

**Outreach Task Force
TRANSCRIPT
Monday 05th December 2011 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-of-20111205-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec> (transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Rafik Dammak
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen
John Berard
Roy Dykes
William Drake

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Joy Liddicoat

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Outreach meeting on the 5th of December 2011. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Wolf Knoblen, John Berard, William Drake, Roy Dykes.

From Staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have an apology from Joy Liddicoat. I would like to remind you all to please

state your names when speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Nathalie and welcome everyone. This is Julie Hedlund. I am assisting with this meeting. It is - as a reminder to everyone we - it's a follow up meeting to the last GNSO Council meeting where there was a motion being considered to approve the Outreach Task Force Charter.

That motion did not pass but a group of Councilors agreed to get together to discuss how we might possibly move forward say with an alternate motion or other related activities.

I know that there were some suggestions discussed in the chat during the GNSO Council meeting on the 17th of November about possibly amending the motion that was put forward at that time.

And what I've done for either this discussion and a starting point is I've put the motion that was presented at the GNSO Council meeting into the Adobe chat room.

I also have available the Outreach Task Force Draft Charter if we want to look at that, and I can of course craft any revisions to a motion and post that in the chat room as we discuss them.

Perhaps I might lean on you a little bit John. I know that you had suggested perhaps some possible changes to a motion, and I'm wondering if you have anything that you would like to suggest.

John Berard: Sure, I'll just restate my concern as expressed at the time, which is looking at the motion - let's see if I can find it here. No, in looking at the Draft Charter that the motion addressed my concern was that Objective 3 of the Objectives and Goals seemed to me to be something that needed - that ought to be done before anything else.

And so we can discuss whether or not the reach of the Outreach group is overly broad. I think there are - some think that as well. We can discuss whether or not it seeks to or causes the centralized Outreach activities in ways that undercut the individual constituencies.

But at bottom my concern is that it's difficult to vote for an activity without knowing what the underlying information is about that activity. So Objective 3 indicates that there would be a survey of existing GNSO Outreach activities to identify populations engaged in the domain name system, the individuals and organizations involved and their season organizations.

It seems to me to be data collection that ought to be the first step, and so certainly I think that's where I would begin and that was my concern. I also felt that the charter and then the motion that we were considering would have done more and needed to or ought to centralize what I think is better done as a distributed function, so those are my concerns.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much John. And I know also that I think Wolf-Ulrich, you mentioned some concerns as well. Did you want to raise them here also?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you Julie. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. I wonder whether you received just my comments some ten minutes ago. So I was sending something to the list and - but I did not have - I did not see whether it went through or not. It was a kind of amendment of the motion. Did you receive that?

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie. No I'm sorry Wolf-Ulrich. I have not seen that come through yet.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, so I'm going to resend it. It was ten minutes ago but you can see if it comes through there, so that's one thing. But the concerns from my side

and from our constituency and - have been with two groups, with two aspects.

We should have two aspects and one was the relation between the OTF let me say, OTF activities, and the Outreach activities of the constituencies and Stakeholder Groups and how to let me say to bring that together or to let me say to - not to interfere too much, so that was one thing.

And the other thing then was with regard to the organization of the whole structure of the OTF. So it seemed to me that it was really organized in a way or should be organized in a way which could be a very, very large group and I was wondering whether the effect of that group could be of that which is expected, so from the Council's point of view.

So I put these - both points together in an amendment of the motion and then - and if you'd like to look at this while I resend it I can also read that. And I want - and then would like to ask for a discussion of these both amendments, and these were my both points.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Wolf-Ulrich. And I still...

Rafik Dammak: Julie? Sorry, it's Rafik. Is it possible to put this - that - this amendment and the motion in the Adobe Connect? I think...

Julie Hedlund: Yes I would like to do that but unfortunately I have not received them yet, and I don't know why that is. I - the only thing I can think is to try to...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, I will send it again in an email to the list right now.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, let me just - I'm just - I've just tried to quit my email function and I'm just going to try to reopen it. Sometimes that is enough to get the latest mail to come through. I don't know why it's slow in getting to me - very odd.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Did others receive that?

