

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Review Team
Thursday, 28 September 2017 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording GNSO Review Team Meeting on the Thursday 28 September 2017 at 12:00 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. Attendance may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/5oNEB>

Recordings may be found at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-28sep17-en.mp3> and <https://participate.icann.org/p7o4s67prqc/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal>

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Julie Bisland: Okay. Thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone, welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 28th of September, 2017. On the call today we have Sara Bockey, Jen Wolfe, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Rafik Dammak and Lori Schulman. I don't see any apologies at this time. And from staff I have Amr Elsadr, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund and myself, Julie Bisland.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. And with this I'll turn it back over to Jen Wolfe. Please begin.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. And thanks, everyone for taking the time to join the call and the meeting today, we appreciate it. On our agenda today we'll do a brief update on any statements of interest, then we'll do a quick update on the consensus

call that closed on the 25th of September for the charter for Recommendation 31. We'll discuss an update to the presentation to the OEC and the GNSO Council, and then we will move onto discussing Recommendations 26-29 and close out with looking at our meeting schedule ahead, our next meeting in October and then looking at the ICANN meeting and beyond that.

So with that, just briefly does anyone have any updates to their statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on. Julie Hedlund, was there anything new that we needed on the consensus call? I think it closed.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, the only update is that the consensus call closed and there were no comments or objections so Recommendation 31 was approved by full consensus. And then I see Wolf-Ulrich has just a short amount of time so just to quickly note, if I may, the next item on the agenda, just that staff is working on the report that will go to the OEC and also the GNSO Council, both of those updates to happen at ICANN 60. And staff should have a draft report out next week.

Jen Wolfe: Great, thank you. And thanks, Wolf-Ulrich, for that comment. Yes, I realize you have a short amount of time so let's go ahead and move on to the Recommendations 26-29. Julie, could you take us through those?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Right, and let's see I've got them in the Adobe Connect room now. I'll have them synced while I speak through them. So these are all recommendations - Recommendations 26, 27, 28, 29 that relate to stakeholder group and constituency membership and statements of interest. And so just to mention then each of the recommendations, 26 relates to the members of the Council, Executive Committee, stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as working groups and the recommendation is complete and maintain a current comprehensive statement of interest on the GNSO Website.

And where individuals represent bodies or clients, this information is to be posted if not posted because of client confidentiality, the participants interest or position must be disclosed. Failing either of these, the individual shall not be permitted to participate.

And then 27 is that the GNSO establish and maintain a centralized publicly available list of members and individual participants of every constituency and stakeholder group with a link to the individual's statement of interest where one is required and posted.

Recommendation 28 is that Section 6.1.2, membership of Chapter 6.1 of the stakeholder group and constituency's operating principles and participation guidelines, the GNSO Operating Procedures should be revised to clarify that key clauses are mandatory rather than advisory and to institute meaningful sanctions for non compliance where appropriate.

And then Recommendation 29 the statements of interest of GNSO Council members and Executive Committee members of all stakeholder groups and constituencies should include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN.

And so let me just then go on to the scope statement. This GNSO review group would review the current GNSO Operating Procedures that are related to the recommendations and work with staff on possible modifications which then would be published for public comment followed by GNSO Council approval. And then there would be assumptions that modifications - if these recommendations were to be implemented, modifications would need to be incorporated in Chapter 5, Statements of Interest, of the GNSO Operating Procedures as well as Chapter 6.0, Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. There may also be changes that would have to be made to the procedures for the various stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So if I might proceed to the analysis that staff has conducted, and then I know that Wolf-Ulrich had some comment - had reviewed this charter and had some comments too. But so with respect to Recommendation 26, so currently in Chapter 5 in the Statements of Interest, in the GNSO Operating Procedures, the definition of a relevant party to which the requirements apply include the Council, work team, working group, committee or other such policy development body, formed by and under supervision of the GNSO Council unless the entities mentioned in Recommendation 26, that is Executive Committee members of stakeholder groups and constituencies, are not currently included in this requirement to complete and maintain a current comprehensive statement of interest.

