

GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
07 June 2011 at 18:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference on 07 June 2011 at 18:30 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-pednr-20110607-en.mp3>

Attendees:

James Bladel - Registrar Constituency
Paul Diaz - Registrar Constituency
Alan Greenberg - ALAC Liaison to GNSO Council, Chair
Tatiana Khramtsova - Registrar Constituency
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ccNSO Liaison APRALO
Sivasubramanian Muthusamy - ALAC IDN liaison - At Large
Michele Neylon - Registrar Constituency
Michael O'Connor - Commercial and Business Users Constituency (CBUC)
Ted Suzuki - Intellectual Property Constituency
Ron Wickersham - Non Commercial Users Constituency

ICANN Staff:

Glen de Saint Gery
Marika Könings
Margie Milam
Kristina Nordström

Apologies:

Berry Cobb - Commercial and Business Users Constituency
Mason Cole - Registrar Constituency
Olivier Crepin-Leblond - ALAC Chair
Jeffrey Eckhaus - Registrar Constituency
Oliver Hope - Registrar
Karim Mohamed Attoumani - Government Advisory Committee

Coordinator: Excuse me, this is the operator. I would like to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Thank you, you may begin.

Kristina Nordstrom: Thank you. Okay. Hello, everybody, and welcome to the PEDNR call today on the 7th of June, 2011. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Siva Muthusamy, Paul Diaz, Alan Greenberg, James Bladel, Ron Wickersham, Michele Neylon and Tatyana Khramtsova.

From staff we have Glen De Saint gery, Marika Konings, Margie Milam and Kristina Nordstrom. Apologies from Mason Cole, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Berry Cobb, Jeffrey Eckhaus, Oliver Hope and Karim Attoumani.

And could I please also remind you to state your names before speaking for transcript purposes? Thanks and over to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Kristina. All right, this is likely to be the last full call although conceivably we could have a short call next week if necessary.

Marika, what do we have on the agenda other than to review the notes that I sent out and the comments that Michael made? Is there anything else?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I didn't receive anything else from anyone else in the working group. I did receive some feedback from the compliance on the their section of the report and things they suggested, you know, taking out some things that (we) and the report said were going to happen but actually didn't happen.

So I'll update that but there's nothing really new there so I think that's something that will be done in the next iteration but aside, I didn't receive anything else apart from what you sent and what Michael sent.\

And you can find it on the right hand side in the Adobe Connect. I posted the two emails there basically.

Alan Greenberg: All right and that's a disturbing comment in its own right, that compliance had hoped things would be done that didn't get done but we won't focus on that right now.

All right, Marika, are there any other items in the report other than the ones I put in my email that need to be reviewed on this call? Were there any other controversial ones that were left in that no one else has commented on them? So I'm assuming other people at least have done a cursory look and haven't commented.

Marika Konings: I don't think so.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Then we'll just go through these. All right, my first one is at line 1200 and something and that's about 35%, 40% onto the document if you want to scroll down.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. While people are scrolling I do have a question in relation to the second paragraph of your email, started actually on the reorganization. And I think that's something I said on my email and indeed what we discussed and I think agreed to reorganize them.

But my question is who is going to do the reorganization and how, or you people prefer, I need you to have a go at that and then, you know, my question would be how would people like to see these organized?

Alan Greenberg: Oh, well, I can answer but other people please speak up. I know I did an ordering of them for the PowerPoint presentation in wherever we were, San Francisco, which tried to group them together by functional use or by the, you know, by the area that they attack.

And so I think that's probably a good start that might need some refining because I did that 2 o'clock in the morning one day. But that was certainly my take on how we should approach it. Not saying that particular organization was the ultimate one but I think that's probably a good basis to start assuming other people are agreeing that we should reorder them.

Comments? Thoughts? If anybody has any particular ones, I just think if someone who isn't focused on the charter and I don't think most people who are looking to understand what it is we're recommending are going to focus on the charter.