Julie Hedlund: Others did I think Wolf-Ulrich.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Is that right? Did some of the others get it?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay I will send it to you again Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, if you don't mind and I'm very sorry. I don't know why - not coming through for me. I just restarted my email and it still has not made its way to me so I apologize for that.

I think that certainly would be a good place to start. While we're - while I'm waiting to get Wolf-Ulrich's amended motion, did others have anything that they would like to comment on?

William Drake: Yes this is Bill. Various comments - first of all can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, very well. Thank you.

William Drake: Okay, so I'm really puzzled about where we are and how all this is working. To put it mildly this is all pretty unorthodox. I'm not used to situations where there is a motion that has been delayed several times to the point that people have gone off the Council.

And it's unclear whether we're still talking about their motion or we're - we were supposed to have the motion sort of re-sponsored by somebody else, in which case I offered to do it and what the terms of doing that are and frankly why we're having a Staff-run meeting.

No offense but I didn't understand that either. And I thought that CSG was going to come back to us - was going to caucus and come back to us in advance of this meeting with some sort of text which we could circulate to NCSC.

And what I'm hearing instead is that Wolf is expressing one set of concerns and John's expressing another set of concerns, and I don't know where - how we're supposed to do this in time for the deadline before we have to revise any motion or whatever for the next meeting.

So I just - I'm really kind of just puzzled about all the procedural aspects of this. But I will say on the substance just looking over what has been shared so far, I don't really understand Wolf-Ulrich what execution of the implementation plan would mean.

To me it should be done by Stakeholders and Constituency Groups, but I know that the charter the way it's written by virtue of a long negotiation that involved CSG members anticipates a collective multi-stakeholder process for coordinating these activities that doesn't preclude as we talked about before Stakeholder Groups or constituencies from raising funds or doing outreach.

It's simply a matter of coordination. So I'm not - if you could clarify for me exactly what execution would mean, that would help me understand the text of your thing.

As for John's concern I don't, you know, we're still at the same disagreement on that. I just don't see this as a Stalinist or virtualization of anything. I see it as something that all Stakeholder Groups worked on for a year plus to come up with a model that was very much participatory and open.

And so that's that but - so in any event I don't put - we're not going to be able to do anything today because NCSG had no idea what was happening. We

won't have to go and talk with our people. Julie can you remind me what the deadline is for submission of revised motions? Is that - to the next Council meeting?

Julie Hedlund: The - thank you. This is Julie and thanks for your comments Bill. The deadline for motions to be submitted for the Council meeting on the 15th of December is this Wednesday the 7th by...

William Drake: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: It would be the 7th. And I see that Wolf-Ulrich has his hand raised so perhaps I'll pass it on to you if you're - if you are done with your comments Bill.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thank you Julie. Bill, thank you. Well I understand your questions and your concerns with regard to the process. So - but never mind. So we were discussing within our constituency and Stakeholder Group about that, but it was just - okay, there's no execution about it and I didn't deliver and provide in advance something more.

I was - okay it's my job to do though but I didn't that, so just - so leave it as it is so - but we discussed it. And the point with regards to execution just only means the following.

If you look to the charter or if I understand the charter correctly, there's something which the OTF should deliver, so this is included in the charter the deliverables.

So - and some part of the delivery is something which should - is I think it's described as a - an executable or maybe another word is used for them - executable implementation plan and strategy.

That's what it is about so to - and this is - what is it about? And the question for me is who should execute that? Who should really then - the body? Who is the one?

It's not only my question; it is Councilors in the constituency who is the one who should do that. And this is a clear statement that was done also during the last meetings that it is seen from the Commercial Stakeholder Groups that more on the side of the constituencies and the Stakeholder Groups rather than to maybe to the OTF who should be the body to do that. That's my statement and the statement in the amendment. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. And I note that Rafik has raised his hand. And perhaps we'll go to Rafik and then - and - but then also I want to give Bill a chance to respond to what Wolf-Ulrich has said.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Julie. Like I say I'm really puzzled by the amendment suggested by Wolf, because it's making these OTF empty and having nothing to do if the - how to say the execution would be - should be delivered task to the constituency and Stakeholder Groups.

The idea behind the OTF is to coordinate that Outreach Task to share best practices and to work together to bring more people. But to - how to say, to - obviously I would just decide just to constituency and Stakeholder Groups.