In addition, the current Chapter 5 does not specifically state that where individuals represent bodies or clients, that this information is to be posted. However, the statement of interest must provide the following information that could be related to that requirement. Are there any arrangement/agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person regarding the participation as a work team member? And if so, please describe the arrangements/agreements and then any of the group/constituency or persons.

So staff suggested the GNSO Review Working Group should review the current language and determine whether it should be revised in order to implement Recommendation 26. For example, per the recommendation, Chapter 5.0, would need to be revised to include Executive Committee members of stakeholder groups and constituencies in the definition of relevant party. And staff of course could draft language for the working group to consider.

Staff also notes that the SOIs of Council and stakeholder groups and constituency leadership are documented on the GNSO site. So separate from Paragraph - I'm sorry - separate from Chapter 5.0, the information of the SOIs of the leadership, the executive positions, are actually posted, they're

posted for the Council, they're posted for the various constituencies and stakeholder groups as noted here.

And so the working group would consider whether or not this provision is met through say the posting of the SOIs you know, separately and not as included in the language in Chapter 5.0. So I'll just stop there and see if there's any questions on that recommendation but I'm happy to just keep plowing along because I know, again, that Wolf-Ulrich is strained for time.

Jen Wolfe: Please go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Can you understand me?

Jen Wolfe: I hear you fine.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Great. Yes, my comment to this recommendation was delivered and distributed as well. So it is just the question of the definition so how - whom we should really include in the group of people who should provide a statement of interest, well and this is the suggestion here is including so-called ExComms so and was of the SGs and constituencies.

First thing I have to say is the following, well is I know the different SGs and Cs, constituencies, they have different habit, well, how to select their ExComms and on what timescale. For example, in our constituency it's done every year so we have - it would be one thing as well, we had to update then these things, you know, by every year.

And the other thing is came to my mind, well, if you look to the procedures themselves, so what is relevant really here is all what is related to policy development. And the ExComm as a group in our constituency in particular and in the ISPCP, they don't have a - the power anything, well, to decide or let me say to, well, to discuss with regard policy which - and make recommendations with regards to policy. All this is done through the working

groups and then it's done through the entire community, well, it's the entire constituency, it's discussed on that level.

And then it comes to the Council members, yes, well, to be discussed and to be voted on that. So that is my concern with that. So on the other hand so if, you know, those - most of these people are anyway covered, you know, usually because there is a interrelation often between working group members and ExComm members maybe they are - as - they are the same people in person so there is no problem, well, to provide the SOI. I would have a concern, well, to make it formally, well, to oblige the SGs and Cs, well, to do so. But that's my comment. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. Any other comments?

Lori Schulman: Hey, this is Lori.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Lori. Please go ahead.

Lori Schulman: Hi. Yes, I couldn't find my hand, sorry. Now I see. Anyway, I just have a question about this confidentiality because this applies to (unintelligible) members of my own constituency, the IPC, because they're attorneys that represent clients. So it says here that if there's a confidentiality - I'm looking at the exact language, "Where individuals represents bodies or clients this information is to be posted. If not posted because of client confidentiality the participant's interests or position must be disclosed." What does that mean? Like you can't say who your client is, but what do you - I don't know what you mean by interest or position. Do you mean the position on the GNSO?

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. That's a really good question. I'm trying to look at the language right now. The participants - information - if not posted because of client confidentiality, the participant's interest or position. So the participant then will be the Council member, Executive Committee member, member of

working groups as opposed to you know, the clients they represent. So I suppose...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead, sorry.

Lori Schulman: No, I just want to say that you're going to disclose your position anyway because that's part of your SOI. But I guess I don't understand...

Julie Hedlund: Well I suppose...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...and I think, you know, maybe what we need to do is ask, you know, maybe, you know, our ICANN Legal staff to try to, you know, parse this a little bit more for us. Go ahead, Jen, sorry.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, no, I mean, I fully understand having, you know, been in the role of lawyer consultant for a lot of clients. Sometimes that is a confidential relationship. You know, so I mean, I think if that's a confidential relationship and if you're there to speak as a lawyer or consultant generally a part of whatever group you're a part of, I mean, I don't see what you need to disclose, that's what your position is, you are a lawyer or a consultant for someone else.