I think grouping them together makes more sense than, you know, trying to relate them to the charter questions. I think that we need a parenthetical or something in each one saying what it relates to.

And I did make another comment later on I think that if we do this, which I hope we will, in the review of the comments for the last proposed report we probably need, you know, some sort of (identification) when we're talking about Recommendation 5. You know, what the current number is if it's changed. So that just needs to be sort of some level of parenthetical added to the recommendations in the review.

Okay, Marika, not hearing any problems with that, then I'll certainly look at the PowerPoint and send you later on today a list of what I think makes sense. But feel free to adjust it or question it if you wish and I'll send it with a list so anyone else has any questions, please go just raise them.

Okay, was there anything else before we go on to the specifics?

Marika Konings: Nope.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So 1201 we had the wording 'single working group would like to put forward.' I think we are putting it forward at this point so I think we should just be more direct in saying 'puts forward' or 'is putting forward.' It's just a grammatical thing because we're not really asking permission or stating it as a hope at that point.

Twelve-twelve, 1212, is - yeah, this is the one on an implementation team if one should exist. And the sentence on providing feedback just says provide

feedback. It doesn't say to whom. I presume that that meant to staff and implementation. The next sentence implies GNSO which I don't think - sounds a bit unwieldy but Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. The intent of that is, as there's no formal process yet as a new PDP hasn't been approved yet on the creation of an implementation review team and also taking into account that there might be some time between, you know, the council has often used recommendations, the board has often used recommendations before there actually is an implementation plan, which you know, might mean as well that this working group might no longer be in existence or certain members might have an interest to participate again.

I tried to build in a bit of a - now that the council is basically the reference point for saying how this feedback should be provided either by, you know, trying to reform the working group or having an implementation review team or, you know, providing their advice to the initial council. That's the way I thought would work best is having the council as the body managing that instead of assuming that the working group or individual members are, you know, still interested in doing that work by the time the implementation plan might be developed.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I had no problem with that. I just had problems with the reference to giving advice to the council. I think it's fine to say that there are individuals on this working group who remain available, you know, that this is not slavery. We can't guarantee they will be available seven months from now, you know, should the GNSO council choose to form an implementation support team or something like that. I'm not sure review is the right word.

But I was only quibbling with the phrasing, advice to the GNSO council. I agree that it should be the responsibility of the GNSO council to chart - no, I hate to use the word charter because I don't want to get into that - but to put together such a group.

Marika Konings: Well, I guess I'm, as well as the question of whether it's official GNSO council advice on the implementation because of course, you know, I think any implementation plan typically is put out for public comment. So there's nothing preventing, you know, individual members to comment on, you know, whatever they think is right or wrong.

The reason why it might go to the GNSO council to give it more weight and more, you know, formal approval saying this is what, you know, members of the working group or a separate team that has been formed, they look at this implementation saying this has been endorsed by the GNSO council as being our position on the implementation.

That was more the thinking around the structure from my side. But, you know, if people feel be more comfortable in structuring it another way I'm happy to change that.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Okay, I guess the GNSO council will do what it wants to at this point. It's just that the concept of giving advice to the council which the council then has to formally pass on to staff puts a level of onerousness on it that I don't think was the original intent. The original intent was to at least alert staff if what they are implementing was not the original intent of the recommendations.

So I guess I'd like to see it less formal than more but let's not belabor it on the call and let's try to come up with some simple words that will be vague enough that everyone has a good level of comfort with it.

Twelve fifty-five (1255) - yeah, that was the one that our current wording says that this is talking about the blackout, not the blackout, the period in which the domain is not working, the required one during the eight-day period.

And it says, "The domain must be renewable by the registered name-holder at expiration until the end of the period." And there's almost an implication there that it means it must not be renewable afterwards.

Am I over-reading this? I guess I'd like to hear from our registrar or do we need to say at least until the end of that period?

Any thought from James or Paul or Michele?

Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: What line am I looking at?