It's looks like for me Stakeholder and it's mostly that losing of silo, so each goes to chance. We will try to bring somehow some new members. I really - I don't agree with this amendment and I don't see that's the good way to work and to collaborate.

Maybe for the sides of the OTF I think that we discussed about that before. It's something maybe can be discussed again to how to find the best sides to make this more efficient.

But for the first amendment I'm not really - I don't see that it's really the - that as good, you know. Really I don't agree so much with that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rafik. Bill, did you want to respond to what Wolf-Ulrich has said as far as your question with respect to the execution? That's the phrasing in the modified...

William Drake: Yes. So I'm trying to understand what execution means Wolf-Ulrich. I'm looking at the Draft Charter, which again is to - participated in - on it together. And it says that the OTF will conduct a survey of existing GNSO Outreach activities.

Now we've - so let's start there. Is that to be done by the OTF in your view or is that to be done by the Stakeholder constituency - conduct the survey?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: May I respond?

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead Wolf-Ulrich.

William Drake: Yes. I want to go through which - each of the, I mean, I want to understand what you're saying. So we've got several defined activities and I want to know which ones you were saying should not be done by the OTF.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: You know, I'm referring to the mission at first so that is - the mission is very clearly saying - the mission of the OTF is to develop strategies and an implementation plan to attract new participants blah blah blah.

And then the OTF should recommend activities and develop content that could be used by different GNSO stakeholders to promote and blah blah blah, so that's it.

So - Rafik, so this is my understanding as well, so that recommendations should come from the OTF which could be used by the different part of the GNSO to execute them.

So that's my understanding with this respect so - and that's why I was making that very clearly in my statement that that is the understanding of it so...

William Drake: So can I just please - do you not want the OTF to conduct a survey? Yes or no? OTF should or should not?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Yes, survey I've - I'm okay with that.

William Drake: And - okay, then OTF should consult with the stakeholders, that's Objective 4, and conduct an analysis of the effectiveness of Objective 5. Should they do that analysis or no?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Point - print point, so sorry, Objective...

William Drake: Objective 5, should the OTF conduct the analysis and develop recommendations, or you're saying the Stakeholder Group or constituency should?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No that's okay. That's okay. Analysis and then let me say research, survey, all these things is okay. We are to have something available, you know, which then could be - could metrics or could measures could be drawn from. That is okay.

William Drake: Okay. So my only suggestion to you Wolf-Ulrich, if you guys could maybe caucus and specify exactly which activities you think the OTF should undertake and exactly which activities you think the Stakeholder Group and constituency should undertake, then we would have something we could take back to our people and say, "This is what they're suggesting."

But right now, I mean, we're all - we're both looking at the same charter and you're talking about executing in a kind of like broader kind of way, but it's not - I think we need to be precise.

So we didn't get any input so we need something to go on, otherwise we can't consider anything obviously, okay. So if you give us something we'll talk about it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: Yes, you know, maybe there's a misunderstanding. So, you know, when I say thought that's the execution of the GNSO global strategy and implementation plan, it's a task for the constituencies and Stakeholder Groups.

I was of the opinion of the deliverables or the provision of that, the global strategy for the global outreach strategy and implementation plan of the Outreach, that's up to the OTF itself. But just - you understand what I mean. There's one thing to...

William Drake: Yes I do but I - again I'm just saying it would help if you could precisely specify what you - what activities you view as being execution, okay, so that we're - because otherwise we're not going to be able to figure out how to respond to it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: Okay but...

William Drake: So just, you know, because this whole conversation's happening because you guys are saying that the way the OTF Charter is written allocates - creates a division of labor that allocates certain activities in places you don't want to be - it to be.

And so we just need to have something that specifies exactly where you do want which things to be so that we know precisely what's being proposed and can respond to it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, so - but let me think about that. So that means along the objectives you have that, so that's probably what I could do, get - quote that and come back with that and tell you what is our opinion, what could be done and what shouldn't be done.

William Drake: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay?