I think if you were giving a comment specifically on behalf of a company, then that would be a different story, you would need to say who you were representing. So I don't know if maybe there's some way to clarify that but, I mean, it's obviously for a lot of people they have a fiduciary duty to their clients that they can't disclose.

Lori Schulman: I understand the duty, I'm not - this is not about the duty. The duty is very clear to me. What isn't clear to me - and maybe I just need to read the language purely on its faith when it says, "If not posted because of client confidentiality, the participant's interest or position must be disclosed."

Does that then mean if I'm a partner in a law firm and I get up and I say or I'm typing and I say, "I am a paid consultant for Loris' law firm" or as opposed to saying, "I'm a paid consultant for XYZ Company, a client of Lori's law firm." That's what I'm trying to figure out, what is actually disclosed, the fact that I'm an attorney that represents third parties or the fact that I'm an attorney that represents undisclosed third parties? I just don't know what the disclosure is literally. What do you write in the SOI?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. Does anybody else have any thoughts on this? Otherwise I might suggest that, you know, we could ask our legal staff if they have some thoughts on how this might be interpreted to make, you know, just have to add a little bit more explanation to make clear as far as what specifically needs to be disclosed or not. I'm afraid I don't have an answer to your question, Lori. I also can see how it could be a little unclear. Marika Konings is saying, "Maybe the question is as well what can be disclosed?" Yes, exactly.

I mean, here we say the participant's interest or position must be disclosed but, yes, what - what exactly is that? You know, how much - what does that mean? So can we take back as an action to try to get a little bit more clarification on this language? I see Marika is typing. Okay. And maybe while Marika is typing - okay, so Marika says, "Can it be stated that someone is participating on behalf of the client without stating who the client is or what their exact grief was?"

And I guess that is the question, right, is - would that still fulfill the requirements of this recommendation? Right. Thanks, Lori. We've captured

that then. Let's see if we can get an answer to that to get some clarification for exactly what needs to be disclosed or not.

So I'll move ahead to Recommendation 27 and again, that one relates to a centralized publicly available list of members and individual participants of every constituency and stakeholder group with the link to the individual statement of interest where one is required.

And so moving along then this centralized list does exist but members of stakeholder groups and constituencies - I'm sorry, SOs and ACs, and stakeholder groups and constituencies, are not required to have SOIs unless participating in working groups or leadership positions. So the GNSO Review Working Group should consider where to include a requirement for such a list.

For example, Chapter 6.0, Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, Operating Principles and Participation Guidelines, could be modified to include a requirement for stakeholder groups and constituencies to provide access to ICANN to their membership lists - well we have the aggregated lists, that's not really the issue so much as the fact that we don't have an SOI associated with each person in that list because an SOI is only required for people you know, as stated, in Chapter 5.0, so not everyone is required to have an SOI.

And this is - staff just notes that members lists of SOs and ACs and SGs and Cs have existed at least until FY '15 if not earlier. Those notes are captured here. So the question then for the GNSO Review Working Group is where would we sort of expand a requirement to not only have this centralized information, to have these lists but also whether, you know, where to have a requirement that the list must also have a link to the individual statement of interest.

Now I'll not here though, just looking at this language, it says, "Where one is required and posted." So perhaps the - you know, so if an SOI is required, somebody is a working group or a work team, then that would be linked to the list so there would be a mechanical aspect of just simply making sure there's a link between the individual listed and that person's SOI. So it maybe that to implement this one would simply need to make sort of connections between information that's already available.

So anyway I'll stop there though and see if anybody has an questions with this. And go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I have to leave in three minutes right now but briefly, well maybe I misunderstood, you know, the approach here. So I do not have any problem with a members list, which is already available because for example our constituency has also members list on the Website, which is publicly available. Well, with regards to the - as I understand - the SOIs, well, linked to those members or have available such a list, that's what I understand is now the request.

And, well, it should at first only just contain, well, SOIs, which are required according to the existing rules with relation to policy development activities on working groups and other bodies. Well, and to where it is publicly available, well, I don't have any ideas and any specific request, well, as long as you can manage that. So that would be my comment. So it's a little bit different than the comment I have filed because I was thinking, well, that ICANN would have, well, specific access to other SOIs in addition to what is already available. So thanks very much.

