

**Transcript**  
**GNSO Drafting Group on Cross SO/AC Working Groups**  
**20 September 2011 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the **GNSO Drafting Group on Cross SO/AC Working Groups** teleconference on 20 September 2011 at 19:00 UTC. . Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-cwg-20110920-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/>

**Attendees**

Jonathan Robinson – RySG - Chair

John Berard - CBUC

Jaime Wagner - ISPCP

Wendy Seltzer - NCSG

**ICANN Staff**

Liz Gasster

Margie Milam

Glen de Saint Gery

**Apology:**

Kristina Rosette – resigned from the group

**Absent:**

Rosemary Sinclair - NCSG

Jeff Neuman - RySG

Tim Ruiz - RrSG

Bill Drake - NCSG

Jonathan Robinson: Hello Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Hello.

Coordinator: As a reminder, today's conference call is being recorded. You may begin.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi Wendy.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much (Tonya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group call on the 22nd.

Coordinator: Excuse me. Jaime Wagner joined.

Jaime Wagner: Hello.

Glen DeSaintgery: On the 20th of September. Sorry for the hesitation. And on the call we have John Berard, Jonathan Robinson, Wendy Seltzer, and Jaime Wagner. For staff we have Liz Gasster, Margie Milam, and myself Glen DeSaintgery. I have noted apologies from anybody. Did anybody - has anybody added their apologies?

Jonathan Robinson: Glen I've got an update, effectively an apology from (Kristina) in the sense that she's told me she's going to have to formerly drop out of this group. So she no longer wishes to participate or is able to participate in this group for undisclosed reasons, so that's effectively an apology from (Kristina).

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much Jonathan. With that, may I just remind you to say your name before speaking for transcription purposes and over to you Jonathan. Thank you. And just for information, the - for the next conference council meeting on the 6th of October, documents should be in by the 28th of September.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, great Glen, so let me do - let me just say so it's Jonathan Robinson here. We've got Wendy Seltzer, John Berard, and Jaime Wagner on the call, which is great guys. I really appreciate you being here and I've been a little worried about having some kind of critical mass to get this going.

Now we've got a very tight time this evening because this call rolls directly into another call as most of you will know on - and so again apologies for the back to back scheduling. I think we're going to try and reschedule future calls for Thursday and we do a poll on that and try and get that sorted out. So really we've got until - (we'll have a hard stop) at five minutes before the hour.

I thought in a way - I'm not sure how many of you managed to see the agenda that I sent out - the sort of suggested agenda that I sent out. Wendy, Jaime, John gave me a...

Wendy Seltzer: How many of the two of us?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Wendy Seltzer: There's not a large anonymity set here.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah exactly, so Wendy I assume you didn't see it or...

Wendy Seltzer: That's correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Correct. All right, well let me just say really that the key thing I hope to achieve is really breathe some new life into this group and tackle a

couple of things on this call really. One is to just go very briefly through the history of where we've got to and sort of the key items that we've got under our belts so far. Try and look at how we might work between now and Dakar, what we might try and achieve by and at Dakar, and then look at and really try and just reestablish where we're at and cover what's been done so far.

So really from my point of view - and please try and interrupt me if you think I'm missing a key point. That's applied to both staff and colleagues on the call here. But really the critical documents for me are that we have a set of draft principles that were I think penned by Liz, but essentially ICANN staff - Liz Gasster. But you know a set of draft principles on CCWG penned by the ICANN staff back in May.

That was followed up by a discussion document that penned with help and input from colleagues and staff, and that both of those documents are available on the GNSO Web site under the draft documents. So if you need to refresh your memory, have a quick look at those. And John to your point on what has and hasn't worked in the past is a section on my draft document that sort of invites input on that if you like.

And with Margie's help in July, we got a draft charter together or a proposed charter of this group together, and that's - and we looked over that and we had a meeting back in around the 20th of July, our last meeting. I think it was the 21st of July. And in doing that, we had very limited participation, but those of us that were on the call kind of in my view - and I hope I'm not doing a disservice, but we sort of spun our wheels a bit around whether or not this group itself should be a cross-community working group.