William Drake: The deadline is Wednesday and it's Monday evening in Europe and we're not going to have a lot of time to turn this around in terms of...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

William Drake: And then the - and I presume the Contracted people want to say something too so we have to move quickly.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you (Bill). Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. I did want to turn back to John Berard. John, the language that Wolf-Ulrich has put forward, or revised language that would - that he perhaps could send and - does that - or would that addressed issues that you've raised, do you think? I know that's asking a bit much since you haven't seen what the revisions would be.

John Berard: I've looked at Wolfe's suggest amendment. It certainly - his heart is in the right place. I think (Bill) is right that he and I should talk and offer a recommendation that everybody else can look at and hopefully get it done by the end of the day Wednesday.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much John. And Rafik, I know you had raised some concerns as well. I assume you'd be, you know, along with (Bill) willing to take a look at some revised language to consider. And - but before that, let me note that Wolf-Ulrich has raised his hand so let me defer to Wolfe.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you Julie. Just to make it complete, I had a second point (about) the size of the ODF itself. But it seems to me not consistent, the text in the charter. You know, the text is talking about 45 members and then another part is the size is not limited, you know.

And the 45 is - there's a reason given because of the number of constituencies plus two persons from each reason. This account that, from my understanding it's roughly around 20 - between 25 and 25. so I would like, you know, to be a little bit consistent with regard to that and I think it's - it could be more effective.

If I look at groups, you know, having 40 and more members, I'm a little bit - I have doubt, you know, about the effectiveness of that so that's the reason why I put 25 in.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Wolfe.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The other thing is with regards to the list earlier, the activities of the OTF, I would suggest, yes, I'll get very soon in contact, especially with John Berard to have close contact together with constituencies and we will come up with (plans).

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Wolf-Ulrich. And Rafik, did you have anything that you wanted to say relating to what (Bill) and Wolf-Ulrich have said?

Rafik Dammak: As I said, (deposit) size is not too - big issue for me. We can kind of discuss about that and I can understand Wolfe's concern and how to make this efficient. So it's not really a problem on that side.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: And yes, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Oh no, it's okay.

Julie Hedlund: And I do want to see if there are any comments from Roy Dykes. Roy was on the (TF) charter drafting team and he's been quietly listening here but I wanted to see, Roy, if you had anything that you wanted to add.

Roy Dykes: I don't have anything specific Julie. I was just really more observing what the comments were. So, you know, I'm happy to entertain any and all of the recommendations for changes. I do think - and I may have raised this when we were drafting. I can't remember. I do think - I do agree with the comment relative to the size of the task force.

Forty-five I think seems a bit large for effectiveness. But I - I don't necessarily know where it should be capped either. But just 45 seems like a pretty large number.

Julie Hedlund: Right and - thank you for that Roy and I do also recall that we went back and forth on how to do - to come up with a number and we did try to give some thought to how the task force would be built, you know, which is why we talked about having the representatives from the constituencies and representatives from the various regions without setting a limit.

But I think that we did agree in the drafting team that it certainly could be a smaller group and that a smaller group could be a little less unwieldy and I think we tried to, in the various iterations, you know, suggest that it could be a small group of just the representatives from the constituency and stakeholder groups and it could very well be - I think as Wolf-Ulrich notes, that there are some inconsistencies that have crept in in the - in a number of iterations that we made that could easily be made consistent, you know, and centered

around perhaps a smaller sized group. So thank you for those comments and thank you Roy.

Roy Dykes: Sure. Sure.

Julie Hedlund: And I would like to speak to briefly (Bill)'s initial comments about the procedure. I should say that I - in my various experience with the council and with working groups, I agree that this is unusual, perhaps unprecedented to have a motion that was carried forward but then had to be basically resubmitted by others because the initial - those who initially made the motion were off the council.

So we had some irregularities there that I think the GNSO council operating procedures did not envision. And I think now we're quite possibly also in an area that doesn't really have any procedures attached to it.

And as for this being a staff meeting, I'm simply here to facilitate the discussion. I don't have any particular goals in mind other than whatever your goals are with respect to the motion of the charter or whatever you would like to achieve with this issue.

I'm just here as a facilitator but I, you know, I don't think that we have a particular procedure that we can point to as far as how do deal with this situation. So in a way I think we're just doing the best we can to figure out how to approach it.