I'm sorry I have to leave so because of another meeting which just people logging in. Thanks for hearing me. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you so much for joining Wolf-Ulrich, in the short time that you have, and thank you so much for your very helpful comment, that's quite useful. Rafik. Rafik, if you're speaking we're not hearing you.

Jen Wolfe: Looks like his line just dropped.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so, Rafik, it looks like your microphone is - you're trying to speak but we're not hearing you. I see Julie is typing. And I'll just note a comment in the chat. Amr Elsadr has said, "My impression is that this recommendation is not creating additional (unintelligible) for SOIs being posted but only linking those that are required to be linked to the centralized membership list." I think Wolf-Ulrich is saying the same thing. And Julie Bisland is saying, "Rafik, please let Julie Bisland know if you need a dial out." We are unfortunately unable to hear you at the moment, but happy to come back to you as soon as we can hear you.

In the meantime perhaps I'll move along, but just noting the comments that perhaps what - in a situation Recommendation 27 we have really more of a - just a mechanical issue of linking SOIs that already exist to lists of members that already exist, and that's something that staff could look into, you know, any feasibility and how that might be implemented.

And no, we don't know why - I don't know if you want to try again to speak, Rafik? In the meantime, moving along to Recommendation 28, so that recommendation states that Section 6.1.2, Membership, of Chapter 6.0 of the Stakeholders and Constituencies Operating Principles and Participation Guidelines and the GNSO Operating Procedures should be revised to clarify that key clauses are mandatory rather than advisory and to institute meaningful sanctions for non compliance where appropriate. Staff could provide draft language for the working group to consider.

Staff notes that two of the (unintelligible) sanctions and compliance monitoring already exist. So for example Council and SG and C leadership,

admin support maintain the GNSO site for leadership changes and collaborates with individuals to have their SOIs complete upon changes to leadership. While the SG C leadership SOI requirements in the Operating Procedures are not authoritatively defined, past leaderships have always completed SOIs as posted on the GNSO site.

Concerning working group participation, at the start of each working group or new additions to existing working group members are required to meet SOI requirements for working group participation. After several weeks of non compliance a member will be reduced to observer until compliance is met. Each formal working group call or GNSO Council meeting the first agenda item is to ask for any updates of SOIs.

And I see Rafik is rejoining. Let's see whether or not he's able to speak. Is Rafik back on, Julie?

Julie Bisland: He's joined Adobe Connect, he's probably trying to get audio right now.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Sure. So with respect to 28, so I think this maybe goes beyond just SOIs. It's one thing that staff could probably try to get clarity on by looking back at the, you know, the recommendations from the GNSO Review Working Part is what are the key clauses in Chapter 6.0, Subsection 6.1.2, that are mandatory? Is it every statement within this 6.1.2 that then is a - instead of should becomes must? We'll look back at the language and see if we can provide some clarification of exactly what is being requested to be changed or whether or not current existing procedures are sufficient to meet the implementation of this recommendation. But perhaps I'll see if anybody has any questions and see whether or not Rafik has been able to get his audio back.

Not seeing any questions so at this point perhaps for 28 staff could take the action to look at Section 1.2, Membership specifically looking at the key clauses in that section that would then be mandatory, what that would mean as far as language and what that might mean as far as the level of compliance and sanctions that may already exist. I mean, if the language has to be changed to be mandatory that would require a change to this section of the procedures and staff could do a draft markup just so that the GNSO Review Working Group could get a sense of what that change might mean. Does that sound like a good way forward on that recommendation, Jen, others?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, absolutely. Excuse me.

Julie Hedlund: So then moving along to Recommendation 29, "Current statement of interest of GNSO Council members and Executive Committee members of all stakeholder groups and constituencies do not include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN per the recommendation, Chapter 5, Statement of Interest, would need to be modified to include the requirement to provide the total number of years that person has held leadership positions and staff would provide draft language for the working group to consider."