I - some water has passed under the bridge between there, but basically my opinion and understanding is that really this has got to be a GNSO group with as broad as possible other participation. If we try and - I don't get the feeling that we've got - that this is really something that's asked for by the GNSO for us to look at and provide the GNSO with some guidance. And I know that there are some views that we should perhaps go broader than that and try to turn this into a community working group, but my current feeling is that we really need to make some progress as a drafting team from the GNSO with as inclusive as possible input and I'm suggesting that the charter reflect that position.

So really I think that's the summary to date and an expression of my opinion, which is something that I would like to discuss. And then the other area then to cover is what might we reasonably achieve. Because what I'd like to do at the next council meeting is set some expectations of what we might achieve over the next while. And as Liz has pointed out, there is some pressure building or a requirement to get some clarity about how these cross-community working groups might work in the future.

So let me pause for a moment there and first of all take your input on the sort of (run after) this and see if there are any comments on that, and then the second point is - and let's take it at that for a moment.

John Berard: Jonathan this is John. It strikes me as I look at and have listened to the discussion that the points of contention are rooted in the policy approaches - how the policy approaches are different. How the

outcomes are different for all the groups that could be participating in a cross-constituency working group.

And so would it be a good idea to identify the catalogue of what those differences are that can cause friction so that perhaps we can when deciding whether to participate or encourage cross-constituency working groups, we will know what the potential obstacles might be?

The reason I pointed out - mentioned JIG and JAS is because I think that the narrow and technical requirements of JIG lent themselves very well to avoiding many of those policy points of difference, whereas the JAS seemed to accentuate those policy points of difference. And that begins with the fact that some groups pass advice onto the board and some groups pass policy onto the board.

Jonathan Robinson: John how would we go about structuring something like that? And I'm trying to think how that would - that seems like a sensible suggestion. I mean my - the challenge will be just how to - let's (park that) and accept that it's - are there any comments on that? Any additional thoughts on that as a way?

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. I think that it is a helpful way to focus on when joint working groups might even be appropriate. Because if it's a policy development process, then there is the bylaws requirement that it follow you know a GNSO process in the GNSO or a ccNSO process in the ccNSO. So I think John's distinction is a helpful one in terms of I think we are talking about joint working groups that are providing advice whether it be to the board, the staff, or to the community - you know those three cases, but general advice.

It might even be advice on a policy matter that could then lead to a PDP that would then go into you know the appropriate channel or process. But I think it's because of those bylaws requirements for PDPs that we are kind of exclusively talking here about other advice that is not a policy development - you know a consensus policy outcome.

Margie, do you...?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for that. What I was going to ask you and I think having heard you out that I know the answer, but my impression is that that means that not much has changed since you sent those draft principles out back in May. That the position remains consistent with those. I don't know how much you can cast your mind back or remember what was written there, but doesn't it seem that...?

Liz Gasster: Well yeah, I mean it doesn't have to be that way. I mean we could - I don't mean to say that that's the only - that we - let me say I'm not arguing for the reverse, which is that that's the only way it can be done and that we have to do join working groups. I was only saying that if we are talking about a PDP, then there is a bylaws required process for following a PDP and I think that's what the contracted parties you know in the previous council discussions on the matter were most concerned about.

That PDPs - you know (too concerned) with that and that advice not go straight to the board without review by an (SO or AC). But those two elements you know seem to be what were of greatest concern to the group, but I definitely want others to comment. I just wanted to make that clarification.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Liz. So one of the key things for me is to try and break any kind of logjam and progress, and I appreciate John's suggestion as to part of it, but I'd like to try and see if there's any sort of practical milestones we can achieve over the next forthcoming period.

And like I say and perhaps in our preamble it wasn't (a recorded session). Perhaps Jaime before you or Wendy joined even, but we have this drafting charter - prospective charter for the group. It's - I'm not sure if you've both had the chance to see it, but I would quite like to get this formalized and get that under our belts and then use a couple of meetings to make some progress.

So while we may not be in the position to do what was initially desired and that is to give a full and final document to the GNSO by the Dakar meeting, I'd like to make some reasonable progress in advance of that. I don't know how realistic it is to get a proper report done by then. What do people feel about what's realistic given that we've effectively got probably a couple of meetings? We've got two council meetings and a couple of telephone call meetings. What can we realistically achieve by Dakar and what might we like to do in Dakar as part of this group?