Alan Greenberg: Line number 1255.

Michele Neylon: What's the problem?

Alan Greenberg: It says the domain must be renewable by the registered name-holder at expiration until the end of that period. Is there an implication there that it must not be renewable afterwards? In which case we should say at least until the end of the period.

Michele Neylon: I'm not a lawyer and personally I don't see a problem with this. But if somebody else has a problem with this, I mean I don't know. I personally...

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Again I was raising issues that, you know, may be of concern. I don't feel strongly about it.

James?

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible) a certain number of people...

James Bladel: Yeah, I think that - go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: No, James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yeah. I mean I just wanted to echo what he said there. I don't see a problem with it with the way it is written now but if there's something I'm not getting, that it could be too restrictive and I don't care if you add in a least or I would stay away, I would stay away from a word like least because I think, you know, we could say something the same way by saying at a minimum and I think that translates a little bit better. But I don't care even if we keep it the way it is now.

Alan Greenberg: Okay then let's just leave it.

Next one is 1258 which is yeah, I think there was a comment or one of the comments that pointed to the term saying that it must result with original DNS resolution path and asked which one are we talking about. Do we need to define that with any more specificity?

Marika, do you remember did we say the answer to that one? I think unless I'm imagining the whole thing, did we say that yes, we should be more specific or did we decide when analyzing the comments that it wasn't of any great import?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We need to look back but I think we did say we would look at this and see if it would make sense to change it but I don't think we firmly committed on changing it so I haven't seen any suggestions on this.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm worried that if we try to come up with words to define it we're going to end up in a deeper pit than we are without them.

Ron:

Ron Wickersham: Yes, this is Ron Wickersham. Rather than cause, how about using the word, we'll restore the domain name to resolve to it so that describes how it was before they made the change that we're trying to reverse.

So rather than, 'we'll cause,' we'll restore the domain name.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm just worried that if - the possibly confusing part is that if the domain had been intercepted by the registrar to go to a parked page as is common, and then it's blacked out, is restore - is the original the parked page or the user's original one? I know our intent is to the user's original one.

Ron Wickersham: They restore, they use restore before expiration if you want to clarify. Doesn't go to a parked page before it expires.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I can live with that. So what wording, we're talking we'll restore the domain name to resolve to the original DNS resolution path in place prior to expiration?

Does that capture it?

Not hearing any nos. Let's pretend there is. Let's pretend it does and put it in? There will be a comment period.

Marika, is it presumed that there will be a comment period or is that standard that the GNSO does go out to a comment period at this point?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The GNSA doesn't...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Doesn't; okay. So it's the board comment period is the first one that would come up.

Marika Konings: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So whatever we're putting in is cast in stone. I think the words I just used are okay but let's, Marika, how about putting it in the draft and we'll highlight it and make sure that other people read it and make sure it makes sense.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to confirm, the only thing we're adding at the end is 'just prior to expiration.' Did I get that right?

Alan Greenberg: I think Ron suggested that we change the words 'will cause' into 'will restore.'

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Twelve sixty-four, 1264, it says, 'the workgroup believes that killing the domain site is the most effective method.' I would have, my personal preference is to make it more that we didn't do any careful analysis to say it's the absolute best one. I don't feel strongly about it though.

Does anyone care? No one seems to.

All right, 1276. Yeah, that was the sentence left over from the previous version and I think we either need to delete it or phrase it in such a word that it's a note to the implementers because we're not going to change the final wording at this point. But the wording of the actual policy, we'll need to do what it says.

No complaints? Let's go on.

Thirteen eighty-seven, 1387.

Marika Konings: Sorry; just on the 1276?

Alan Greenberg: Twelve seventy-six is what we did. No, no, - yeah, 1276, '77.

Marika Konings: Right, so there was agreement to delete that because I didn't, I don't know if there's any issues but I think there are exceptions in which case you don't want...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. No, on retrospect that's why I said I think it probably should be changed to be in the same tone as several other statements saying that the implementers must take into account the exceptions.