So staff notes that this recommendation could be difficult to implement as the text is stated here. Perhaps staff can suggest if there are changes to the SOI forms that a start date field could be listed within the SOI. This way the system can calculate the total number of years from the current date minus start date to current number of years. Now that staff would note that that would not then indicate however leadership positions. And I think what this recommendation is trying to achieve is to show who has held leadership positions and for how long.

And Marika notes, "Would it be more valuable to list actual leadership positions with years held as an accumulation may not be that helpful." I think,

yes, Marika, I think that's the point I'm also trying to make is that cumulative number of years doesn't really get at I think the recommendation here. I think the recommendation is more interested in, you know, have you held a leadership position and for how long?

So this would require a change to Chapter 5.0, there would be an additional item that people would have to complete and we would have to determine whether or not anybody with a current SOI would have to then go back and update it accordingly and that is it then grandfathered or is it something that starts us, you know, with the new SOIs? I mean, obviously it would be valuable to have the back dated information but that could entail, you know, a considerable amount of work on the part of community members.

So maybe I'll just open it up for comments and questions. And then there's just a general note to staff notes that the SOI platform is going to migrate from the current wiki solutions that we use to the global enrollment platform. This platform could allow for proper connection to individual's profiles and better alignment with the SOI to the working group entry into the system. The unofficial target date for launch is FY '19. Clearly that's beyond what the date of when we need to get this recommendation implemented, which needs to be before the end of this year. So that is a point of interest that, you know, there could be further improvements to the SOI.

So Marika Konings says - she says - "So could an interim solution be to add a field asking people to list previous leadership positions held? And what is considered a leadership position that may also require some definition. For example, being an appointee to NomComm, is that a leadership position?" so those are good questions. And I'll see if others have questions as well and I'll note that unfortunately it looks like we've lost Rafik again.

Okay, so Rafik said dial out is not an option. Unfortunately it looks like his Adobe Connect line has dropped again. So, Jen, Lori, Sara, any thoughts on this one?

Jen Wolfe: No, I don't have anything to add. Lori or Sara?

Julie Hedlund: Okay, I see Rafik has come back into the room. Okay, so I see Sara says, "Nothing to add." Lori says, "Nothing pops out." And thank you, Jen, also. So perhaps what we can do for this recommendation is make some suggestions for an additional field that - where people would list previous leadership positions and then - and possibly, you know, and current positions. I think that we would have to develop a definition of what is a leadership position. And staff could take a draft at that as well.

So let me just summarize where we stand on each of these as we've gone through these - these recommendations and the action items. So with respect to Recommendation Number 26, so we do need to clarify what needs to be disclosed. So the action item for 26 - and possibly to go back to our ICANN Legal staff is to provide more input on what would be required for disclosure to fulfill the requirement in Recommendation 26. Staff will take that action.

On Recommendation 27, staff will investigate the feasibility of implementing the recommendation and report back and specifically just the mechanical aspect of connecting, you know, the membership lists we already have with existing SOIs as they exist.

Recommendation 28, staff will review the key clauses in Section 6.1.2 of the Operating Procedures that would need to be changed to implement the recommendation and provide a markup to the working group.

And then with respect to Recommendation 29, staff will provide a proposal of the addition of a field, the SOI that list past and current leadership positions. And then also clarification of what is a leadership position.

So staff takes those actions. I don't think there's any more discussion on this recommendation. I will note that we also have action item for

Recommendation 6 that we had previously reviewed to combine that with other recommendations. There's two other recommendations that relate to diversity, Recommendation 31 and 33 - pardon me - and 36. So staff has that outstanding action item which we'll include in the notes so that we don't lose track of it.

So Jen, I guess the next item is the meeting schedule and also about the run up to ICANN 60.

Jen Wolfe: Sure. Sure, yes. So our next meeting is two weeks from today, which is the 12th of October. And I had noted I won't be able to be there but confirm that Wolf-Ulrich will so that he can run the meeting. And then following that, we are close to the next ICANN meeting. And, Julie, were you able to check your travel schedule?

Julie Hedlund: I'm definitely available. I'm not actually...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...leaving until late that evening. So and I think I'm hopeful that some people won't be traveling yet.

Jen Wolfe: Go ahead and go on the 26th?