John Berard: Well first of all, when are we going to get the - when will we move the charter? Will that be the meeting of the 6th?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, John. That's...

John Berard: Will we move the charter for the meeting on the 6th?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that's what I'm proposing.

John Berard: Okay and then we would intend then to offer some initial commentary at the meeting on the 26th. So the question is what do we do between now and the 26th. Do we begin to get community input on the points of contention that prevent the smooth operation of cross-constituency working groups?

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point. How do we - is it...?

John Berard: I mean could we also open - could we quickly call for comment in some fashion and not rely on the staff in this regard? Bueller? Bueller?

Jonathan Robinson: Has anyone from the staff got any input on this? What realistically given that we've got the opportunity for a couple of calls, the meeting which I think we've tentatively scheduled some time, and I think we've applied if you like for some time on the schedule for this issue in Dakar. What form of outreach or broader community input is possible?

The charter envisions a publication of announcement on the ICANN Web site and distribution out then into the GNSO, stakeholder groups, and so on. What's realistic in terms of soliciting input?

Woman: Well one thing that Jeff Neuman is working on - you know he is working on the open meeting plans with the staff and trying to take to heart the proposals that have been developed by that little working group that was charged with kind of enhancing our open council meetings. And one of the things that seemed to be a chorus of agreement was making the council meeting itself more interactive. This is obviously something of interest to many communities, so this might

be something that's quite ripe for an open mic session you know early on in the council meeting.

Because Jeff was looking for you know ideas along those lines, and I think that he was - there were a number of different - because we have so many working groups, there's a bit of a judgment call about which working groups would rise you know to the top that we might solicit the most robust input at the meeting. But if this were something that you know you all or the council - you know to me, it's actually a good candidate for a robust discussion at the open mic because you do have other - you know especially if we could encourage representatives of other (SOs and ACs) that have an interest in this to express their views. It might be quite relevant.

It also you know candidly might be premature because one of the things you talked about is you know kind of getting the GNSO's house in order. You know trying to figure out what the council really wants you know, and what would work best for the council's rules and for your understanding of policy development issues, and you know taking input from other groups. So I think that might be one opportunity. You know it's difficult to get a separate meeting on the calendar if that's what you were thinking about for outreach, but it's never impossible. We could always ask. (The time is closed) for the schedule itself, so a separate meeting would be difficult.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah well somebody asked me about a separate meeting and whether that was desirable and I said potentially yes. So I don't know if that application - but in any event, I think your suggestion is very good, and I appreciate your point on both its relevancy but it's potentially premature without council I think having the proper opportunity to deal with it in a structured way.

Do you know if this has come up in any planning discussions? Has this particular working group or drafting team - has this come up as a prospect for the open mic session?

John Berard: You know I thought I was on that. And in fact, I saw Adrian a couple of weeks ago who is also on it, and I'm not aware that there's been any formal progress. I was kind of curious about that. I will have to go through and check my email to see if I've missed something.

Woman: Yeah they had written up - or Glen you had written up some notes for that group that have been circulated I believe, and then Jeff used those notes as kind of a basis for trying to get the process for arranging for the meetings. And when we last met with Jeff, the cross-community working group was one of the groups that we kind of put in the candidate pool if you will as you know a possible good one to have on the open mic Wednesday.

But I think what he wanted to see - we have so many motions on the 6th - nine or ten. What would actually come out of that? how many get voted on, what gets voted on, because there could be pressing obvious things that come from that that dictate or that you know help you and everyone decide, but it was on the short list. Let me say that.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Well that's encouraging to know, although I approach with some trepidation because I might end up in some kind of role in trying to manage it in terms of the session. I'm not sure how that would be handled, but yeah that's encouraging to know then. What else?

So let's assume for a moment that is the case. We end up with getting good and comprehensive community input at the meeting via that session. What else might we achieve in advance of that? I mean how does my suggestion to try and get the charter on the - move for the charter to be accepted on the second council meeting? are we largely happy with that kind of - I mean given that this charter is pretty much drafted at this point, I can recirculate it with my suggested changes, which are as I say not particularly material and potentially put that forward as a motion. How does that sound?