And with that being said, then what I heard was that Wolf-Ulrich is going to coordinate with John to come up with some more specific language and perhaps giving some more - a little bit more detail on the amended motion and on particularly the aspect of execution, that is, what aspects of the charter would be, you know, would be handled by the OTF and what might be handled by or executed by the constituencies and stakeholder groups.

And also we do have a Wednesday deadline. Certainly as you know, Wolf-Ulrich and John, as soon as you can some language to this list for all of us to consider, that will be most helpful.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you Julie. If I may just add - so I looked again at the - to my amendment and maybe that was also a misunderstanding (unintelligible) because in short term. I'm not talking about a GNSO global strategy and implementation plan other than the strategy and implementation plan which is - talks about - was in the charter here. You know, that may be the big misunderstanding. So...

William Drake: No, that's not the misunderstanding. Don't worry Wolfe. That's not it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But now it's understood what I mean, yes?

William Drake: It's understood that you were referring to the charter. It's not understood what is entailed by the term you're using. So that's why we needed to discuss that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay good. I will pick up that and come back with that, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Wolf-Ulrich, and thank you (Bill), for that clarification as well. Does anybody have any more - any other comments?

William Drake: Julie...

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead.

William Drake: This is (Bill) again. Just on the procedural point. No, I was just puzzled about how we're doing this because I'm just not used to things working this way. And in - I don't really even understand at this point what the status of this thing is.

I mean, my recollection - I'm in the middle of 800 other things today - but my recollection is that on the last council call, there was a discussion about whether the motion could be - had to be kind of reassigned to somebody else and there - whether - how then this would be done.

And I don't think we reached any clarity on that. I mean, I'm not even sure at this point whose motion this is or what the terms of engagement are on its revision. I offered to be a sponsor and somebody else offered to be a second. But it's not clear to me that that's actually the current situation.

And I don't really know where we are. So do you have any better understanding of that then I do?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I - well, it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So I have the full understanding so (Bill). So really what we need is for any motion, whether it's the existing one or it's an amen- so called amended or a different one, we need sponsors for that. So that that's clear.

So that means for me, it's my understanding that for - if, for example, you come up and say, okay, this is the motion as it is and so you put it on the table again so that's it.

And then there'll be a second as well. And if there's something different, it - this motion could be amended then and you have to, as usual, or there will be a second motion, a different one so (is a responder), so - and we have experience on council how to deal with that. So that's my understanding. But we need - at least we need for any kind of motion, in this respect, we need sponsors.

William Drake: Well I - thanks Wolfe. I did say I would sponsor it and somebody did say they would second it, but yet that doesn't seem to be respected in anything as far as I could tell so far. I don't know just why that is. I'd have to go back and look again at the minutes from the last call and see if...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So what we could do, you know, we need to have a preparatory call on - for the chair and the vice chair for the next meeting. So there is a draft agenda already on the table which includes the OTF.

And so I would suggest to my colleagues and the chairs and vice chairs, that we take this motion and put you as the sponsor of the motion into that. And the second I have to define, you know, I don't know the name - what one but so that would be my suggestion. Does that help (any)?

William Drake: Well I - I think Rafik - that's fine. I really - I don't care who does it I just don't understand what the status is. I thought Rafik offered to second it but I can't remember - I don't have the minutes in front of me.

Julie Hedlund: Well, so this is Julie. I think we're talking perhaps about two things here. There - we did get new sponsors for the motion that was put forward on the meeting on the 17th and I think that was you, (Bill), and I think it was perhaps Rafik who had seconded. But I'd have to check the notes. But that...

William Drake: No, no. It's Joy sorry - (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, yes that's correct. So - but that motion was not passed. So I think what we're seeking now is a new motion relating - and Wolf-Ulrich can correct me if I'm wrong - a new motion that needs to be put forth by the 7th. It needs someone, you know, to put it forth and someone to second it on the - well, at least to put it forth on the 7th.

The second doesn't have to happen on the 7th but the motion has to be made by someone and that could be you, (Bill), it could be Wolf-Ulrich. But I think what we're really looking at is a revised motion. Is that your understanding Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So I forgot that we had already this motion on the table and voted on that. That's correct, Julie, so we have to come up with a new motion and, yes, and that's what the task of this or the target of this (rule) was, so that means we have to find something until tomorrow or to Wednesday. Wednesday is deadline, yes. So...