Marika Konings: So is it something then you would like to see added to that beginning statement?

Alan Greenberg: Hold on, let me go back to it.

Marika Konings: We have...

Alan Greenberg: Ron, do you have something on this point?

Ron Wickersham: Yes. This is Ron Wickersham. Rather than saying final wording which says, you know, which is a note to ourselves to revise it, just say the implementers will need to exempt cases or the implementation policy will need to exempt cases, putting the work off on them. Is that what you intended to do or does that help any?

Alan Greenberg: I'm just looking at what the actual recommendation says.

Marika Konings: It's in 1216 to 1220 where we talk about, you know, special consideration to context, (unintelligible provisions and I guess there we could, for example, add as well consideration need to be given as well where, you know, certain provisions do not apply in cases of fraud and what else did we mention?

Fraud, breach of registration agreement, (unintelligible). I think we can maybe just include that there because I guess it might be the same...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, it could apply to others as well. Yeah, I think that's a good idea.

Thirteen eighty-seven, 1387, was just a capitalization issue. And, Marika, in 1255 you caught that there was an upper case A instead of a lower case in RNH@A, at E? It's in my note.

Marika Konings: I'll look on that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So 1387 is just the word name should be capitalized.

Thirteen ninety-one, 1391,

Woman: Sorry, that's my husband alarm. It'll go off in a moment.

Marika Konings: I think (unintelligible), on that one I think I just forgot to take out something.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, okay, the whole sentence just goes. Okay, yeah.

Fourteen thirteen, 1413, whoops. Yeah, this is the - unless the registered name is deleted by the registrar at least one post expiration notice must be sent. I think we need an 'unless the name is actually renewed.'

No complaints there? James?

James Bladel: Yeah, on 1412 and 1413?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

James Bladel: Recommendation 12?

Alan Greenberg: Yep.

James Bladel: Why couldn't we say unless the registered name is deleted by the registrar - deleted or renewed - maybe that gets what you're after?

Alan Greenberg: Yep. Clearly we don't want them to send a note, a spam notification notice the guy renewed two days ago.

James Bladel: Well, okay, that's fair but I also don't want the registrar to be penalized if they cross in the mail so to speak. (Unintelligible) queued up for any renewal notice and then somebody gets one after they've already pulled the trigger on the renewal and we don't want that to count as spam.

Alan Greenberg: I would hope - well, it may count as spam but it's not an infraction of a rule I think.

James Bladel: I would say it's not spam, it's just the timing.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Oh, well, I mean I don't think we can prevent those, you know. You probably all have at the bottom of your letter if you've already paid the bill, then forgive this mail.

James Bladel: Possibly.

Alan Greenberg: That's customer relations, not violating a rule. All right, that wording is fine. I don't think there was a problem with that, renewed by the RNH@E. We don't want one of these transfer renewals to count.

James Bladel: Wait; what?

Alan Greenberg: Well, when a name is transferred to another owner, you know, as part of an auction or something, that technically counts as a renewal.

James Bladel: Right.

Alan Greenberg: And that's not the renewal we're talking about.

James Bladel: Just a second here, let me think on that one. Well, I mean I don't know that we have to be - it's like unless the registered name is renewed or is deleted by the registrar...

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I can live with that. That's fine.

James Bladel: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Alan, just concerned about what you just said.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Why would a change of registrants infer a renewal?

Alan Greenberg: Well, a change of registrant after expiration, which is the process that is used, you know, for going along with auctions and such, is from a registry point of view a renewal.

It is; there's no other way to look at it. It's a renewal where it swaps an owner at the same time.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: But I don't think I really have a problem with it here. We could be more specific; I don't think we really need to though.

If no one else has an issue with it, let's keep on going.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Can you just confirm what is it; is it I'm going to add 'or renewed' or are we going to add 'or renewed by the RNH@E'?