Margie Milam: Hey Jonathan, it's Margie. Jaime has been in the queue. I think he wanted to say something and I also wanted to get in the queue as well.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm sorry Jaime. I apologize. I'm not on the - because of the little mix up about the call, I haven't logged on to Connect, so please guys just jump in. There are only four of us - four or five plus the staff. But please just jump in Jaime. I'm sorry. I'm not monitoring that.

Jaime Wagner: I don't know if you are hearing me. Are you hearing me?

Jonathan Robinson: We can hear you Jaime. Go ahead. We can hear you. Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Okay, my position would be to focus first on the draft - on the chartering of these cross-community working groups. So I would suggest for us to focus on the chartering as the first focus, but I understand that you are now concerned with the charter of our drafting team, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Correct. And in fact Jaime just to help you there, under the objectives and goals laid out in the charter of our drafting team, one of

the key areas is to find a way forward for effective chartering of cross-community working groups.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah and I don't know if I would go much further than that. That's my point in a first attempt. There was an expectation that the GNSO working groups - the work that has been done around the GNSO working groups would fit in cross-community working groups. This was an expectation, but I feel that this is an input that should be given afterwards to a larger group.

Jonathan Robinson: Jaime can you just help me clarify my understanding of what you are saying there? So I think I'm hearing you say two things. One that you think - you are suggesting that...

Jaime Wagner: That we should narrow our - the scope of the drafting team to focus only on the chartering of the cross-community working groups.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so the first point...

Jaime Wagner: Hello.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I'm digesting. Is there any - I mean what - have you seen the drafting team charter as it stands at the moment?

Jaime Wagner: The drafting team roles and functions. This is the effective chartering functioning and utilization.

Jonathan Robinson: Correct. Correct. Yes and you are saying trim it back to simply focusing on effective chartering of CCWG.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comment or thought on that from people on the call? Or maybe Jaime maybe you could help us on why you think that that's - we should limit ourselves to that extent.

Jaime Wagner: Because I would - I understand that in the second round it would be easier not to face some positions from other stakeholder groups if we present something that is very (finished) in the GNSO discussion. This could face some opposition when it is offered to other community stakeholders, and I think that the chartering issue would not face opposition. That's an impression.

Jonathan Robinson: That's helpful. Any other comments on that or thoughts?

Jaime Wagner: And I think also that chartering is already a broad enough issue for us to - at least to have to phase our work into two phases. The first phase where we would phase only the chartering and then another phase where the group could be open to other stakeholders and other community groups. Then it would feed which kind of policy or not policymaking issues should be tackled by the cross-community working groups.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah I must say I grapple with this whole thing of participation or not because the charter is (envisions) very open contribution and participation. There's never been an intention. I think the only issue here really is whether the drafting team is in some way a cross-community working group or whether it is a GNSO chartered working group with wide-open invitation to participation from anyone else within the community to contribute. So I think to some extent I'm not sure I

fully grasp the subtleties between the two because the intention is to get as broad as possible input in any event.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm trying to think where we go next in terms of what we might achieve. Unless there's some other feedback on whether we limit ourselves as Jaime is suggesting to effective chartering of community working groups or whether - I mean I hear what you are saying Jaime. It is both potentially - it would likely be of limited scope and therefore not encounter opposition or the GNSO determining this without sufficient other input. And also frankly it is perhaps a smaller mouthful to bite off, but I just wonder if that limits us to likely doing anything useful.

Jaime Wagner: Well you don't think that providing an effective chartering? Because the problem is how are these groups being chartered. I think this is where the problem has arisen. Different charters from different organizations and this is where the JAS working group failed or presented some problems, and I think that if we come up with a narrower focus and we come up with something in chartering, we would be doing a great job. And I think this is a much more objective and feasible thing to do in this short timeframe we have ahead of us.

Jonathan Robinson: Do you mean specifically with respect to between now and Dakar.