Man: Okay...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: My suggestion would be, so after a discussion within the constituency and the stakeholder group on our side, so I will leave you a message whether we will come up with a motion, like in this correction as I put it on the table. So that could be one way.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

William Drake: Sorry, this is (Bill).

Julie Hedlund: Yes, go ahead.

William Drake: You're right. I mean, I'm looking at the minutes now. Okay, so yes, we had the ten abstentions. I forgot that also. So the motion failed. And so now if we're going to do a new motion, the question is, are we doing a motion that (ultimately) alters the - because, I mean, I would be perfectly happy right now to say that I would sponsor the same motion again in hope that now people have had time to talk about it and we could consider it and then we could amend it.

But if instead we're going to do it another way, maybe you know, because I mean I, you know, I - then it's not clear to me. I mean, if the motion - if CSG is going to do the motion, and it's going to read substantially different from the motion that we defeated the other day, then we're going to probably end up with a very different voting alignment on the whole thing.

And this could all - also I suppose we could have another (unintelligible) right. They'll probably defer this a couple of times and we could be talking about this in the New Year, so...

Man: Yes.

William Drake: ...I have a feeling this is going to be another one of those shows that goes on for a while. But I would've been very happy to - that's why I was waiting for lan- I thought that the idea was that an amendment to the existing motion was being sent in advance of this meeting, so that's why I was kind of confused about - so we're starting over suggesting (that).

Julie Hedlund: That's right. I'm sorry for the confusion (Bill) and I should've been more clear. Yes, my assumption - and I shouldn't - I should have clarified it - was that because that motion was not passed, that motion as far as I know, cannot be brought forward again in its - you know, in the state that it was...

Man: (Current point).

Julie Hedlund: ...didn't pass. So now we really are talking about a brand new motion. It may have a lot of the language from the previous motion. Some of that might make sense but it is, of itself, something new. And I see that Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up. Please go ahead Wolfe.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you Julie. That's correct. So - and so (Bill), I - frankly speaking, so I don't know what will happen and - or what will be the outcome of the (CSG) discussion we will have over the next day and two days. So I cannot promise that a motion like this which I put on the table, say it's a motion. It's not an amendment. It may be a motion - like this will come through, you know, from the (CSG) side.

Or maybe that the opinion is okay - why should we come up with a different motion? The other failed and that's enough. So let me - just start going that

way. So I don't think so, that this is the way. But it may happen as well. So you should be prepared, (exercise) wise, well, to come up with a way that's your own motion let me say. And this is like - what which would be also different from the original one.

William Drake: Right. Well, you know, change the number of participants I suppose. But what I'm concerned about is simply the process point because if you're - if you're doing the motion and that's fine with me, I don't - no way we're going to vote on it that time because we - by the time you come back with our - a whole new motion that you vetted through the CSG, there's not going to be time for NCSG or the registries, registrars to have really talked it through anyway, I don't think, or to come up with an alternative.

That's what my guess is but we can see - we'll see - so if you're starting fresh, it's in - I'm happy to just put it in your hands (Wolfe). Go ahead and come up with something by Wednesday and we'll see if we're in the position to vote on it but my guess is we may just ask for it to be deferred.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay, let's wait and see.

William Drake: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you (Bill). Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. So we'll look forward to seeing something from you, Wolf-Ulrich, in your coordination with John Berard and others and if you could send that to this list that will be most helpful.

And we will then, as our goal, try to have something then to submit on Wednesday by close of business Wednesday and have it posted for consideration for the next council meeting.

William Drake: Sounds good.

Julie Hedlund: Is there anything anyone else would like to add?

William Drake: Thank you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: I want to thank all of you for this meeting and for your flexibility in being able to join and I will - I'll continue to work with you and assist in any way I can.

William Drake: Okay great.

Man: Thank you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone. And if there is no other business, then I suggest that this meeting is adjourned.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much.

Man: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: (Take care) everyone.

Man: Bye all.

Julie Hedlund: Good bye.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Thank you. We'll now stop the recording. Thank you very much.

END