Alan Greenberg: We're pretty religiously using the registered name-holder at expiration when it applies so I think it should apply here also.

James Bladel: Alan, this is James. I disagree with that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

James Bladel: I mean I think that we're either; we may be inadvertently making a material change here. I don't know if we're trying to or if we're just...

Alan Greenberg: I don't think we are.

James Bladel: Yeah. So I just would say like, you know, unless the registered name is renewed, or is deleted by the registrar, you know, I think that covers us and I think it makes sure that we're not being overly restrictive in a way the registrars are accidentally going to trip over, you know, all (unintelligible) policies that they think is behaving in one way but is actually behaving in a separate way. Or it could be read to be behaving (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I had no real - like I said, I have no real problem with it. Looking at it on the screen right now I suspect it should have read, which we never put in, at least one notification to the RNH@E. I think we used that in other places but I'm not sure.

James, is that a material change in your mind?

James Bladel: No. I think here it might be and I'm not saying that it is; I'm just saying...

Alan Greenberg: No, no, I'm not commenting on renewed by, I'm saying the sentence that says, 'at least one notification.' I'm wondering if after that it should say, 'to the RNH@E.'

James Bladel: That nice.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I think that should be there.

James Bladel: Yeah, I just wanted to make sure when we say renewed by, you know, who's renewing it by - I want to make sure that we're not introducing a new restriction, maybe inadvertently introducing a new restriction that trips us up.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. No, okay. I'm happy with just renewed or deleted by the registrar as you suggested but I would add that to the RNH@E after the word notification.

Ron, is your hand up again or is that the old one?

Ron Wickersham: Yes, that's up again. Yeah, I'm uncomfortable with the idea that renewal is a broad term and I'm uncomfortable that there's an issue with saying renewed by the acronym, RNH-whatever (unintelligible).

If this requires more thought I'm uncomfortable with deciding it right now. I mean can this be deferred till the next meeting if there is because I'll put a strong objection as the party to want to see it less nebulous or unrestricted so I can give some more thought. I just can't come up with anything that's for the money here.

Alan Greenberg: Well, if that's the only change I suppose we could make it next week if we have a meeting next week. We could do it on the mailing list. I'm not particularly worried about it because we're talking about the notification, the

post-expiration notification. You know, it's not saying who has the right to renew. We still have all of those clauses in place. And, you know, we already have a clause...

Ron Wickersham: Okay. The requirement that the original registered name-holder has the right, and it is a right now I believe once we've done this, the right to renew for, you know, at least until the eight-day period has expired.

Alan Greenberg: That implies no one else can renew it before them because the renewal is, you know, is a one-time event. So I don't really have a problem with it. But if you want to think about it you certainly can.

Ron Wickersham: But yeah, I can understand - okay, I can see the issue of it being restricted to notification and not the...

Alan Greenberg: I don't really understand the problem that James has but I don't think it's an issue.

Ron Wickersham: M-hmm.

Alan Greenberg: Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yeah, I don't think it's an issue either. I just wanted to be careful, that's all.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah,

Paul Diaz: Maybe overly careful.

Man: (Unintelligible). For the record, would you just read the sentence again as we've agreed?

Alan Greenberg: “Unless the registered name is renewed or is deleted by the registrar, at least one notification to the RNH@E, which includes renewal instruction, must be sent after expiration.”

All who asked for it, says okay.

And that’s the end of my specific questions. I did have a reference to the (Nugee Teal D) contract and, Marika, do you want me to put a comment, formal comment period or will you pass it on? This is the place where they called the (RGD) a registry grace period.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can pass it on but I think it’s always helpful as well that it comes through the proper comment as well.

Alan Greenberg: I will do that in that case.

I’m just wondering how many times various people looked at that and said okay and didn’t notice it was wrong.

All right, Michael Young’s comments. Marika, my analysis was he was talking about the section on the comments on the last proposed report. Is that the way you read it also because he’s talking about the ones numbered 1 to 57 and that’s the only place that applies.