Jaime Wagner: Not only that, but yeah to present something. Even if we narrow our charter to the focus of chartering, I don't think we would be able to present something that - to finish something until Dakar.

Jonathan Robinson: I agree, which kind of loops us back to the suggestion of putting the CCWG firmly in this candidate pool for an open mic discussion. Because if we (could draw) back the deadline for producing something for the council, which is somewhere in the fourth quarter of the year, getting significant community input during the Dakar meeting would then to my mind put us in a position where between now and Dakar we really set up a basis in which we can take input or the questions we seek to answer rather than trying to produce any form of finished product.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Any thoughts on that Wendy, John, or Liz, or Margie? How does this description or the shape we're talking about - how does this sound?

John Berard: While I appreciate and in most cases would endorse Jaime's wanting to more narrowly define the project, my feeling is that we're going to see as soon as Dakar I believe increased pressure for the climate of an increasing number of cross-community working groups on issues ranging from ethics and conflict of interest to uniform contract terms.

I mean my feeling is that there is going to be a lot of energy behind bringing more of the constituencies together at the start of consideration, and I think a lot of that is going to be driven by the board. I believe that there will be an increased number of requests from the board to create these kinds of things. So while I might otherwise think that one step at a time would be pretty good, I do think we need to do a little bit of running here before we walk. And so I would encourage us to be as - to take in as much as we can with this first step.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah I hear you loud and clear. That's a good point.

Wendy Seltzer: This is Wendy and I apologize. I was called away for a moment during the call.

John Berard: My plan worked.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah Wendy can we help with catching you up at all? Would you like a free synopsis of the last five minutes or so?

Wendy Seltzer: No, I won't put you all through that.

Jonathan Robinson: Well the essence Wendy of what we are grappling with a bit though is I think it's simply really helpful to get any input from you as well.

I mean I think that the things I'm grappling with is John has highlighted that there's a bigger context to this, and there's a bunch of cross-community issues potentially coming down the track and pressure for these to be dealt or issues to be dealt with in a cross-community way by cross-community working groups. Unless we make significant progress in reasonably short order, we risk these - we risk getting into an impasse.

Because I can already see as Liz touched on earlier that when there's a suggestion of cross-community working groups taking place, that the bounce back is well wait until the GNSO - don't start anything until the GNSO has done its work on this.

Wendy Seltzer: So we've got pressure to work quickly.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah correct. And so...

Wendy Seltzer: And nobody - and none of us with bandwidth to do a lot or concern that we don't even have enough people to participate.

John Berard: And that's the reason I'm wondering if we can issue some kind of - a call for input from the community to help inform the work of this working group. I realize that it would probably not be totally within - I mean is there an opportunity to if we go back to each of our constituencies, if figure out how to instigate comment, at least we can get people talking and thereby pushing this thing further up the priority list.

Jonathan Robinson: John I hear someone else wants to come in, but just a quick comment. Is that you Liz or is it Margie? Who is trying to come in?

Wendy Seltzer: It's Wendy trying to add something.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi Wendy. Fire away.

Wendy Seltzer: Well I sense that we've got two different or at least two levels of challenge. One is that we need among the GNSO Council to define our attitude toward these working groups and then we need to get input from the rest of - other parts of the community on what they want to participate in. and I think we would be - you know have a plenty large enough job just trying to coordinate what we as councilors want to get out of cross-community working groups and what scope we are willing to give them.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Wendy, it's Jonathan and in many ways that's where we got kind of stuck the last time around on the call, which is why I came into this one saying look how about we keep this tight and we try and make as much progress as we can in understanding the GNSO attitude to these things. But it's a very - it's a really circular problem because we run the risk as Jaime is touching on of being seen to be going off without proper input. Yet if we try and get comprehensive cross-community input, we run the risk of you know having too much to deal with too soon.

And the other thing Wendy that Jaime was suggesting is maybe we really narrow the scope. Perhaps we really narrow the scope of what we're trying to do down to just concentrating on effective chartering of these community working groups, which is really tightening up the focus.

