temporary reservations -- that we will have met the January deadline that the board motion had.

Now somebody correct me if you think I'm wrong there, but that's my view.

Stefan Hanking: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, no, I agree. I think the board motion essentially is serving notice that if the GNSO cannot make a recommendation on second-level protections for the first round, that is, you know, do protect them, don't protect them something, that it's asking the GNSO are there any security stability issues? Because, you know, they're essentially - I think they're serving notice that they plan to act. If the GNSO doesn't make a recommendation they can act on, they will act themselves.

That's the way I read it. So they've set the GNSO a deadline. Boards -- in recent years -- have been very effective in getting the GNSO to act by setting deadlines. So they've done it again, I think.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So Berry just posted a comment (unintelligible) saying that the only difference from what Chuck says, that the board motion requested reserve names was not temporary like we have now.

I think that's a discussion that we will have with the board at the council meeting in Toronto. I think the board will be very hard pressed if we initiate a full (PDP) on this to actually act and put it on the reserve names list unilaterally. I think that would create a lot of consternation between the council and the board.

So especially when the board hid a bunch of - well not the board, but there was a lot of information that wasn't provided to the Drafting Team which would've been helpful months ago. So...

Alan Greenberg: Jeff, it's Alan. I disagree with Berry. I think the board - because one of their where as' says they like the idea as if they had looked at a recommendation ahead of time, which they probably did. They like the idea of taking action which will minimize harm and then fixing it later in the (PDP). They as much as said that.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So (unintelligible)...

Alan Greenberg: I think we're doing exactly what the board wants to see.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, my impression is that someone may have led the board or discussed this issue with the board as to how we were coming out, because I think you're right.

So with that, is there any other comment? I think we were talking about the public comment period. I know that we went on.

But just to make sure what we're going to post is that the group will - that there's consensus in the group to put this out for public comment and support for this position. But we're also providing other opinions or statements provided by members of the group or constituency stakeholders for reference.

So does anyone disagree with that? Or is that okay? Is that fine?
Agree/disagree?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Just tell us what the deadline is for getting those statements in.

Jeff Neuman: Well, I mean, I want to post it this week.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So I'm going to tell you by tomorrow. And then Berry and I - Berry's got his hand raised, probably going, "What do you want me to say at the beginning?"

So Berry, do you want to...

Berry Cobb: Yes, thank you, Jeff. I'll start working on the forms to get the public comment request started.

I just wanted to ask, in terms of the statements by the various stakeholders for this document, will we put it into an appendix for this actual recommendation document? Or do you want it to be two separate documents? Or are we asking that the stakeholders actually post their statements into the public comment forum once it's open?

Jeff Neuman: I would recommend that we put these as appendices to the statement.

Berry Cobb: Okay, so yes.

Jeff Neuman: I don't think there's a need to have the stakeholder groups put them in again, unless they don't get it in on time.

But I think we take all of these things that we've gotten and put it as appendices.

Berry Cobb: Great.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: This is Wolfgang. I agree with the (unintelligible) that we should not forget to work in parallel, as it was more or less agreed.

But this has not to be into text as it is proposed.

Jeff Neuman: Great.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry, just real quick. Then I'd recommend that we put a deadline of Friday morning or Friday UTC 1800 so that I can get those collated - attached to the document and get the request submitted to Web admin so that we can get it started by Friday afternoon Pacific Time.

Jeff Neuman: You are more generous. I was going to say tomorrow (COB) wherever you are.

Berry Cobb: That works for me.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And then, Berry, maybe you and I can - if you want to run any of the text by me just for the forms, feel free.

Berry Cobb: 10-4, I will. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. (Stefan), you still have your hand raised? Or is that old or...

Stefan Hanking: No, I think it's old. I'm sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Does anybody have any other comments?

We are scheduled - just so you know, we are scheduled for a meeting in Toronto. I'm trying to - and I know I haven't said this yet, but I just looked at the time.

Berry, is there a way we can have that - and I know everyone's going to kill me, so don't shoot me. But the meeting right now is supposed to take place during the same exact time that another meeting that's important for a lot of us will be attending. I'm trying to remember which one it was. I'm not sure if it was a Trademark Clearinghouse one or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. What day is our meeting? I'll check right now, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: It was Wednesday at 9:00 am, I think.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And hold on. So ours conflicts with the - looks like it conflicts with the inter-register transfer policy and Trademark Clearinghouse.