Marika Konings: Right, this is Marika. That’s what I assumed as well looking at it. I’ve heard something was maybe (unintelligible) talking about the public comment review tool and he wanted that reorganized but then I, you know, reading your email I think maybe he wanted to reorganize the whole section which would then basically show for each of the recommendations to say more clearly the comments made and changes made.

But I think as you know that they would take quite some work to do that and I don’t know if it necessarily makes it easier for, you know, people that have

not commented or haven't been closely involved in the process. To them, you know, really read the recommendations while I think those that actually made the recommendations should probably see in the comment review tool how we've addressed them.

But that's just my...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think the substantive part of his comment though really was pointing out that we talk about the charter questions but I don't think we have the charter questions there. Do you know what number this is, where this is in the document? I'm scrolling through and I don't see it off hand.

Marika Konings: Sorry, I'm not sure what you're referring to there.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay. I find it now, around page 45 is an example. You group these with great sections that talk about the recommendations as they apply to each charter question. I don't think you actually put the text in of the charter question in this table though. And I think that's the largest part of his comments.

Marika Konings: Oh, okay. Well, that can be done. Just means that it becomes substantially larger. I mean the other way these just refer people back to other sections of the documents where, you know, those questions are spelled out.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, all you have to do before the first occurrence of charter question one in the gray box, put a new box immediately preceding it showing the charter question. So it really only adds five boxes to the whole table.

He's asking for a bit more than that but I don't really think is his second section, he seems to want to the recommendations echoed twice in the table and I think that's overkill.

But if prior to the first occurrence of charter question one you show what the question is, I think that addresses to a large extent his overall concern that someone reading it from scratch doesn't quite make the relations.

James?

James Bladel: Hi, so James speaking (unintelligible). So not very, not really weighing in one way or the other on what Michael is proposing and I think he may even be onto something here but I had two thoughts about, you know, changing the structure of the document at this point.

First is that if we deviate too far from the document that everybody commented on the first and second round, I think that we're going to introduce some confusion when a new final report comes and even if that's material and you're saying the same thing, it doesn't look anything like the document that people have reviewed in previous public comment cycles.

And, you know, the second thing is, is I think that we need to be mindful of how much work this is going to be and our goal to, you know, get this thing wrapped up as close as possible after Singapore and what that's going to take away from as far as staff, you know, reworking with documents.

So, you know, just those two points of caution before we dive in with what he's recommending. I'm not saying he doesn't have some good ideas here; I think he does. And perhaps these are things that we should save for future reports but I think swapping horses midstream on this report might introduce more confusion than it solves.

Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thanks, James. I think the main issue he's raising however is just that we make reference to the charter questions but don't show the text. So we

can fix that by adding five sentences, you know, five boxes into that one table.

James Bladel: I mean if it's cosmetic then I guess it would be best to (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, completely cosmetic. It's inserting five lines into the table.

James Bladel: Okay. Well, then, I'm okay with that. I would just be not really, you know, we don't want this to go through a restructuring process in the document, you know, saying the same thing, comes out the other side looking completely unfamiliar to...

Alan Greenberg: No, his suggestion if I read it correctly is really just saying make sure that someone who is interested enough to read the public comments that came out, since they're making reference to the charter questions, put the text of the charter questions there so they don't have to flip back to find them,.

James Bladel: Okay, okay. Well, I guess I would...

Alan Greenberg: He's asking for a little more than that but as I said, I think that's gilding the lily a little bit too much.

James Bladel: Yeah. Okay, right. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: And in terms of the change I was suggesting a reordering the recommendations. As a historic document this is what people are going to look at, not the prior report, so I think it's important to make this one legible and understandable.

So even though it does reorganize them, as long as we have reference to the old ones I think we're okay.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think indeed it's not so hard to make that change here and I'm probably I'll need some (unintelligible) as well of the actual public common review tool to see there if we actually need (unintelligible) down the charter questions and again I don't think it'll take too much time.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Being realistic, if people get this far in the document if they don't know by that time which questions we're addressing then they definitely weren't paying attention in the first 40 pages.