Wendy Seltzer: Well if we keep going Meta, we won't get anything done.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah and so I came into this call with you know my kind of pragmatic hat on and thinking well how do we really try and - because I feel both responsible and aware that the progress is looking thin on the ground for you know something that was really kicked off back around May and here we are three or four months later with not much to show for it. And I freely admit that's partly because I have been very busy, but nevertheless, I'd like to try and achieve a little more than we have to date.

And so perhaps I could - I mean I don't know how. I mean Jaime you seem to have a charter in front of you. John and Wendy I don't know how much of this draft charter we've got. I don't know how much

charge you have to look at this and whether we could recirculate that, reinvigorate that on a list between us, and see if we can't shape something up. That or a variant of it to try and get in front of the council.

I mean the shape I'm starting to see now is potentially that a couple of calls between now and Dakar and some question as to whether we have an open mic session on the CCWG issue, understanding that that brings with it some risks. And I wouldn't mind discussing that with the council in fact and seeing how receptive other (councils) are to that.

Margie Milam: Hey Jonathan it's Margie if I may chime in for a moment.

Jonathan Robinson: Margie I would love to hear something. Thanks.

Margie Milam: You and I had an email correspondence about whether I should make a request for a meeting in Dakar and I did submit one. I submitted one for Thursday morning because there's a lot of activity going on and that seems to be a time hopefully that wouldn't have much conflict, but that might be an area where you could get other input. I mean you are talking about hopefully getting the viewpoint of other you know (SOs and ACs). And you know if we approach that meeting in Dakar as something where we're trying to get input, you know that might be one way of doing it.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah and I appreciate you reminding me of that Margie because I thought we had a conversation about putting this issue on the schedule in Dakar. Do you know when we will know about that?

Margie Milam: We submitted a request last week and I don't know how long it is before they actually you know work out all the conflicts and publish it. Liz, do you have any idea when that might be when we will have a...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: ...chatting, because I'm not sure either.

Margie Milam: Yeah I will find out and send an email to the list so you guys know when we will know, because off the top of my head I don't know.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, so I mean we're probably coming into the wrap up few minutes here at the moment, but what I've got from this is that essentially there are a few things. One, we've got to (put out) another (doodle) poll to try and set up a couple of Thursday meetings between - you know two or three Thursday meetings every two weeks between now and Dakar. And we will make - we will use that as a - or certainly meetings that don't run directly into the (consumer metrics) meeting because of the overlap there.

Two, I'm going to recirculate the charter as it is at the moment with some minor suggested changes and try and take account of what has been said on this call. And then three, having there is a prospect of putting this draft charter depending on how we get on the - by email of putting this before the GNSO as a motion to define a way in which this drafting team is going to work.

And then four, I suggest that we - it sounds like we've got a suggestion of either dealing with this as a part of sort of an open mic session at the GNSO public meeting and/or as a public meeting on the Thursday

morning in Dakar. How does that sound and are there any other comments in and around that as a kind of practical way forward?

Any other thoughts or comments before we bring this rather short meeting to a close?.

((Crosstalk))

Wendy Seltzer: ...by silence.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes it sounds like it.

Glen DeSaintgery: Jonathan this is Glen. Just one small comment that the final schedule review for the Dakar meetings is Wednesday the 21st of September.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, so we should know a little after that whether we are on the schedule or not and how that is likely to work.

Liz Gasster: And I would encourage you to let Jeff know if you think that that would be valuable or you know we can do that too if that's something you particularly (want).

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah sure Liz. I guess for me the question is if we get to be on the schedule on Thursday morning, I mean I think we're talking about two separate potential events here aren't we. One is part of the GNSO Council open meeting and the other is a separate item on the meeting schedule as an open session on CCWG. Am I correct in my understanding?

Margie Milam: Yes that's right.

Liz Gasster: (Depending on if you could) really do the kind of outreach you would like at the Thursday session.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: So if we get on the schedule for the - on the Dakar schedule for the Thursday session that may influence Liz the thinking of whether we want to then be part of - CCWAG as part of Jeff's session as well.

Liz Gasster: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. All right everyone, I did promise we would try and wrap it up by five to, and it looks like we can just about manage to do that. I think that's a little progress and I really appreciate your time on the call. Let's pick it up on the list and see if we can't work with this.

Woman: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks very much.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks.

END