Berry Cobb: And the Trademark Clearinghouse.

Chuck Gomes: Trademark Clearinghouse implementation occurs at the exact same time as our meeting.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So everyone, don't shoot me. But what I would recommend is - I'm not sure how long we're going to need to meet or whether we definitely need to meet at this point. Why don't we just do it from, again, don't kill me, from 8:00 to 9:00 am -- if there's a way to do that -- in the same room as the Clearinghouse one so that we - or someplace where we know we'll be done by 9:00.

Chuck Gomes: Jeff, this is Chuck. That doesn't eliminate conflicts for some of us, but it probably doesn't affect quite as many. I know I have - there's an academy working group that I need to be involved in the schedule from 7:00 to 10:00.

But, you know, that may just be me.

Berry Cobb: Jeff, this is Berry. I'll get with the (meetings) team to see (it done) a reschedule. I'm not sure what the cutoff date was for that, so hopefully we can accommodate.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I mean, because I hear what you're saying, Berry, but this is the first, I mean, just this week is when we first saw the time. I just think if it's during the Clearinghouse meeting, most people aren't going to be - and I know myself, I have to be at the Clearinghouse meeting.

And there may not necessarily be a need for us, as a Drafting Team, to meet during that time period. So let's just kind of see what happens during the public comment period, see what happens during the weekend. And then we may end up just canceling it anyway. But it'd be good to have it on reserve in case we need it.

Berry Cobb: 10-4. I'll look at the reschedule and then back out as - maybe we cancel it.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. Is there a need for the council to talk to us as a group like usually happens on the weekend?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So there is a session during the weekend where this subject will come up. And of course like, you know, I certainly appreciate all of you to be there if you want to be there. Let me just see if they know what time that is.

I'm trying to see what the last - sorry, this'll take me one minute.

(Jim) Bikoff: Jeff, I think it's Saturday, 11:00 to 12:00 or something like that.

Jeff Neuman: There's been a lot of changes. So let me just go into the official one that I have. You may be right.

And yes, it's still 11:00 to 12:00, yes, on Saturday.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again, Jeff. Boy, some people may not be there yet. But as many of us that can be there during that time, that would be ample.

(Jim) Bikoff: I will be (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so I know obviously all the council members will be there. And anyone that could attend, that would be great to just have you guys there in case there's any questions. You know, it's always great to have them answered by members of the team and not just the Chair. So thank you for reminding me of that.

Okay. Well I wanted to say thank you to everyone on the hard work that everyone has done. I'm glad that we're able to get this statement out. And, you know, who knows, I'm sure there's going to be a new Drafting Team that's setup. I don't know if it's going to be this one. I don't know who the Chair of that will be.

But thank you, everyone, for working on this. And we're still around to respond to any comments. So thank you, everyone, for spending the time.

Berry Cobb: Jeff, this is Berry. Everybody is welcome to drop. I just want to read in J. Scott's statement. He asked it to be read into the record as well.

Jeff Neuman: Well, I mean, I...

Man: Thanks everybody, bye.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Good (night). But I want to say thank you also to Jeff because he was able to manage this - all the difficulties to construct (event). Thank you very much, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Thank you, everyone.

(Jim) Bikoff: I'll join in that. Thanks Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (Jim).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: If we - we're going to put a statement attached as an appendix. I mean, that's going to be in the record for the public comment (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: All right. Okay, yes, that's good enough then.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Berry Cobb: (Thanks Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: And if I'm wrong I'll take the blame. So I think we can...

Berry Cobb: Yes, no problem.

Jeff Neuman: ...stop the recording on that and - Berry, if you have any questions just let me know.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. And I'll send out the (unintelligible) emails from me later in the afternoon and tomorrow morning.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Berry, for your help.

Berry Cobb: All right, take care.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, bye.

Berry Cobb: And Nathalie, I think we're done.

Coordinator: Okay. Thank you, Berry. (Tonya), can you please stop...

END