Julie Hedlund: I would suggest that. Alternatively, we could try - we could see if people were interested in switching to the week before just to - would it be then the 19th.

Jen Wolfe: The 19th.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I mean, a value of that is that so, you know, we'll have - staff will have the OEC report, you know, that can also be used for the GNSO update at ICANN 60 for the working group to review next week. It's a fairly straightforward report in that it's pretty much of a matter of simply taking

existing text out of the implementation charters and out of the implementation plan and shifting it into the report format.

So there's not - so staff isn't really having to create anything new, anything that the working group hasn't already seen. But this report would need to be distributed to the Council and to the OEC prior to ICANN 60 and in the case of the Council within the - no later than the document deadline for reports to be considered at the GNSO Council meeting, that meeting is on the Wednesday, the 1st of November so backing up 10 days from that.

The value of having a meeting on the 19th would be to have two meetings to review the report and that that review would happen you know, prior to the report being then released to the Council, whereas the meeting just prior to - on the 27th, sorry, 26th just prior, it would be too late for the working group to make any further changes to the report, I mean, the report would have to have been submitted prior to that.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, so unless there's an objection then why don't we schedule our next meetings for the 12th of October, and then again the 19th of October so that we have time to get everything prepared properly. And then so then we would be looking at November 2 is during the ICANN meeting and then the following week is usually a break week. And then do we want to send out a Doodle poll for resuming or do we want to try to pick up then again on the 16th? What were you thinking, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: I was thinking this time seems to work well enough for the core people who join.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: I'm a little bit hesitant to try to pick other times because we now have so many meetings that it becomes difficult to find unconflicted times, and in fact I'll just note that we did agree that we had to change the time for the meeting

on the 12th of October for Wolf-Ulrich to be able to cover that meeting so as not to conflict with the GNSO Council meeting that's also that morning. So I think...

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...I will check but I believe that that's been rescheduled to 1300 UTC as opposed to 1200 UTC so we get a little bit constrained. So I would suggest we pick up on the 16th at our usual time and hope you know, get our usual core group of participants.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay, does anybody have an objection to that calendar? Not seeing anything on the chat or any other comments okay...

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Jen, I just want to let you know that - yes, I'm Europe mid October so like the 17th until after Abu Dhabi. I'm not going to Abu Dhabi but I'm going to remotely participate from European time rather than - oh yes, Amr, yes, Amr just put in the chat, oh no 1400 is 2:00 pm? You're ahead, I'm sorry. Please ignore what I just said, I was counting backwards instead of forward. I apologize.

I'll do the best I can to make the call but I am in Europe at that time at another conference. So I'll just play it by ear, that's the best I can promise.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. So if you're in Europe it should be okay because it's mid afternoon, that's right. Okay. So if there's no other objections, Julie, why don't we go ahead and send out update calendar invites to everyone with the schedule and then we can hopefully just continue on that until we hit the end of the year and holidays and we can look at what we need to do at that point.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. That sounds good. So I'll look to the secretariat on that so just confirming again we've got 12th of October that time I think has changed to 1300 UTC, we'll check that. We will meet on the 19th of October as opposed to the 26th. The 26th will then be canceled. We will not meet obviously during ICANN 60 or the week immediately following so we'll pick up again at the usual time of 1200 UTC on the 16th of November.

I didn't have anything else on the agenda, Jen, I don't know if anybody else had anything?

Jen Wolfe: No, I don't have anything. Does anyone else have anything they want to address? We can wrap up a little early today. I see Lori is typing.

Julie Hedlund: And she says, "I am good."

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay, I must be slower than you are. Okay, well great then we can bring this meeting to a close so thank you, everyone, for your time. Again, we appreciate your continued commitment to this effort and we look forward to speaking again soon.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thanks, everyone. And we'll make sure to get the report - the OEC report out to you prior to next week's meeting so we can spend time on the next call with that. Thanks, everyone, thanks so much for joining.

Lori Schulman: Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen, for chairing. Appreciate it.

Julie Bisland: Thanks, everyone. Today's meeting is adjourned. (Simon), can you please stop the recordings? Everyone, have a great rest of your day.

END