Alan Greenberg: Yes but not all of us have memorized them like you have.

We're at the end of the comments that were submitted by me and Michael. Is there anything else before we ask Marika to do a final version that we'll have a couple of days to look at for any typos or other nits and lock it up and send it off?

Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. (Unintelligible) then suggests a timing on that. If you can give, you know, send (unintelligible) the mailing list and the ordering of the recommendations I think you said you were able to do that later today...

Alan Greenberg: I will.

Marika Konings: I can probably turn the document around tomorrow taking into account the comments you discussed today and put it out for a review. And then the question is how long do people want to review that final version before we actually just, you know, send it to the council and publish it.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I would say typos you can probably give us till Monday on. Anything which is any more than a typo I think that people better get it to the list by your Friday morning at the latest? Does that sound reasonable?

Marika Konings: Okay. So then basically Tuesday would be the publication date if nothing major happens (unintelligible) between now and then.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I mean, you know, for careful reading weekends are good from my point of view anyway but I wouldn't want to see anything substantive change at that point.

Marika Konings: And then you have a (unintelligible) you need to add in there and I'm not sure (Unintelligible) and Kristina and Glen will be working on that. In the meantime the attendance sheets will need to be updated and included as well.

Alan Greenberg: Right. Is there anything else we need to cover, folks?

If not we'll end. It's after 15 minutes and this will be - does anyone see any reason why we need to meet next week?

Woman: Not that I can (unintelligible), no.

Alan Greenberg: Well, barring something that comes up that needs a real consensus call on the phones so I would ask you all to keep the first half hour of the meeting for next week open but at this point we will not schedule one and this will be the last official meeting of this group.

And if that is indeed the case I thank you all for your stamina if nothing else and your working in good faith together.

James? Oh, Marika. Yes, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Sorry. If I could just remind everyone that there's a presentation to the (Unintelligible) scheduled for Saturday, 18th of June from 2 to 2:45 local time and of course, you know, all the working group members are welcome to join that session.

Presumably there might be questions from the council that will be helpful to have some people there to respond to or discuss.

Alan Greenberg: Marika, is there much that has to be done other than adding the new recommendations and the rewording to the presentation that we'll be using from the one in San Francisco?

Marika Konings: No, I don't think so.

Alan Greenberg: And changing the next steps.

Marika Konings: Right. Right and I'm happy to update that and send that around for people to have a look at.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you.

James?

James Bladel: Yeah, so just to confirm that aside from that presentation to council we're not planning any convening of this group in Singapore?

Alan Greenberg: I'm hoping there's going to be a good bar that we may want to convene at.

James Bladel: Okay. Socially I think I was going to recommend...

Alan Greenberg: I was not planning a meeting.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. Just wanted to confirm that and yes, I totally support the idea that we should meet socially and...

Alan Greenberg: As the acting chair, as someone reminded me the other day I was never actually made chair of this group, as the acting chair I'll be happy to pay for a round of drinks for everyone.

James Bladel: I was going to say, that sounds like a slippery way of getting out of the bar tab.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, no, no, no. I said even as acting chair I'm quite willing to do it.

James Bladel: All right. Well, it isn't all up to you, Alan

Woman: Is there some sort of bar tab thing that has to do with chairs? I never...

James Blade: Well, you know.

Alan Greenberg: Well, Mikey, I know you're going to want to avoid it because you tend to be chair of a number of groups here and there but this acting chair is grateful enough that I'm very happy to do that.

Man: Well, thank you, everyone, and thank you, Alan, and look forward to seeing some folks in Singapore and toasting the end of this process.

Alan Greenberg: I thank you very much.

Man: Way to go, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, bye-bye.

Man: Thanks, folks.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Look forward to seeing you all when I do see you. Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: (Unintelligible), Alan. Bye.

END